

**Lund University**

**Sociology of Law Department**

**Master programme in Sociology of Law/European  
Law**

**Master Thesis (RÄSM 02)**

**Spring 2014**

**“European Youth Parliament as a factor of legal culture  
change for Russian youth”**

**Abstract:**

Current research is dedicated to exploration of legal culture of Russian students and place of Europeanization in the formation of legal culture. Particularly it is studied legal culture of Russian students who participated in International Youth movements (like European Youth Parliament) and who did not. Theoretical framework for this research included legal culture, Europeanization, “living law” and legal pluralism concepts. The qualitative and quantitative methods were implemented to conduct the research. This research resulted in finding differences and similarities in legal culture between studied groups, allowed understanding how participation in International Youth movements (like European Youth Parliament) may affect formation of legal culture of Russian students and what is the role of Europeanization in this process and how Europeanization should be understood in the context of study dedicated to Russian students.

Key words: Europeanization, Russian Youth, living law, legal culture  
of Russian youth

**Thesis supervisor: Rustamjon Urinboyev**

**Student: Eriks Varpahovskis**



**LUND  
UNIVERSITY**

# Content:

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	4
<b><u>1.1. Historical background</u></b> .....	4
1.1.1. Context: identity.....	6
1.1.2. Context: legal culture.....	7
<b><u>1.2. What is EYP?</u></b> .....	8
1.2.1. European Youth Parliament.....	8
1.2.2. Organization.....	9
1.2.3. Participation.....	10
1.2.4. Audience.....	11
<b><u>1.3. Research question</u></b> .....	13
<b><u>1.4. Aim</u></b> .....	14
<b><u>1.5. Structure of the paper</u></b> .....	14
<b><u>1.6. Literature review</u></b> .....	15
1.6.1. Methodology of literature search.....	21
1.6.2. Outcome.....	22
<b><u>1.7. Theoretical section</u></b> .....	22
1.7.1. Theoretical pillar number 1: living law concept.....	23
1.7.2. Theoretical pillar number 2: legal culture concept.....	25
1.7.3. Theoretical pillar number 3: legal pluralism.....	27
1.7.4. Theoretical pillar number 4: Europeanization concept.....	28
1.7.5. Conclusion on theoretical stratagem and links between theories.....	30
<b><u>1.8 Methods and Methodology</u></b> .....	33
1.8.1. Methodology and methods.....	33
1.8.2. Research ethics and research process limitations.....	39
<b>2. Empirical findings: presentation and analysis of results</b> .....	40
<b><u>2.1. Survey</u></b> .....	40
<b><u>2.1.1. Analysis of results–survey</u></b> .....	40
2.1.1.1. .Block 1: traditional-national-international comparison.....	42

2.1.1.2. Conclusions: block 1.....	43
2.1.1.3..Block 2:living law application.....,	45
2.1.1.4. Conclusions: block 2.....	45
2.1.1.5.Block 3: association and participation.....	48
2.1.1.6. Conclusion for survey part.....	48
<u>2.2. Digital ethnography.....</u>	49
<u>2.2.1.. Analysis of results – ethnography.....</u>	50
2.2,1,1.First question: corruption.....	50
2.2.1.2.Second question: unwritten laws vs official laws.....	50
2.2.1..3.Third question: moral aspects vs official laws.....	52
2.2.1.4.Conclusion for ethnography part.....	52
<u>2.3. Outcomes from empirical results.....</u>	53
<b>3. Discussion: theoretical prism for results.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>4. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<u>4.1. Conclusion.....</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>4.2. Further research.....</u>	<u>58</u>
<b>5. References.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>6. Appendix.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<u>6. 1. APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE TRANSLATED.....</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>6. 2. APPENDIX 2: OVERALL STATISTICS.....</u>	<u>74</u>

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1. Historical background**

For almost 70 years on the Eurasian continent existed one of the biggest countries in modern history – the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This country was established on the basis of 15 formerly independent republics. A key ideology of the USSR was Marxism-Leninism and people of the country were trying to build Communist state. After 70 years this state collapsed and split into 15 republics which re-gained sovereignty.

Dissolution of the USSR put all former Soviet republics in transitional period. Countries tried to reform all their administrative structures, legal systems, economic policies, educational systems, and political structures. Daily lives of people, their habits, culture, and traditions changed (Dorogova et al., 2002).

Despite that national, religion and ethnic traditions were practiced during Soviet rule, the State government developed and promoted “Soviet” traditions, way of live of “Soviet citizen”, understanding of the world through the prism of Soviet way of thinking. This Soviet model of upbringing of own citizens implied the idea that youth should think and act in collectivist way and contribute to common well-being of nation and working class in particular, while Western model was focused on individualism (Kost’kin, 2008: 138-139). In other words socialist/communist things and way of life were presented as good, while Western capitalist things and way of life in the West were presented as destructive and bad.

Transitional period captured the moment when socialist/communist ideology collapsed and people suddenly saw that Western governance systems are more prosperous, people in Western-countries have better access to products, technologies, food, entertainment, freedom of speech etc.

From the moment of collapse of Soviet Union Western countries started having greater access to markets of ex-Soviet republics, started having more opportunities to influence on people through soft-power tools like

telecommunication production, education, filling markets with Western productions, culture etc (Marinichenko, 2009).

As far as in this thesis we are focusing on Russian youth there is a necessity to draw a vision on how the newborn state of Russia developed after a collapse of the Soviet Union. Such a focus will help us to better understand how complicated was the upbringing of new youth and what kind of influences young Russian citizens faced during upbringing period.

This influx of Western influence on new Russian state impacted on internal policies within State. Western experience of country building was considered by government as successful and as a result government headed by Yeltsin started to reorganize life of Russia in more Western way, more European way, as it seemed to be more progressive in comparison to “Soviet” way. It led to abolishment one-party (Marxist-Leninist) system, to adoption of new more progressive Constitution and other legislations, it led to development of market economy in the state, it led to renaissance of Russian Orthodox Church and its popularization, education system of the state started to experience influence from the West (Mau et al, 1998). Changes in this systems led to international student organizations gained access to Russia in the very beginning of 1990s and were able to establish branches in Russia (AIESEC, MUN) (Model UN, 2014; AIESEC RUSSIA, 2014), AFS (1992) (AFS Russia, 2014), ESTIEM (1994) (ESTIEM, 2014).

In 1999 Putin’s era of government started. Since 1999 Putin served as deputy Prime Minister, Prime Minister, acting president of Russian Federation when Boris Yeltsin decided to resign. In 2000 Putin became a president. He continued policy of Boris Yeltsin in terms of reformation of Russian state. During this period number of legislative and education reforms was implemented. International relations of Russia with EU were intensified in terms of building mutually beneficial partnerships. In addition to it the huge attention was given to development of youth national movements in Russia like Idushie Vmeste (2000) (Idushie Vmeste, 2014), Nashi (2007) (Nashi, 2014) and cooperation with other international youth movements started to develop in Russia like European Youth Parliament (2002) (EYP Russia, 2014), Eurasian Union of Youth (2005) (EUY,

2014), Youth Assembly of SCO(2009) (YASCO, 2014) and other Non-commercial youth organization (Zelenova, 2009: 66)

Despite the recent political events in terms of Russian-Ukraine, Russian-EU relations, despite that Russia has a chance to be isolated due to sanctions, despite recent implementation by Russia a number of regulations in terms of registration of NGOs who are sponsored by non-Russians entities it worth highlighting that Russia is open for international NGOs.

### **1.1.1. Context: identity**

Current situation in terms of cultural, political, legal views of Russian youth is complicated because there are view influencing powers: 1) influence of Soviet state efforts in terms of Soviet identity building wasn't eradicated and some Soviet traditions, views, culture could be transferred from parents (who were born and brought up in Soviet Union) of youngsters to their children who were already born in Russian Federation, because parents participate in upbringing of children and most of current school and university teachers were born, brought up and educated in Soviet Union; 2) some of current teenagers experienced shortcomings in terms of education, upbringing, legislation that were connected to transitional period of Yeltsin reign, when, for instance, legal system was not normalized, corruption in all authorities blossomed (what continued and developed during Putin's reign (Party of People's Freedom, 2011) and children learned life in streets, 3) youngsters who were born after Soviet Union collapse gained more access to international (European) education and exchange opportunities due to development and popularization of international organizations (like UN Model, AIESEC, EYP), new international cooperation between education authorities (like exchange programs between Russian universities and abroad universities), promotion of exchange movements, development of Internet as a main media source for youth.

Consequently Russian youngsters' identity is composed of traces of Soviet identity, transitional Russia experiences, external influences of XXI century and recent developments.

Assuming external influences on Russian youth identity it is necessary to test if this influences were done by international youth movements in particularly by European Youth Parliament because it is closely stick to "European" and "Europeanization" terms that have special meaning in Russian context.

Close cooperation of Russian government with the EU and development of Russian openness to international NGOs, public discussions of internal and external political issues, access to tourism and education abroad trips, and development of media sources for the last 20 years led to better education in terms of legislation, but it is still unclear if this NGO development led to reformation of legal culture of nation. Such trends are especially strong among the Russian young people who actively take part in the international youth movements such as European Youth Parliament (EYP), the process that I am going to investigate in this master thesis.

### **1.1.2. Context: legal culture**

Primary concept that the research is built around is the concept of "legal culture". In this research legal culture is used as theoretical pillar and the subject of study. In particular we assume that Russian youth has legal culture and legal culture of Russian youngsters who participate in international youth movements like European Youth Parliament and those who don't participate might be different. In this research legal culture is a concept that can be described as "dominant pattern" of perceptions of law, attitudes towards law, ideas, opinions and expectations about law by certain people/community/society what results in special way of behavior regarding law and special way of thinking about law (Kurkchian, 2009: 338).

Consequently certain communities whose legal culture is explored in this research are Russian students who participate in the EYP and those who don't.

As far as legal culture includes patterns that touch upon behavior (acting) in regards of law and thinking (attitude) on law both these aspects are assessed.

Legal culture is the key-concept for this research because exactly with the help of this concept it is attempted to define differences/similarities between Russian students who participate in the EYP and who not in behavior and thinking in regards of law.

Taking into account that Russian legal culture concept is underdeveloped (Kurkchyan, 2009: 338) it worth noticing that this research will contribute not only to measuring legal culture differences/similarities between Russian participants and non-participants of EYP but also will contribute in building an understanding of Russian legal culture concept by Russian youth in general.

## **1.2. What is EYP?**

### **1.2.1. European Youth Parliament:**

Current research is aimed on scrutiny of the people who participated and not participated in such European youth movements like the European Youth Parliament (EYP). For better understanding of the importance of participation in the EYP for the topic of the research further I describe features of the EYP and work of this organization.

### **1.2.2. Organization**

Organization started in 1987 in France. Within 20 years the EYP became one of the most popular European youth movements. Today it involves over 40,000 members and under the name of the EYP over 120 different events are conducted annually in over 30 countries of Europe (including Russia and Ukraine) (EYP, 2014a). Currently headquarter of the organization is situated in Berlin, Germany. The EYP is recognized as a programme of Schwarzkopf-Stiftung Junges Europa



(Schwarzkopf-Stiftung, 2014). “Today the EYP is one of the largest European platforms for political debate, intercultural encounters, political educational work and the exchange of ideas among young people in Europe” (EYP, 2014b). The EYP serves as an educational tool for youngsters from European countries (not only EU) that allows understanding each other cultures and political mechanisms, with access to events by the EYP the participants gain access to new knowledge, experience and consequently their vision/perception of, for instance, national legislation might be shaped or changed.

The EYP is active in Russia from 2002 (EYP Russia, 2014) the EYP events take place in Russia and Russian EYP members (EYPers) go to events in other EYP countries where they are involved in cultural and educational processes. As far as one of the main aims of the EYP is the internationalization and cultural exchange the promotion of Europeanization and common European identity occurs. As participants of the EYP events young people discuss and debate various topics which are mainly Europe-centered (Schwarzkopf-Stiftung, 2014).

### **1.2.3. Participation**

#### **Formal aspect:**

This research is based on the comparison and assessment of two groups. These two groups are: EYP participants and EYP non-participants. By EYP participants are understood those people who have at least once took part in events organized by European Youth Parliament. EYP participants are those people who were either organizers of the event, or performed at the event as delegates (member of the committee that contributes to development of the resolution dedicated to certain issue), or chairs, co-chairs of committees (head of committee that guides work of the committee), journalists, editors (people who are responsible for the media coverage of the event), vice-presidents, presidents (official heads of the events).

By non-participants are considered people who never took part in events conducted by the European Youth Parliament and have never performed in roles mentioned above.

It is important to highlight that among non-participants can be found people who were planning to participate in European Youth Parliament events but due to certain reasons could not do it (were not selected, didn't apply, didn't attend the event etc.)

After participation in at least one event by the EYP person becomes a EYP alumni.

### **Cultural aspect:**

Participation in the EYP also comprises educational and cultural aspects. People from all around the Europe share their knowledge, experience, meet each other cultural patterns, cooperate in order to produce a solution for various issues. This practice broadens people's views, teaches them English language, international, regional and local legislations, make them more internationally oriented (EYP, 2014).

Conditions for participation: everybody can participate in the EYP events who is aged between 14 and 27 years old, who is students of school or university. It is necessary to highlight that for participation in this event at least intermediate knowledge of English or French language is needed. Not many researches were made on knowledge of English language by Russian, but the last research by Levada Center outlined that 17% aged between 15 and 29 stated that can speak foreign languages. 80% of this share meant English language (Levada, 2008).

Such low rate stems from lack of opportunities to learn and practice foreign language (university with high quality language programs, access to foreign literature). Majority of English speaking students according to this research are based in Moscow and other biggest (population from 500,000 and bigger) cities of the country (Ibid.).

Inexplicit condition for the participation in the EYP is interest of the person to meet new people from different parts of Russia and other countries, to learn new things (in particular things that are related to solution of different problems), to travel (this includes aspect of readiness to spent money on going abroad).

#### **1.2.4. Audience:**

Depending on participation indicator the two different groups are defined: EYP participants and non-participants.

#### **The differences between these groups are following:**

EYP participants usually come from one of the biggest cities of Russia, he/she can speak English at least on the intermediate level, he/she wills (or at least is not afraid) to meet new people and to travel, he/she (parents of the participant) can provide minimal funding to cover travel and living costs during participation in events, he/she is interested in expanding of own knowledge/educate themselves about different things.

Average Russian students live in cities and towns of different population, approximately only every 5<sup>th</sup> of them can speak English at least at the intermediate level because of limited access to university programs on English language, foreign literature, lack of will/opportunity to learn language, due to limited financial support, especially those who live in distant places only there are not many opportunities to travel within country and abroad. According to results of researches on Russian students hobbies and spare time activity (Sociologysoul, 2014; Sibac, 2014) only 15% of students are ready to dedicate own spare time to self-education activity (EYP is and education project).

Despite differences measured between groups there're no researches dedicated to legal culture of these groups, furthermore despite having different features there are no evidences that representatives of one group have certain way of understanding legal culture and other representatives are more prone to have different legal culture understanding. Savin in his research found out that

perception of legal culture for Russian students is influenced by media (creation of an image of law abiding person, role model), family, education and personal experiences in terms of relationships with official legislation (2011, 16-17) and understanding of legal culture concept and legal culture itself are similar to students of any specialty excepting those students who study law (Savin, 2011: 13).

### **Common features of these groups:**

The common features of these groups are that both EYP participants and EYP non-participants are students, that come from Russia, all of them belong to same age group 14-27, all participants of the research are in process of getting education, all of participants have opportunities for self-education (they have Internet, research was done online).

### **Entry conditions to the project**

There are certain entry conditions to participate in the EYP project that students should meet: language requirements, ability to cover travel and participation costs, will to meet new people and to spend time on self-education (participation in EYP), have access to the Internet (to make applications to learn about the organization).

Participants may not have additional or specific knowledge on certain topics to participate in the EYP, but should be proactive in terms of participation in education projects.

### **Relation between participation in the EYP and “legal culture”**

This research allows drawing differences in understanding of legal culture between EYP participants and non-participants. Due to the fact that legal culture topic is not very well developed in Russian science and legal culture of students was studied only partly it is impossible to delineate features of attitudes and behavior of two mentioned afore groups regarding legal cultures. There're no

clear evidences on the fact that EYP participants had different legal culture attitudes before joining EYP in comparison to students who have never participated in the EYP. In this regards is reasonable to assess differences in legal culture between EYPes and non-EYPers in order to see differences and allow assumption that these differences (if they are present) might appear due to participation/non-participation of students in such an educational projects like EYP.

### **Europeanisation in this research project**

Europeanization is complicated concept. In this research primary Europeanisation stems from not only from legal culture concept but from culture itself and historical background. In this research the EYP is considered as a tool for Europeanization of students and their views, understanding of legal culture. But it is necessary to highlight that Europeanization is very unique concept in Russian context. This Europeanization in Russian context is further discussed in theoretical section.

### **1.3. Research question**

Assuming that legal culture is dynamic, unstable, permanently develops and sensitive to socio-political and economic changes and given that part of Russian youngsters participate in youth international movements, *the following socio-legal question arises as to whether this participation and involvement in international youth parliament (in particular European Youth Parliament) moulds the legal culture of Russian young people and what form does this influence take if it is present?* If this is the case, the following sub-question logically stems from the afore mentioned main research question: How does the participation of Russian young people in European Youth Parliament (EYP) affect their legal culture in comparison to those Russian youth who never took part in EYP?

Thus, this thesis will investigate and answer the afore said questions by employing both quantitative (online survey) and qualitative methods (digital

ethnography) and draw on socio-legal theories (living law, legal culture, legal pluralism) and concept of Europeanization as the theoretical framework.

#### **1.4. Aim**

The aim of the research is to find out if the participation of Russian youngsters in the European Youth Parliament events (Europeanization) affected their legal culture and changed personal attitude and usage of the tradition-based/tradition-rooted norms and laws. This research allows depiction of legal culture change of young Russians through their participation in NGOs and this research also allows demonstration of the effects and efficiency of such soft power instruments like NGO, how NGOs can contribute to legal culture change of young people.

Furthermore this research allows examination of the effects Europeanization on legal culture, exploration if there is a difference between Russian youngsters who participated in the European Youth Parliament (and Europeanized) and who didn't in terms of legal culture and proneness to associate themselves to different law layers of legal pluralism (including living law layer explained by living law theory).

The key-aim of the paper is to examine whether that participation of young Russians in European Youth Parliament (Europeanization) affected their legal culture associations in way that after participation youngsters are less prone to follow living law choosing to follow more official norms.

#### **1.5. Structure of the paper**

This master thesis consists of 6 parts.

1) Introduction where historical and political contexts are explained. There research question is discussed and presented with the aim of the research. In addition introduction part contains literature review, theoretical section and methodological parts.

- 2) Second part is dedicated to presentations and analysis of empirical data gained through implication of survey and digital ethnography.
- 3) In the third part empirical outcomes are discussed through theoretical prism of the research.
- 4) In the conclusive part all results are summed up and presented with brief explanation of background, theoretical and methodological contexts.
- 5) Appendixes containing statistics info and translation of the questionnaire.
- 6) The last part of the paper contains references.

## **1.6. Literature review**

Russia and Europe have longitudinal relations that last for century and history of these relations is rich soil for the research by scholars that represent various scientific fields. For this research it is necessary to focus attention on Europeanization.

There are extensive discussions on Europeanization in terms of terminology and practical applications and results (Radaelli, 2003; Ladrech, 1994; Héritier, Risse, Cowles, Caporaso, 2001; Medvedev, 2008; Börzel, 1999). The theoretical discussions on Europeanization meaning are presented by variety of scholars like Radaelli (2003), Ladrech (1994), Héritier, Risse, Cowles, Caporaso (2001) and others. By some of them Europeanization is considered as a process of super-state institutionalization rooted in EC or EU processes (Radaelli, 2003: 30; Ladrech, 1994: 17). Other scholars express different opinion, and they focus on Europe as geographical entity: in particular, Héritier and Risse, Cowles and Caporaso address Europeanization term from the perspective that Europe is a continent that contains different European countries of the continent (not only EU member states or only Western European countries) (2001; 2001:3). If we combine these perspectives of viewing Europeanization through super-national authorities and viewing Europe as a geographic continent or region that includes countries that are both member states of the EU and not we may conclude that Europeanization is a process which leads to creation of new super national institutions on the basis of regional authorities.

Different perspective on Europeanization is demonstrated by scholars that write about Europeanization within a context of EU relations with former Soviet republics. In this case Europeanization is examined within a context of politics and in particular through the prism of European Neighborhood Policy which supposes improvement of non-EU states for cooperation with EU. This improvement is led in four dimensions, such as (1) promotion of democracy; (2) cooperation within economic field; (3) Justice and Home Affairs; and (4) resolution of conflicts (Franke, Gawrich, Melnykovska & Schweikert, 2010: 150; Drautzburg, Gawrich & Melnykovska (ed.), 2008: 36; Mkrtchian, Huseynov & Gogolashvili, 2009: 126; Melnykovska, 2008:2; Petersen, 2012: 7-8; Alieva, 2006: 17; Raik, 2011: 11; Makukh, 2006). Consequently from this perspective Europeanization is a process of meeting EU standards by non-EU member states, and this Europeanization according to scholars could be found in non-EU member states actions to improve cooperation with EU and intention for realization of aspirations of becoming EU member state one day, without being guaranteed it by the EU in case of reaching of standards dictated by integration needs (Petersen, 2012:8; Raik, 2011: 11; Kruglashov, 2011, Popescu, 2011; Suzhinskaya, 2013; Tsuladze, 2012).

We can see different Europeanization if we wear glasses of scholars that examine Russian-EU relations (Bordachev & Moshes, 2004, Trenin, 2004, Medvedev, 2008; Bragina, 2012): for instance, Bordachev and Moshes examine relations between Russian and EU and define Europeanization in this context as a political model where Russia should fulfill requirements made by the EU in order to adopt European norms and values (2004:97). Trenin also highlights value aspect of the Europeanization and adds to the concept of Europeanization, presented by Bordachev and Moshes, “the integration component”, trying to look at Europeanization from the standpoint that Europe is a continent, not political entity and super state (2004:19), Medvedev also shares Trenin’s and Bordachev and Moshes’s view on Europeanization within a context of EU-Russia relations in terms of values component (2008:8). So concluding Europeanization concept within a context of EU-Russia relations it is fair to state that it is a concept of



changing of values of Russians in order to make them more “European” (term “European” in Russian context has very specific meaning and is discussed further in theoretical chapter) or meeting European high-standards of living and to make Russia more suitable for integration with EU, but not becoming EU-member state. Opportunity of becoming EU member state is not even considered by Russian scholars.

Other perspective on Europeanization could be found in studies dedicated to research of Europeanization through the prism of culture phenomenon on Russian soil (Bazhenova & Syomina, 2008). In this regards Europeanization is seen by Syomina and Bazhenova as process, or cultural dialogue, where European culture performs as a culture-generator and Russian culture as a culture-recipient, and in this case Russian culture tries to improve by learning from European esthetic, technological, value aspects (2013).Kalinichenko bridges Europeanization of Russian culture in general and Europeanization of legal culture of Russia by portraying impacts which modernization (Europeanization) of culture in general made to Russia’s legal system and culture. Kalinichenko outlines that cooperation of Russia and EU fostered reformation of Russian laws in order to make them more harmonized with European ones (2011:71), special focus is made on the issue that Russian legislation act in a way of harmonization and not as reception of legal norms. Petrov and Kalinichenko expand on notion of Europeanization within a field of legislation and draw it as “in the internal domain, Europeanization is linked to the influence of the EU dynamic *acquis* on the legal orders of EU Member States, and to the need to adapt their institutional and legal structures in accordance with EU requirements. In the external domain, on the one hand, Europeanization can be associated with the growing role of the EU as a global player. Indeed, the EU has acknowledged this role through its various external policies and initiatives directed towards third countries”(2011:326). In this context term of Europeanization seems to be a phenomenon that happens to legislations of EU and non-EU members that implies changes in legislations in order to meet goals that stem from cooperation with EU governing body and could be described as a complicated process of reformation of legal system for the

sake of economic cooperation successes, nevertheless worth saying that this process is not complete yet (Snyder (ed.) 2000: 304) and its successes could be disputed.

Scholars who study Europeanization in education have different vision of this concept and its impacts, so according to Anneke Luijten-Lub Europeanization is the regional version of Internationalization and is described as “cooperation between EU countries and economic, social and cultural activities crossing their national borders are expanding quickly based on the notion that such cooperation is required for stability and economic growth within the region” while Internationalization in the education (Luijten-Lub focused mainly on Higher Education) is “any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more)responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy, and labour markets” (2007: 33-34). Scholars that study Europeanization of education in Russia interpret Europeanization as a process of enrichment of Russian education with value (understanding and respect of different cultures, peace-keeping and conflict-prevention, “European-identity” building) and linguistic (bilingual or multilingual education) components (Irkutskaya, 2010: 19) and interdisciplinary approach to education process (Kolobova, 2009: 1509). This attitude towards Europeanization in Russian education also resulted in accepting by Russian education system of quality assurance standards elaborated by Europeans, because these European standards were considered as higher in quality than current Russian ones (Morgan & Kliucharev (eds.), 2012). Consequently, Europeanization from the standpoint of scholars writing about Russian education is a complex phenomena initiated by EU or EC and aimed to impact on value and content of Russian education which results usage of European (“progressive”) standards (Bazhenova & Syomina, 2008).

Despite there are various studies dedicated to the examination of Europeanization of Russia in different contexts, my literature review indicates that less scholarly attention has been paid to Europeanization of Russian youth in the context of youth movements and the impact of those movements on Europeanization of

culture of Russian youngsters – neither in terms of culture nor in terms of legal culture. Previously conducted studies on Europeanization of Russia in political, legal, education, cultural contexts created a fundament for further researches. Rich background of scrutiny of Europeanization in before mentioned Russian contexts allows starting to explore topic of Europeanization in cross-contextual frame, in particular we focus on impacts of Europeanization on Russian youth and its legal culture through participation in international youth movements.

### **Student Legal culture in Russia**

If we address the issue of legal culture of Russian students we face the situation when not very much studies are complete regarding this topic and some of studies might be only partly relevant for the topic of current research.

Studies dedicated to the student legal culture of Russian students were completed by Russia scholars like Gurova (2013), Savin (2011), Nefedov & Nefedova (2006), Ryazanova (2014), Saakyan (2009) and also there should be highlighted the fact that there are also studies dedicated to the research of Russian legal culture as whole, as phenomenon, without exploration of particular social group (Zubok & Chuprov, 2007; Belyaeva, 2013; Kasyanov, 2011; Kurkchiayn, 2009).

Current studies of Russian legal culture could be divided in three key-areas of studies: first area of study is the Russian legal culture as phenomenon (Zubok&Chuprov, 2007; Belyaeva, 2013; Kasyanov, 2011), scholars define the legal culture at the Russian soil and it's way of evolution.

Second key-area that is studied is how people (in particular Russian students) become educated in term legal culture, what measures influence on formation of legal culture for students (Savin, 2011, Gurova 2013).

Third area key-area of studies is dedicated to the research of the level of education in terms of law, how legally cultural are students (Nefedov & Nefedova, 2006; Ryazanova, 2014).

Literature analysis of mentioned researches delivered following points that should be considered during current research. In Russian context of the research it should

be highlighted that legal culture is tightly connected to legal education and legal “upbringing” (Gurova, 2013), what appears in the situation when person of good “legal culture” might mean that this person knows well official legislation/norms (Ibid.).

The second important point is connected to the first one and touches upon who and what influences on formation of legal culture of students. These studies inform that legal culture is influenced and formed through three main channels: media channels (Internet, TV, newspapers etc.), education channels (schools, universities), family (upbringing) (Gurova, 2013; Savin, 2011; Saakyan, 2009).

The third key-area of studies is the research of the level of legal culture of students, on how well they are educated in terms of norms/knowledge, how do they behave within legal frames. Researches in this area provided us with important data on that says that for instance 27% already has administrative infraction, and 18% of students don't break the law because they are afraid of punishment, meanwhile 96% of students declared that they respect law and rights (Ryazanova, 2014), other research showed that almost 70% of students declare own law-abidance. In addition researcher found that while there is a lack of understanding of the “norm” itself by students 44% of them stated that legal norm is the behavior rule in public (in society) which was sanctioned/imposed by state (through official state legislation) (Savin, 2011).

Despite the presence of some studies on legal culture of Russian students there is a room for further research. In particular current research contributes to development of this topic in three areas: development and understanding of the legal culture phenomenon as itself in terms definition through the prism of Russian case; exploration and understanding of education channel of formation of legal culture of students by assessment of participation of students in the EYP as possible influencing measure on formation of legal culture; and exploration and understanding of Russian students legal culture by scrutiny of attitude and behavior within different legal frames.

### **1.6.1. Methodology of literature search**

For gaining information about the research topic I looked for literature using various approaches.

First of all it is necessary to mention that due to the fact that the research deals with the issue which involves Russian-speaking persons I considered that it is relevant to conduct the search not only in English, but in Russian as well. Consequently the search of literature was bilingual.

Secondly I would like to define search tools that were used. To find literature linked to my topic I used certain engines:

- Google (Global web search engine)
- Google. Scholar (Global web search engine that indexes scholar literature in different scientific fields)
- Yandex (Russian web search engine)
- LUBsearch (a system of Lund University for literature search at Lund University Libraries)

Thirdly I should underline that for finding necessary literature I made a search via search engines using different combinations of words like “Theory of Europeanization”, “Concept of Europeanization”, “Europeanization of education”, “Europeanization of youth (youngster/young people/students)”, “Europeanization of Russia (Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova)”, “Europeanization of Russians (Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Azeris, Georgians, Moldovans)”, “Europeanization of Russian (Ukrainian, Belarusian, Armenian, Azeri, Georgian, Moldovan) youth (youngster/young people/students)”, “Europeanization of former (ex-) Soviet states”, “legal culture”, “legal culture of Russian youth”, “legal culture of Russian students”, “Russian legal culture” etc.

The search on the basis of these word combinations the search was conducted both in English and Russian.

After the search engines gave me search results I picked up to first 30 findings (links), opened them and examined them on the point of relevance to the topic by reading introduction either abstract of the article/ chapter in the book.

### **1.6.2. Outcome**

The literature review of subjects needed for the research showed that Europeanization topic is widely researched and serves as suitable theoretical platform, while research in practical application of Europeanization to Russian context is partial and not frequent, this might stem from the reason that science in Russia is in transitional period and Europeanization is not fundamental perspective as it might appear in EU countries. This factor begets a fertile soil for the current research as a research aimed to enrich knowledge about Russian Europeanization in education and legal culture contexts.

Legal culture is also widely researched by scholars from the EU and the USA, while in Russia legal culture is not that popular topic for researches and in particularly for students community. Consequently literature review gave good base for the research of the legal culture within Russian context and also provided initial information on the research of legal culture for Russian students, but findings are episodic and it indicates that this field is not very well developed, furthermore exploration of participation in youth organization of students an influence factor to formation of legal culture of Russian students is almost underdeveloped. Current research will be one of the first brick in scrutiny of the influence of participation in youth organization on formation of legal culture of Russian students.

### **1.7. Theoretical section**

This section is dedicated to explanation of theoretical basis of the current research. This research demands the usage of number of interconnected theoretical concepts: usage of few theories stemmed from complex of the context

in which Russian youngsters can find themselves. This complexity of contexts generated few factors that explain and influence of studied phenomena, in addition need for usage of set theories was brought by limitations of theories themselves and in this case each theory supports other.

The role of each concept/theory is presented as a separate part and as a part of theoretical framework of the research.

Theoretical stratagem (set of theories) of the research interconnects four pillars: living law, Europeanization, legal culture and legal pluralism. Relation of each theory and its place in the stratagem is explained further.

### **1.7.1. Theoretical pillar number 1: living law concept**

In the very heart of my research lies the concept of living law that was developed by Eugen Ehrlich, one of the sociology of law founding-fathers (Hertogh, 2009: 16). His concept of the ‘living law’ implied that law exists within society even without being formally put on the paper and presented to the society as some legal statutes like constitution, charter, decree etc (Ibid: 17). Despite the norms are not put on the paper they are followed by society members (Ibid: 4.) The presence in the society of such a phenomenon like ‘living law’ creates the situation of norms duality: on the one hand there are formal legal norms, and on the other hand there are norms that do not function as official laws, but still these norms are followed by people (Ibid.: 3-4).

One of the most important feature of this theory is that Ehrlich tries to incorporate in the study of law some psychological aspects, this results in a situation when the key focus of the study goes to not the official legal norms, but senses and feelings of person (morality issues) (Ibid.). In particular if we talk about violation of norms, Hertogh states that according to Ehrlich violation of the law may result in “feeling of revolt (Empörung)”(Ibid.) while “violation of a law of morality leads to a feeling of indignation (Entrüstung).Moreover, an indecency corresponds with the feeling of disgust (Ärgernis),tactlessness with a feeling of disapproval (Mißbilligung), an offence against etiquette with ridicule (Lächerlichkeit) and,

lastly, those who do not follow the same fashion cause a critical feeling of superiority (kritischen Ablehnung)” (Ibid.). Consequently violation of “living law” norm may cause much deeper anger of people whom you share the community in comparison to violation of legal norm (Ibid.).

Another aspect that should be mentioned regarding this theory is that according to this theory the usage of the “living law” occurs in certain levels of society (Gurvitch, 1947: 54-56). This statement stems from the Aristotele’s vision of theory of commutative and distributive justice, where he outlined such levels of the law like family (village), city, political group, national (Gurvitch, 1947: 56). In case of “living law” this gradation of legal level is interesting in terms of understanding that unwritten norms mainly operate in everyday life of people within families (villages) and it might evolved in some unwritten norms (like etiquette) that is not officially regulated by the state but is followed by people, and violation of these norms (moral codes) might cause deep offence (Ibid: 57).

The living law is a complex concept, thus for better understanding it is necessary to look at it from three different dimensions. Nelken (2008), one of the biggest modern scholars in Sociology of law, outlines three dimensions that should be considered while studying “living law” concept.

- The first one is that there is “the law beyond Law” which means that all norms cannot be placed on the paper as codes and there exists some norms and law on the consciousness level of people (Nelken, 2008: 12).
- The second dimension is “Law without the state”, this dimension refers to the situation that there might exist some legal regimes that do not exist as legislation established by the official state while they do exist in practice, as communal law or norms or some transnational and corporation internal codes and these norms are followed by members of the certain community (Ibid: 17-18).
- The third dimension is looking at living law as a source of “order without law”. The norms that exist in consciousness of people and that occur due



to association of these people to certain communities lead to creation of order within society, within relationships. And these orders are not necessary placed on paper as codes. Society might create an order without putting rules on paper (Ibid: 24-26).

These three approaches towards “living law” allow us making interconnections to other concepts that are needed for the research. For instance, admission of the fact that people use various unofficial norms in a daily life and that they follow some laws “without laws” and their relations are regulated and there is an “order without law” in their communities leads us to the necessity of understanding such a concept like “legal culture”. This concept explains why people in certain societies do follow one official and unofficial rules, and why people of other society use different official and unofficial rules in a daily life.

“Law without state” approach provides us with a link to the concept of legal pluralism. Legal pluralism concept will allow us viewing multiple legal layers that people are placed to and understand how people correspond to each this layer.

Assuming that living law influences daily lives of people, in particular youth of Russia it further completes legal culture of youngsters. By understanding and measuring of Europeanization influence on legal culture of Russian youth we will be further able to trace and understand of Europeanization on the heart of legal culture in this research – living law.

### **1.7.2. Theoretical pillar number 2: legal culture concept**

The legal culture concept is also complicated by variety of fields where it could be applied and variety of scholar views on it (Nelken, 2004; Visegrády, 2013; Van Hoecke & Warrington, 1998). If we take a look on legal culture concept from the point of view of sociology of law we may consider definitions that were drawn by David Nelken (2004). For instance, according to Nelken, legal culture from general perspective “is one way of describing relatively stable patterns of legally oriented social behavior and attitudes” (2004). Legal culture is composed of certain elements: “a) written law and “living” law; b) institutional infrastructure

(judicial system, legal profession); c) the models of legally relevant behavior (e.g. legal actions); and d) legal consciousness” (Visegrády, 2013: 15). Multidimensional set of components gives a vision on a legal culture like on a concept that can be very specific for different ethnic or national communities because number of factors influence on establishment of legal cultures (Nelken and Feest (eds.), 2001: 24-25). Among these factors are etiquette and moral norms of the society, legal system of the society and its development in time, current political context and attitude of people towards legal norms (Nelken and Feest (eds.), 2001: 26). Consequently it is fair to state that “the concept of legal culture emphasizes that law is more than just a set of rules or concepts (Van Hoecke & Warrington, 1998: 5)”. Law can be considered also a social practice inside of community, that follow common legal norms (Ibid.). “It is this social practice which is determining the actual meaning of the rules and concepts, their weight, their implementation, and their role in society” (Ibid). The specific aspect of law is that it is not just a “isolated” social practice or “isolated” set of rules and norms (Ibid): “law and legal practice are one aspect of the culture to which they belong. ‘Legal cultures’ are part of more general cultures” (Ibid). And as far as legal culture is a part of general culture it is necessary to understand that as the general culture it is not stable and it might be changed due to certain reasons: as the general culture can be changed by external and internal influential factors the similar thing can happen to legal culture (Berman, 1983: 526-527). It can be influenced by internal processes (for instance Industrial Revolution caused creation of new written regulations and unwritten norms what led to change in legal culture of country) (Justman & Gradstein, 1999:479) and external processes (for instance Globalization urges countries to harmonize national legislations for the sake of easier trade process, what leads to change in legal culture of country) (Kalinichenko, 2012: 70-71; Buxbaum, 2005: 482-483).

From the perspective of topic of the research it makes sense to take a look on understanding of legal culture from the perspective of Russian scholars (Zubok&Chuprov, 2007; Belyaeva, 2013; Kasyanov, 2011). According to them,

legal culture is a constellation of knowledge, values and personal aims in regards to rights and opportunities of rights' practical implementation by legal subjects within a process of cooperation (Zubok&Chuprov, 2007: 36-37; Belyaeva, 2013: 29-31). Legal culture is a complex phenomenon of public life including legal norms, principles, legal consciousness, legal relations, legal behavior within a process of realization of life aims. (Zubok&Chuprov, 2007: 37). As far as context is essential for studying legal culture (Dezalay& Garth, 2001: 242), I would like to draw the attention of the reader to the Russian context. According to Belyaeva, current young generation of Russians has quite poor knowledge in jurisprudence of the state what leads to increase in law infringements (2013: 28), Kasyanov also stresses attention on regressing legal culture of young people of Russia what results in "legal nihilism", decrease of trust to official legislation and increase of usage of "living law" approaches if they contradict official national or local legislation (2011: 100-101). So currently legal culture is seen by Russian scholars as problematic issue that should be influenced in order for betterment of lives of youth and next generations.

If we look at interconnections of legal culture concept to other theoretical pillars of the research we will see that legal culture concept incorporates in itself the "living law" concept and by large extent is built around relations of people towards living law and its contrast to official law.

Examination of ties between legal culture concept and legal pluralism concept demonstrates that legal pluralism affects national legal cultures and legal cultures of nations/ethnicities might affect efficiency and development of legal pluralist system.

This legal pluralist-legal culture discourse is especially interesting because we have the fourth legal pillar – Europeanization concept. Europeanization of legal culture is a widely discussed topic (Visegrády, 2013; Börzel 1999; Medvedev, 2008; Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001) and current outcomes from Europeanization of legal cultures are disputable. At this particular moment "the law of the EU is not the "European legal culture "but the product of the *European*

*legal cultures*(Visegrády, 2013: 34).The new “European legal culture” is in the making and manifested by, *e.g.*, the proliferation of technical norms and the growing unity and vertical plurality of the legal system” (Ibid).

### **1.7.3. Theoretical pillar number 3: legal pluralism**

Another theoretical concept that is needed to be presented and discussed is “legal pluralism”. Griffiths after doing deep research on understanding and definitions of legal pluralist concept came with a conclusion that “legal pluralism is concomitant of social pluralism: the legal organization of society is congruent with its organization (Griffiths, 1986: 38). “Legal pluralism” refers to the normative heterogeneity attendant upon the fact that the social action always takes place in a context of multiple, overlapping, ‘semi-autonomous social fields’, which it may be added, is in practice a dynamic condition” (Ibid.). It is interesting that initially legal pluralist concept stemmed from interaction of national and local norms and according to more modern scholar Brian Tamanaha legal pluralist concept refers to the “incorporation or recognition of customary law norms or institutions within state law, or to the independent coexistence of indigenous norms and institutions alongside state law (whether or not officially recognized)” (2008: 390).

With the help of this concept we can analyze the legal system consisting of different layers of law. Furthermore through the prism of legal pluralist concept we can see the interaction between law layers within a country like national/ local/ regional/ municipal/ normative (“living law”) laws in addition to it laws of different order can be examined as well, like interaction between national, regional and international laws (Varpahovskis, 2013: 265) and, for instance, Belonosov and Nekrasov, modern Russian scholars, claim that legal pluralism concept can be used and helpful tool to explore modern legal issues connected to development of polyethnic societies at the national and international levels where these society can promote own interests and legal authorities try to build legal systems that deliver benefits to certain groups (2013: 148). Furthermore as far as

in modern world development of international laws start to integrate personal legal culture but common laws and national laws are still in power legal pluralism can be seen as the useful tool to make this study because “legal pluralism provided a useful alternative framework because pluralism had always sought to identify hybrid legal spaces, where multiple normative systems occupied the same social field” (Berman, 2009: 226).

Within a context of globalization of XXI century it is worth mentioning that while states may claim legal monopoly and declare that they are key legal authorities that produce initial law the fusion in terms of legislation has already began and as a result in Europe some legal fields of state are now under authority of the EU (Ibid: 386). In the same time the customary, non-coded norms (“living law”) are still present in a daily life of people.

Consequently legal pluralist concept allows us seeing how complicated and multi-level is the system of norms and laws in today’s modern globalized world is: while for centuries states were monopolists in terms of official legislation, now they are started to be replaced by superior state authorities (like international organizations, like EU) (Kalinichenko, 2012:71) while daily life of people is still sometimes regulated by living law norms leaving official norms aside (Bezgin, 2012: 77).

If we analyze interconnection of the legal pluralist concept to other theoretical pillars of the research we will see that all four pillars supplement each other. For instance, development of “living law” theory contributed to development of legal pluralist concept, because Ehrlich’s focus on norms that are followed but are unwritten demonstrated plurality of order layers within a state and plurality of layers that are followed by citizens and plurality of layers that may interact with each other or contradict making citizen to choose one for the sake of other (Dupret, 2007: 3).

If we examine interconnection of legal pluralism to legal culture we can detect links between these concepts in terms that legal pluralism affects legal culture of people making them more tolerant or intolerant to legal layers of different order, while it may work vice versa when legal culture of nation might influence on acceptance or non-acceptance of legal pluralism structure in society (Itzcovich, 2012). Such ambiguity can be found in a current situation with the EU, when the legal structure is in transition and people on the one hand are accepting EU supernational norms, on the other hand they are afraid of losing sovereignty and all this results in a risk of “legal nihilism” when “there is no certainty and there is no legality” (Itzcovich, 2012: 375).

From the standpoint of Europeanization, legal pluralism concept is relevant for understanding concerns of Russian politicians, scholars, people on necessity of Europeanization and extent of Europeanization of society because the fear of “legal nihilism” expressed by Itzcovich and fear of “legal nihilism” expressed by Ivanova(2013) may rule further development of legal culture of people, may influence on further understanding of Europeanization.

#### **1.7.4. Theoretical pillar number 4: Europeanization concept**

Europeanization concept despite its wide usage by scholars (Radaelli, 2003; Ladrech, 1994; Héritier (2001); Risse, Cowles and Caporaso, 2001; Börzel, 1999) is a complicated concept that could be defined differently depending on the context. If we examine Europeanization concept from general perspective, its definition will stem from political context like the EU, while it is essential to understand that Europeanization concept could be applied not only to EU member states, European Community member states or prospective members of the EU and EC as this concept is seen by Ladrech (1994:2), but the Europeanization should be seen as a concept that is applied to states that belong to European continent (geographical entity) and not necessarily to those countries that are willing to become a part of the EU (Bordachev& Moshes, 2004). From this

geographical standpoint Europeanization should be used a concept that can be applied to all states that are placed in geographic Europe.

Europeanization concept implies political change within a country in order to meet common rules and standards proposed by higher authority, for instance the EU, as Risse, Cowles and Caporaso highlight (2001:3), but as I mentioned before it is necessary to widen perspective on the Europeanization and include there other non-EU states. Hence, if we look at the Europeanization from the scholars extended perspective we will see that the common authority for European countries might be located not in the EU legislations but, for instance, in international agreements that are followed by all European countries (including those that are not in the European Union). This is actually was underlined by Börzel who named as one of the features of Europeanization that “domestic policy areas become increasingly subject to European policy-making” (1999:574). This perspective gives us a prompt on connections between Europeanization concept and legal pluralism concept, because such application of Europeanization requires taking in consideration various legal authorities, including international agreements.

Taking into consideration that Europeanization concept definition is dependent on context I would like to highlight that Europeanization concept within a context of Russian legal culture, Russian education system, Russian culture in general refers not only to legislation subordination and political reformations for integration (Coppieters (eds.), 2004:29-30)but to cultural change, because since 17<sup>th</sup> century till nowadays Europe (in particular Western Europe) is associated with progress (Bazehnova & Syomina, 2008). Consequently Europeanization in Russian context of education, technology, culture refers to the “progress”. So if from standpoint of Western scholars we may conclude that *Europeanization is a multi-featured concept that purports formation of national politics of European-based countries (not only the EU member states) in a way that common “European identity” is celebrated and common European legal norms and rules are followed for mutual benefits and development and promotion of integration processes on the*

*continental basis*, for Russian context Europeanization is more of influence of European (Western European) culture on Russian culture and this Europeanization can be defined as *a process of reformation of Russian society and identity due to acquaintance and implementation of European (West-European/Western) standards and achievements in terms of values, technology, education, legislation and other fields*.

If we analyze interconnection of Europeanization concept and legal pluralism then we'll see as I mentioned before that Europeanization refers to change in legal structure of society in terms of delegation of more authority to regional super national authority for the sake of integration (Kalinichenko, 2012: 71).

In terms of analysis of linkage between Europeanization and legal culture (and “living law” as the heart of legal culture concept) it is necessary to highlight complicated nature of the context. Currently citizens of EU member states and prospective member states of this political establishment are in process of transition from national/local legal cultures to European legal cultures: moving from association themselves with “living law” layers, local regulations and national regulations to European layer, while in Russian context this transition is even more complicated. While Europeanization in Russia implies implementation of higher standards including legal field it doesn't necessarily mean that Russia and EU will be more integrated and legal culture of European will be duplicated by Russians. Europeanization might change Russian's attitude towards “living law” and towards national law layer, but due to complex outcomes of this change the result might not repeat outcomes of Europeanization of legal culture of EU citizens.

Consequently theoretical grounds of Europeanization elaborated by Western scholars might need of rethinking due to specific context of Russian history, culture, politics etc.

#### **1.7.5. Conclusion on theoretical stratagem and links between theories**



Theoretical pillars of the research are tightly glued to each other and supplement each other, but taking into consideration that current research is dealing with Russia it is necessary to admit that Russian context might influence on theoretical elaborations and interpretations made by Western scholars (Radaelli, 2003; Ladrech, 1994; Héritier (2001); Risse, Cowles and Caporaso, 2001; Börzel, 1999; Itzcovich, 2012).

Legal culture, “living law”, legal pluralism, Europeanization – all these theoretical concepts applied to Russian reality demand specifications and extensions because without these specifications and extensions these theoretical concepts might be hard to apply. For Europeanization concept it is necessary to understand that for Russia Europeanization is a process of application of higher standards; for legal pluralism it is necessary to understand that EU legislation layer does not exist in Russia; for “living law” concept it is necessary to understand that attitude of people to this law layer might be different to attitude of West Europeans due to difficult process of transformation of the Russian state from socialistic to capitalistic one; for the legal culture as to “living law” it is necessary to understand that Russia was in process of transition for the long time and legal culture of young Russian was formed with the influence of set of contextual factors that is hard to find in Western Europe.

Thus application of theoretical pillars should consider contextual factor otherwise applicability of concepts can have very limited extent. All these concepts relate to each other and are building unique theoretical prism through which unique legal culture of Europeanized young people of Russia is further demonstrated and explored using empirical methods.

## **1.8 Methods and Methodology**

### **1.8.1. Methodology and methods**

In this part methodology of the research is discussed, data collection methods of the research are presented and reasons for choosing certain methods are explained.

Furthermore this part contains sections dedicated to limits, limitations and boundaries of the research from the methodological standpoint.

### *Methodology*

As far as this research uses both qualitative and quantitative methods and data is gathered in different conditions (through observations, interviews and hermeneutics of secondary data) the methodology can be characterized as *triangulation* (Somekh&Lewyn (ed.), 2005: 274). The implementation of mixed-method methodology is explained by benefits in terms of findings. As it is explained in Somekh and Lewyn this kind of approach enhances credibility (escaping bias), receiving more developed picture of social world (more different aspects could be detected and taken into consideration), understanding with bigger values consciousness and wider diversity of values (Ibid.:275). Usage of set of methods allows detection of contradictions between data which is a positive feature of triangulation because such a detection of contradictions demonstrates to scholar that there could be made mistakes in data gathering methods (Ibid.: 276).

Usage of multiple methods shows its efficiency not only in looking at the phenomenon from wider perspective, but it also allows preventing so essential data/aspects not to be considered/noticed by the scholar, consequently different methods corroborate each other and support (Silverman, 2005:121).

### *Methods: Online interviews*

Target audience: Russians (those who live in Russia for at least 3 months), aged between 14 and 27 (this is the age when people can participate in the European Youth Parliament). People who participated in European Youth Parliament events and those people who did not participate.

Sample size expected: 200 interviews. 100 interviews of European Youth Parliament participants and 100 interviews of non-participants.

Sample size achieved: 192 interviews. 64 interviews of European Youth Parliament participants and 128 of non-participants. 12 interviews were excluded

because they were completed by respondents that were nationals of other country than Russia.

Language of the interview: Russian

Way of spreading: the questionnaire was composed in Google Documents in Russian language. It was spread among target audience in the popular Russian social media website - VK.com - as message from different communities/groups and as an individual message to potential participants.

Questionnaire: consisted of 20 questions, absolute majority of questions were close-end questions, while there were given non-obligatory open-end questions in order to give to a respondent an opportunity to share “sensitive information” within this research is he/she feels need to do so (Somekh & Lewyn (eds.), 2005: 220). The English version (translated) of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1. In order to be more certain about survey results the respondents are asked direct and indirect questions.

Timing: there were no timing restrictions for this questionnaire. On the average it took 3-4 minutes from a respondent to pass the survey.

Ethical issues and reasons for choosing this method: online survey method was chosen due to number of reasons, among which are following

- receiving primary data,
- unbiased by interpretation data and anonymity (Neuman, 2007: 189)
- generalizations-friendly data,
- fast access to the questionnaire (Neuman, 2007: 189)
- interview is taken by respondent in comfortable for him/her time and place (Ibid.)
- no interference and influence from interviewer as it happens to offline interviews (Neuman, 2007: 186)
- Anonymity (Ibid.)
- no expenses on paper, ink, pens (Gorard, 2003: 4)

- automatic analysis by software (Ibid.)
- distant work available (Neuman, 2007: 189)

Time frames: data collection took 4 weeks

Data: primary data; individual answers for the questionnaire

Definitions: questions included terms like “National legislation”, “International legislation”, “Tradition-based/family norms”. For these three terms there were not given any detailed description not to confuse respondents and not to narrow down the term to, for instance, one particular aspect. “National legislation” means legislation/ rules of behavior imposed by Russia for own citizens within a country, “International legislation” means legislation/rules of behavior when International laws may apply (it could be UN declarations ratified by Russia, bilateral agreements, etc). By “Tradition-based/family norms” are meant rules of behavior which were developed within family, ethnic community, clan etc., which are not officially declared and imposed by the state but which are followed. By “Contradiction” of norms it is understood the situation when different rules may apply and they might oppose each other.

By “your city/ country” is understood Russia particular city that person associates him/herself. “Other city/other country” is the place where person feels him/herself not at home, where foreign (not common for this person) rules may apply.

Limitations: findings could be more representative if the sample would be over 400 in total, but due to limitation in time frames of the research, it was impossible to recruit this amount of respondents. Due to cultural diversity of Russian society, the attitudes of people regarding the research question might vary, but due to time and financial limitations it was impossible to conduct more in-depth culture-centered research in Russia.

Calculations: data was primarily calculated in Google Documents. Further it was downloaded as Excel tables to the computer.

### *Methods: Online ethnography*

Online ethnography (virtual/digital ethnography) is modern type of ethnography that evolved in last 20 years. Virtual ethnography initially was aimed to study Internet users and Internet as a culture (Hine, 2000: 14) but further due to mass usage of the Internet it turned to become a useful and helpful tool to study people of different communities, not only those that are cyber-centered (like gamers, bloggers), but, for instance, students or young people. According to statistics from 2013 (October) 91% of Russians aged below 25 are Internet-users and 76% of people aged between 18 and 24 are daily users of the Internet (Bizhit, 2014).

As far as online ethnography refers to set of methods of data gathering I would like to highlight that in this particular research the observation method is used.

Implementation and definition of method: on the walls of various communities (groups) in the website VK.com dedicated to different things – topical (history, politics), organizational (EYP), cultural (Russian culture) I created a topic where people could discuss such a question like “if corruption is part of Russian culture”, “if international law should be more important and followed by Russians than national law, or vice versa”, “what is should be more important for people traditional law or official legislations in secular country like Russia”, “do you use living law when it should be used official legislation? In what kind of situations?” etc.

I didnot interfere discussions in order to change somebody’s opinion, but I promoted discussion by asking open questions like “how?” and “why do you think so?” etc. This ethnographic method could be characterized as the Internet forum (or Online Bulletin Board) (Sade-Beck, 2004: 47).

Number of forums: 3

Language of forum: Russian

Target audience: Russian-speakers, users of VK.com

Number of responses received: 70+

Quantity of participants/contributors: 8

Timing: 4 weeks

Reason for choosing this method: there are also number of reasons why this method was chosen, which are following

- receiving primary data
- respondent can explain own position in details
- respondent can stress attention of participants to certain aspects of the issue
- fast access to the forum
- respondent participants in comfortable for him/her time and place (Ibid.)
- no expenses on paper, ink, pens (Gorard, 2003: 4)
- fast download for the analysis
- distant work available
- opportunity for the research to notice which aspects of the issue should be studied more, or to which aspects/concerns should be paid attention more

Data: primary data; messages of respondents gathered from bulletin boards

Ethical issues and limitations: this method is not anonymous, thus some respondents might feel uncomfortable to expose own positions if it is extreme or might seem deviant in comparison to others positions. Respondents might be influenced by the opinion of previous contributors to the forum. It is hard to trace the place of living of all contributors. This method is based on answer to open-end questions; consequently data analysis process cannot consider all possible inflections and views of contributors. Despite the researcher gathers primary data the hermeneutics are further used by the researcher and it is impossible to escape possibility of researcher's influence during interpretation process.

*Methods: hermeneutics*

Hermeneutics is the approach that is used by scholars to justify and to deepen findings by implementations of interpretations of contexts or messages while doing the research (Inwood, 1998:3502-3505). While this approach allows addition subjectivity relish it is necessary to use this approach in studies where context of the issue is complicated and might be influential and there is a lack of opportunity to measure influences of the context on the issue(including individual vision of the issue by the respondent/study participant) (Somekh & Lewyn (eds.), 2005: 114-115).

Data: primary data - results of survey and online forum messages were analyzed and discussed; secondary data – articles by other scholars are analyzed and discussed in order to better portray the context of the research and possibly measure additional factors that may influence research results.

### **1.8.2. Research ethics and research process limitations**

During research process I faced certain limitations that prevented me from achieving the ideal results on sample size for the survey. I collected interviews of the EYP-participants using community/group in popular Russian social media website called VK.com. Expected number of EYP members who participate in the research was 100 but it was possible to achieve only 64. This result might be caused by couple of reasons such as limited research period, tiredness of EYP members from participation in the researches (almost in the same time with current research there was launched a research by European Youth Parliament on unemployment), teenagers are not the most active participants of the researches in Russia, participation in this research was free-of-incentives/volunteer.

Certain limitations were faced while conducting digital ethnography. Digital ethnography implied collection of answers that were given by users of VK.com. The problem occurred when certain questions were posted. For instance question on if respondents had situations when they had to follow common norms/”living laws” while these norms and laws were contradictory to official legislation. So without a purpose I asked on if people have ever broken the official law. Due to

complicated political situation because of Crimea events and fear that this social network is under surveillance by Federal Security Service of Russia (Kostyuchenko, 2013) and it is not safe to publish some statements that might affect you by prosecution for acts that might be considered illegal.

## **2. Empirical findings: presentation of results**

This section of the paper is dedicated to data that was gathered by implementing research methods. The section is divided in parts dedicated to each research method. General overview of collected results is given and explained. The quantitative part of the empirical data, online survey, will be presented and analyzed first, and then in the subsequent sections, I will present the results of my ethnographic study, digital ethnography.

### **2.1. ONLINE SURVEY**

Implementation of the survey allowed collection of fruitful data. Survey participants were asked to answer 20 questions (including filtering questions). General overview of data collected is given below to each question in general and further split in groups of those youngsters who take part in the European Youth Parliament (EYPers) and those who never participated in the European Youth Parliament (non-EYPers).

#### **Interview structure and explanation of questions:**

As far as this research focuses on complicated issue and multiple factors may be involved in formation of legal culture of Russian youth it is necessary to prove results demonstrated in one question with in-direct or re-interpreted questions (Somekh & Lewyn (eds.), 2005). For this purpose were built three blocks of questions:

BLOCK 1 – Traditional-National-International Comparison



- First block was dedicated for finding out preferences of groups in terms of declaration of self-affiliation with legal layer (traditional norms, national laws, international laws). This block is composed of 6 questions. In each question respondent is offered to compare two layers to each other in choosing one that he/she prefers personally. Second stage of this block is checking if respondents are prone to choose the same answers in case when certain condition is applied. In particular, respondents were offered to demonstrate own affinity in case when condition of *contradiction*. Usage of question with conditions allowed to see if people declare own affinity to legal layer only in case when it does not contrast other layers or not. In addition, this two-step approach allowed to check if answers for the first step questions were correct and to check how solid are declarations of respondents on their affinities to legal layers mentioned in these first step questions.

#### BLOCK 2- Living Law Application

- Second block of questions was dedicated to revelation of behavioral patterns of respondents in particular situations when living law and official national laws could be applied. There were taken four situations of possible application of living law which contrasts official legislation: corruption, insult in the street, money lending, disturbance by neighbor. Respondents were offered to choose a behavioral pattern for each case when living law could be applied. This block of questions was also split into two steps. In the first block respondents were given a condition that situation happens at home (in Russia, in city where they live, area where they live) and in this case respondents should choose between legal layers in case of collision of living law with national law. In the second step of this block of questions respondents were given another condition: for corruption and insult cases they were told that they are abroad, in other words, they were subjects of international legislation (holder of Russian passport abroad is under protection of Russia);there appears international

context and collision between living law and international legislation. For the case of money owing the condition of relative/acquaintance was chosen. This choice of conditions allowed checking if the condition when you are asked to owe money by relative makes person to act according to living law. These questions allowed find out respondents' proneness to act/not to act within living law in certain cases where living law could be applied and acting illegally might contradict official laws. Furthermore this double-step approach let re-check if answers given by respondents in at the first step correlate with answers given at the second step. Finally, by having second block of questions allowed making conclusions on behavioral patterns of respondents in comparison to declarations may differ depending on situation when living law might be applied and depending on context where/when living law might be applied.

### BLOCK 3 – Association and Participation

- Third block of question was dedicated to gathering of general data about respondents needed for composition of sample: sex, age, participation/non-participation in the European Youth Parliament and other youth organizations.

Need for usage of partly repeating questions and usage of second block of question stems from the methodological needs to check correlation of answers from the first block and from research needs to look at the research subject from various sites and assessment of how living law application in different context can work for respondents.

Consequently, usage of questions presented in two blocks with internal double-step system inside each block created opportunity for mutual check of answer correlation and check on dependency of answers on variety of contexts.

#### **2.1.1. Analysis of results-survey**

Tendencies demonstrated by EYPers and non-EYPers were drawn from the comparison of numbers demonstrated in the survey. After survey was completed data was downloaded and questions for the answers were calculated. By comparing answers which were given by EYPers and non-EYPers which were turned into percentage I received outcomes on preferences of these two groups of respondents. Overall statistics are attached as Appendix 2.

### **2.1.1.1. Block 1: traditional-national-international comparison**

#### *Traditional vs National*

Answers of respondents for the question about which law system (Traditional or National) is more important in personal opinion for the respondent it is necessary to highlight that half (50%) of EYP participants mentioned that for them National (official) legislation is more important than laws that are “appointed by traditions of my family/ ‘narod’ (‘narod’ in Russian in this context means “people of my nation/ethnicity”)”, while for non-EYPers laws that are appointed by traditions are more primary and important than national legislation, this point of view is stated by also 50% of respondents of the group. Answers for this question shows tendency of EYPers to consider national laws supremacy over tradition-based (unwritten) laws, while non-EYPers tend see tradition-based laws as more important in comparison to national legislation. It is also necessary to mention that there were shares of undecided (“Hard to say”) answers for this question - 18% for EYPers and 13% for non-EYPers.

Case of contradiction of tradition-based laws and national legislation made tendencies (showed by respondents in the first comparison question) a little bit less explicit and non-EYPers still were assured in supremacy of tradition-based laws over national legislation (42%) and vice versa for EYPers (46%). Contradiction condition increased number of respondents for whom it was hard to decide (21% for non-EYPers and 22% for EYPers).

On the basis of these two questions couple of conclusions could be made: a) EYPers tend to demonstrate proneness to consider national legislation supremacy

over tradition-based laws even in case of contradiction; b) non-EYPers, vice versa, tend to see tradition-based laws as more important than national ones, even in case of contradiction.

### *Traditional vs International*

Answers for the question on which laws are personally more important for respondents, tradition-based or International ones, quite ambiguous results were demonstrated by EYPers. According to statistics, supremacy of International laws over tradition-based laws for EYPers is uneven because answers split almost equally (50% - International laws more important than traditional, 43% - traditional are more important than international) with very small number of undecided answers. In the meantime EYP non-participants continued to show explicit tendency to consider supremacy of tradition-based laws over other laws, in particular 50% of non-EYPers highlighted importance of tradition-based laws over international ones.

Contradiction condition for EYPers squeezed gap between those who stated that International laws are more important and those who stated vice versa and made it almost equal (43% vs 40%). It is worth mentioning that contradiction condition increased number of those who felt that it is “hard to say” (from 6% to 17%). Despite that contradiction case increased number of people among non-EYPers for whom it was “hard to say” (from 12% to 21%) which laws are more important the biggest share (42%) stated that tradition-based laws are more important than international laws.

From answers from this pack of question also some conclusions could be drawn: a) Non-EYPers tend to demonstrate proneness to consider tradition-based laws as more personally important ones even in comparison to international ones; b) proneness of EYPers to consider supremacy of international laws over tradition-based laws is present but is not that evident.

### *National vs International*

In a comparison of national and international laws by EYPers the priority was given to national laws (54%) while supremacy of International legislation was highlighted by 41% of respondents. Similar results were shown by non-EYPers who also put national laws as more important (53%) while international legislation was highlighted as more important only by 35% of non-EYPers.

In case of contradiction of National and International laws 35%EYPers stated that international law is more important for them while 49%EYPers found National law as more important in this case. 16% EYPers were unable to decide. The contradiction condition didnot significantly influence on results demonstrated by non-EYPers in the first National-vs-International comparison question.

Certain conclusions can be made on the basis of results of answers for national-vs-international laws comparison question: a) EYP and non-EYPers tend to put national laws over international laws in personal importance rank; b) contradiction condition doesn't really influence in respondents proneness to put national laws over international laws.

#### **2.1.1.2. Conclusions: block 1**

On the basis of comparative block of questions there also could be demonstrated certain tendencies: a) EYPers are prone to put national official laws to the top of personal priorities while leaving international and tradition-based laws behind, respectively; b) non-EYPers tend to explicitly put tradition-based laws on the first place, national legislation on the second place and international legislation on the third place in the rank of personal importance; c) contradiction condition permanently increases number of "hard to answer" choices (on the average by 2 times).

#### **2.1.1.3. Block 2:living law application**

Four situations were chosen where living law could be applied instead of official legislation; through analysis of answers on behavior in particular situation the proneness to act in accordance with "living law" will be assessed.

### *Corruption*

In the first situation respondents were assessed on their attitude towards corruption/bribing (solution official issues with the help of money or gifts giving to responsible representatives of authorities). Statistics on EYPers' behavior in Russia say that 28% find it is acceptable to bribe (even they consider it as 'undesirable practice') and 33% confirmed that they had to bribe due to local norms in Russia while they find this unacceptable. Non-EYPers are more prone to consider bribing practice as acceptable (36%, including those who said that bribing is "acceptable, but unlikely"), while only 16% of non-EYPers confessed that they have to bribe due to local norms while they find it unacceptable.

Regarding bribing practices abroad it is essential to notice that two thirds (66%) of EYPers and non-EYPers find it unacceptable to bribe abroad and never did it, while the rate of "acceptability" of bribing varies for EYPers and non-EYPers (18% vs 28%).

From the corruption case could be outlined three conclusions: a) while majority of EYPers and non-EYPers find bribing practices as unacceptable (especially abroad) b) the rate for acceptability of bribing practice is higher for non-EYPers; c) statistics show that EYPers had to bribe due to local norms twice more often than non-EYPers (33% vs 16%) in this regards it would be sufficient a research to find reasons for such influx from EYPers side.

### *Insult*

The second case was dedicated to the case when the relative of our respondents was insulted in the street at home and abroad. From the answers given it might be stated that absolute majorities of both EYPers and non-EYPers would prefer/agree to solve insult situation at home without help of official authorities (96% vs 89%).

For the case of insult with a condition that this insult was made not at home the majorities of EYPers and non-EYPers still prefer/find it acceptable to solve issues linked to insult without involving official authorities (79% vs 79%).

Questions on insult provided us with following conclusions: a) insult of relative both at home and abroad seems to be a situation which majority (regardless EYP participation or not) prefer to solve in accordance with living law and without inclusion official legislation; b) such attitude of Russian youth towards insult issue should be further studied for better understanding reasons why insult issues are considered as undeserving involving of official authorities.

### *Owing money*

The third case of possible living law application is money owing procedure. Almost equal numbers of readiness to owe money to an acquaintance (in Russian 'znakomiy' – is a person whom you know but he/she is not a friend 'drug', it might be a classmate, colleague, friend of a friend etc, word "friend" ('drug') was not used on purpose because in Russian culture/language friend might have very strong meaning like a very close person, sometimes much closer than relatives and there is a very popular saying "if you want to lose a friend – lend him money", it would be problematic to find out who follows this saying and not). Only 19% of EYPers and 20% of non-EYPers are ready to lend unofficially a sum of money that equals "six month personal budget". Meanwhile only 36% of EYPers are ready to lend money officially ("under receipt") and 51% of non-EYPers are ready to do so.

In case of owing money to relative 54% of EYPers and 52% of non-EYPers are ready to owe money to a relative without demanding any official confirmation of lending. Meanwhile 22% of EYPers and 32% of non-EYPers are ready to give money to a relative "under receipt".

Answers for the question regarding owing money urge us to conclude that: a) EYPers are ready to act according to "living law" on the similar level as Russian youth that don't participate in the EYP, but in the same time b) EYPers are less prone to give money in general.

### *Neighbor*

In the case when respondents are offered to solve the situation which is noisy and which was already contacted previously EYPers and non-EYPers showed quite similar results. Both EYPers and non-EYPers are prone to solve situation within legal field (including calling to police). Only 13% of EYPers and 15% of non-EYPers are ready to take actions that might be illegal in its nature to solve the situation.

Key conclusion that could be drawn from fourth situation that in this case of possible case of living law application youth of Russia would prefer to solve the issue within a law by calling police if necessary.

#### **2.1.1.4. Conclusions: block 2**

Second block of questions provided us with valuable conclusion that behavioral patterns of EYP participants from Russia and Russian non-EYP participants in situations where living law could be applied is almost similar with minimal deviations in statistics. Consequently EYP participants are prone to act as other Russian youngsters in 4 typical situations where living law may contradict official or international legislation.

#### **2.1.1.5. Block 3: association and participation**

##### *Association*

59 % of EYPers associate themselves with country (where they were born or live or born and live) and 52% of non-EYPers associate themselves with country, 37% of EYPers and 38% of non-EYPers associate themselves with particular areas in the country (region, city, village etc). Worth mentioning than respondents who chose other options highlighted that their associations may differ depending on where they are (if abroad then they associate themselves with country, if they are asked inside Russia – then more with concrete territory), in addition to it respondents highlighted that they associate themselves with particular ethnicity/ethnic roots.

##### *Participation*



Answers given to the question on participation showed that EYPers are more prone to participate in international youth movements than Russian youth that never took part in the EYP events (25% vs 10%).

#### **2.1.1.6. Conclusion for survey part**

Revision and analysis of answers given by EYP participants and non-EYP participants within a survey demonstrated following tendencies:

- On the declarative level EYP participants highlight their proneness to act within national legislation and find national laws as most important ones in comparison to tradition-based laws (living laws) and international laws.
- On the declarative level non-EYP participants outline supremacy of tradition-based over national laws and international laws.
- In four situations where respondents were offered to choose if they will act in accordance with official legislation or act unofficially respondents representing EYP site and non-EYP site demonstrated quite similar results.
- In four situations the choice of official and unofficial actions was balanced and youngsters depending on situation chose official or unofficial way of action.
- EYP participants are more prone to join other international youth organizations than Russian EYP non-participants.
- Neither EYPers nor non-EYPers demonstrated domination preference for international legislation (national legislation and tradition-based legislation were put on the first places respectively by EYPers and non-EYPers).

From the standpoint of outlined conclusions the following assumptions could be done: EYPers of Russian and other Russian youth might assess situations that demand choosing of “living law” approach and “in accordance with official law” approach from initially different perspectives (national legislation for EYPers and tradition-based laws for non-EYPers) but conditions of the situation make them act identically what leads to abandonment of declared national law or tradition-based law priorities.

Similar behavior of EYPers and non-EYPers in four described situations demands better examination of conditions and reasons of actions of participants in order to find out if argumentation base of EYPers and non-EYPers for choosing certain way of action varies.

Low preference in regards of international legislation as the most important one demonstrates high significance of national legislation and tradition-based legislation in daily lives of youth.

## **2.2.DIGITAL ETHNOGRAPHY**

For ethnographical part of the research there were collected over 70 responses that allow better understanding of positions of Russian youth regarding legal culture and these comments are used for the analysis in the further section of the research.

### **2.2.1. Analysis of results – ethnography**

#### **2.2.1.1. First question: corruption**

The first discussion was urged by question on of “corruption could be considered as a part of culture of people”, what implies the behavioral attitude towards corruption as everyday thing that cannot be escaped because it lies deep in cultural roots of people. This discussion gathered plurality of opinions while most of the arguments were stated in favor of consideration of corruption as a practice that is not rooted in culture. There were outlined five types of arguments in favor of statement that corruption is not a culture:

1) *“It’s not a culture, it is a practice obtruded by one group of population upon other groups”*

In this case corruption and way of solution of issues by bribing is considered as a special mechanism of solution that is used by certain people in order to achieve better results, such as bigger financial gain, power/influence gain etc.

2) *“Culture is an achievement of people, not a gap in system”*

This opinion implies understanding of corruption not as a cultural phenomenon because only achievements of people should be considered as cultural phenomenon. In this case huge role plays terminological aspect of word “culture”. Elaboration of discussion led to a mid-conclusion that corruption could be considered as tradition, but not all traditions could be acknowledged as “cultural”. In this case is should be outlined one more time that words “culture” and “cultural” in the first meaning in Russian language are synonymic to “civilized, well-educated, intelligent, enlightened” (Aleksandrova, 2011) .

3) *“In different societies, in different cultures there could be opposing views on same things (example cannibalism in tribe). Caucasus has two ways – to integrate in Russian [author’s note. for Russian is used “Russkiy” which signifies ethnic Russians, not state affinity – “Rossiyskiy”] society like Tatars did and forget about bride kidnapping [author’s note. Bride kidnapping is a tradition among Caucasus nations living in Russia which sometimes is still practiced] or to live outside of Russia because in Russia kidnapping is kidnapping. The same thing with corruption – it is a criminal law offence”*

This opinion sharply outlines the fact that Russia consists of many nations and views of these nation on official legislation may vary and some tradition-based laws can contradict to criminal laws of a country. Secondly this opinion highlights that cultural things are problematic to define/assess and grade of its “culturality” depends on the person/group that makes a definition/assessment.

4) *“Corruption is when you try to cheat the system, you try to swindle it. It is a common moment to all mankind, so it is not a cultural thing”*

This position demonstrates the opinion which infers that all people live in a system (for instance state) and they try find to gain additional benefits, freedoms, power despite limitation that official system poses in front of people.

5) *“Proneness to commit crimes can hardly be acknowledged as culture. Such proneness might signify collapse of culture. While not everything is so clear with traditions...”*

This opinion insists on separation of culture (which again refers to achievements of nation) and traditions (where some deviations in regards to official legislation could be found and some “bad” traditions might take place).

The opinion of that recognized possibility of viewing corruption as a part of culture:

*“Culture of people is not necessary something good. Usually people say that it is necessary to save culture and customs. I think that corruption is part of the system, but it doesn’t mean that it is impossible to struggle against it and eradicate it”*

This opinion signals that corruption/tradition of bribing could be considered as a part of culture and that culture can include negative features. In addition to it is strongly highlighted that corruption is a negative thing that should be combated.

#### **2.2.1.2. Second question: unwritten laws vs official laws**

This discussion dedicated to question “have you ever followed unwritten laws in a contravention to official legislation” was generally unsuccessful due to sensitive nature of the question. Although people in formal survey indicated that they went in contravention to official legislation people were shy or reluctant to give comments and details on their experiences.

#### **2.2.1.3. Third question: moral aspects vs official laws**

Third discussion was initiated by the question “Have you ever acted in accordance with law and meanwhile understood that you are acting immorally”.

Opinions given in comments could be accumulated in two comments:

*“Beauty of Russian legislation is in optionality to follow it”*

This comment gathers common opinion on that in Russia you can skip following official rules if you don’t feel that you want to do it, it could be done in many

ways, for instance, by simply not obeying the law, or by finding other legal way to achieve needed result, or by purposeful breaking of law.

Second comment that describes situation with legal moral dilemma is:

*“We are having municipal elections soon. I know how election system is constructed and according to the law I have to vote for somebody because there is no option “against all”, while morally I would forbid all of them to go in government for upcoming 20 years”*

This comment demonstrates that at certain levels society is tied with legislation quite strictly what leads to immoral (from personal standpoints) act which they have to commit because of law.

#### **2.2.1.4. Conclusion for ethnography part**

Digital ethnography part results demonstrated few very important results that should be taken into consideration when general conclusions are made.

According to answers of respondents corruption is an ambiguous phenomenon that can be considered both as a cultural phenomenon and not. On the one side corruption can be linked to culture of the nation, on the other hand people refuse to recognize corruption as cultural phenomenon claiming that it is mechanism that is used by people of many cultures to overcome officially implied barriers and limits. Corruption is just one example of possible phenomena that could be considered as rooted in culture and contradicting official legislation. There are certain cases when culture rooted behavior patterns contradict official legislation. So from this perspective it is beneficial to look at corruption as just a representing case of such law-breaking behavior. By doing extrapolation of corruption case to other situations we may see that in current Russian (Russian meaning belonging to state) society there are discussions and disagreements on behavioral forms that on the one hand can be recognized as culture but in the same they might be rejected as cultural phenomenon, and in this case they are given only tradition status.

Further ethnography discovered dilemma of ambiguity regarding presence of moral aspect in official legislation. On the one hand Russian youth is ready to admit as belonging to culture some phenomenon that are not violating official law but on the other hand Russian youngsters admit that some official laws and legal system might be unfair and immoral. It means that Russian youth can fully consider as cultural behavioral patterns that are not violating the law but also meet some common to all Russian citizens moral sense. It leads to a conclusion that very limited number of cultural behavioral patterns can be recognized by all Russians as all-Russian culture leaving traditions (culture rooted behavioral patterns) of ethnic minorities or official law-breaking patterns with “unrecognized” status.

If we look at this Russian context situation through the frame of legal culture concept we face such an outcome that legal culture of Russian youth cannot include officially illegal behavioral patterns, because culture by its meaning in Russian context implies that it is within official legislation, while opposing opinions are also present.

Another important outcome of ethnographical research that should be outlined is strong stressing of cultural diversity and even dissociation between ethnies composing Russian population. This outcome draws necessity to research legal traditions in terms of law following/violating of different ethnic groups in Russia. Such a research might demonstrate situation when legal cultures of certain groups might include law violation behavioral patterns which will be recognized by whole ethnic group as a legal culture exemplars.

### **2.3. Outcomes from empirical results**

Empirical studies provided with valuable information for current research and researches in the future. Examining complex results of survey and ethnography begot couple of answers and thousands of questions. Empirical research demonstrated that legal culture of Russians who participated in the EYP is different from the legal culture of those young Russians who never took part in

the EYP. This difference appears on a declarative level while behavioral patterns appears to be similar, furthermore this research demonstrated that this question deserves to be researched for understanding conditions and contexts that make EYPers act in a same manner with non-EYPers while they declare different things.

I found out that association to legal layers could be practical and declarative and participants of the European Youth Parliament in Russia are prone to declare own affinity to national legislation layers in contrast to other Russian youth, while actions of youngsters both EYPers and non-EYPers are close to be identical. Further research of legal culture issue through ethnography delivered a message that understanding of legal culture and living law patterns by Russian youth is ambiguous and complicated. Russian youth tries to behave in accordance with national law, but in the same time they are confused by morality issues that arise and by imperfections of legal system that create gaps for legal misbehavior. Additional difficulties stem from the diversity of Russian population in terms of affinity to ethnic groups and affinity to follow tradition-based rules. Furthermore tradition-based rules may contradict with national legislation and these tradition-based rules by certain ethnic group might be considered as primary while by other ethnic group these rules might be considered as criminal and people that act within these tradition-based rules deserve to be punished for violation of official law.

There is legal dilemma that consists of cultural (legal cultural) diversity, diversity of tradition-based rules, imperfections of legal system, moral unclearness, lack of trust to legislation producing authorities.

This legal cultural dilemma inside of Russian society on the one side explains why behavior of EYPers and non-EYPers is the same while they declare about own association differently and on another side this dilemma explains why both EYPers and non-EYPers prefer to act within official legislation in some cases and why they both act prefer to act illegally in other cases. Legal barriers in Russian

society are of blurry nature and youngsters are put in a situation when they have to decide what is moral and if legal obligation is enough strict and legal to be fulfilled.

### **3. Discussion: theoretical prism for results**

This section is dedicated to discussion of empirical results through the prism of theoretical pillars of the research. Empirical studies proved reasonability of application of all four theoretical concepts but they also delivered an important message of necessity to take into consideration national Russian context. As Ehrlich was examining legal norms of people from Bukovina of different descents in Austro-Hungarian Empire and difference in their attitudes towards official legislation (Hertogh, 2009: 26-27) I examined attitudes of youngsters of Russia on their attitudes towards legislation. Empirical findings demonstrated that people still use tradition-based norms in combination with official national norms what may remind situation in Austro-Hungarian Empire of Ehrlich's time when Grand compromise (*Ausgleich*) between legal systems was achieved and when there were used official and unofficial norms in a daily life of people (Ibid.: 29-32). Both in Ehrlich's case and Russian youngsters' case living law took place, and people were prone to act using different types of rules (unofficial and official) and in certain cases tradition-based rules were more important for them. Empirical studies within this research delivered evidence that despite the usage of unofficial norms in contradiction to official ones Russian youngsters have dilemma in acknowledgement of tradition-based norms as legal culture because some of tradition-based norms might be considered as immoral. In the same time issue of morality may perform as a reason for choosing of "living law" (Hertogh, 2009: 3-4) by Russian youngsters in case of contradiction to official law, because imperfection of Russian legal system and unfair usage of laws by, for instance, politicians may cause feeling of injustice, of indignation, or revolt (Ibid.).

If we assess results of research through the Europeanization concept we'll see that Europeanization for Russian youth means different things in comparison to what



Europeanization means to citizens of EU members or prospective EU members. Europeanization for Russian youth in terms of legal pluralism doesn't mean acknowledgement of all-EU legal norms as the most influential, for Russian youth the main level of official legislation is national level and this level might compete with "living law" level. But despite EU prism for Russian youth is not that relevant in terms of definition of Europeanization, the Europeanization plays important encompassing role because it was used as identifier of higher standards, civilized society, westernization (Bazhenova & Syomina, 2008), but it doesn't mean implication of legal norms elaborated and implied by the EU as the superior authority for Russian Federation.

Current research revealed some behavioral patterns of Russian Youth (EYP participants and non EYP participants) that might be considered as features of legal culture of these groups: like readiness to act within legal norms, but sometimes within unofficial norms depending on situation; in general people would be happy to follow official norms but sometimes authority lacks of trust and sometimes official obligations are immoral or contrasting tradition-based laws. On the other hand young Russians have specific understanding of meaning of "culture" and due to this reason before mentioned features might be recognized by some part of Russian youth as part of culture and legal culture, while other part rejects in such recognition.

Results of the research demonstrated that Russian youth (both EYP participants and non-EYP participants) can make distinction between tradition-based norms, national legislation and international legislation but in the same time none of these two groups consider international legislation as primary and prefer to focus on following tradition-based or national legislative norms.

Assessing usage of multi-pillar theoretical system for conduction this research it is reasonable to notice that such theoretical approach allowed not only to receive answers for the research question but in addition it made possible to look at the research subject from plural angles and come up with vision that there are number

of contextual factors that can influence on formation of Russian youth legal culture. Number of contextual factors (like trust to current legal system in the state, affinity to certain ethnic group, morality issues) can limit influence of participation in youth movements (in particular in EYP) on formation of legal culture change of Russian youngsters.

## **4. Conclusion**

### **4.1. Conclusion**

As a concluding point I would like to outline key findings that were received thanks to this research. First of all it became possible to positively conclude that attitudes towards legal layers and legal culture of Russian young people who participated in European Youth Parliament and those who didn't are different. Difference appears on declarative level of association of themselves with legal layers, while in practice behavioral patterns of young people are quite similar. Especially it should be noticed that neither EYPers nor non-EYPers see international legislation level as primary for their self association and attitude.

Application of ethnographic method of the research enriched findings of the research with valuable information on vision of disposition of official legislation and tradition-based norms by Russian young people: it showed that young people meet multi-faceted dilemma in terms of finding national legal culture attitudes in conditions of imperfection of official legislation, moral senses, polyethnicity, aspiration for becoming civilized (Europeanized) society.

This research is just one of the first bricks in a process of understanding youngsters' vision of legal culture, Europeanization processes, legal pluralism and living law in the context of current Russian reality which thrived from complicated historical and complicated current political processes with all their influences.

### **4.2. Further research**

This research opens the door to further researches in number of fields in complicated context of Russian reality. Due to source and time limitations in research it was impossible to conduct more detailed research and include additional factors and features that deserves to be examined, in this regards I would like to highlight number of questions that should be studied further in order to make legal culture topic more explained and deconstructed.

Taking into consideration such factor as polyethnicity of Russian society it makes reasonable to conduct researches assessing youngsters' legal behavior patterns and readiness to put tradition-based laws as primary ones depending on ethnic belonging of the respondents. By conduction of this type of the research it would be possible to see if readiness to act within living law differs from ethnicity to ethnicity in Russia.

Taking into consideration that Russia is federative state and there are numerous republics and autonomic regions in Russia it might be valuable to conduct further study on if Russian youth is aware about regional/republican/municipal laws and if this type of laws play important role in lives of Russian youth.

Current research was conducted in a period when Ukraine experienced oppression from West (the USA and EU) and East (Russia), these sides are competing and it leads to implementation of propaganda strategies. I remind that formally all revolts began from Ukraine's will to join the EU, to become Europeanized. Russian media started interpreting "Europeanization" in a very specific way, by making Russians and pro-Russian Ukrainians associate "Europeanization" with gay marriage laws (GolossRossii, 2013), economic collapse of Baltic states (KievskiyVestnik, 2014) and Greece (Lukyanov, 2014) after joining the EU. Due to this information process meaning of Europeanization for Russians might shift from classic meaning of "reaching higher standards" and becoming "civilized" (Syomina&Bazhenova, 2008) to some negative one. In this regards it is essential to study what does "Europeanization" mean to Russian youth right now.

Finally, this research demonstrated that in some cases Russian youngsters are afraid to speak publicly, participate in public discussions (including online forums) on topics that may be considered as sensitive, because they touch upon politics and legislative issues: in this cases participants might have fear of acknowledging that they acted illegally or have a fear on giving details on illegal actions that they have taken. Stemming from this issue it is suggested for further researches to use personal in-depth interview method because this method keeps anonymity and might be beneficial in gaining information on reasons and details of illegal actions.

## 5. References:

AIIESEC RUSSIA (2014) History of AIIESEC in Russia. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.aiesec.ru/about/aiesec-russia-history>

AFS Russia (2014) AFS Russia. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://afs.ru/about-afs/chto-takoe-afs/>

Aleksandrova (2011) Dictionary of Russian synonyms. Accessed 15 April 2014 at [http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/dic\\_synonims/68660](http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/dic_synonims/68660)

Alieva, L. (2006). EU and South Caucasus. CAP Discussions Paper.

Bazhenova, T.P. & Syomina V.P. (2008). Essence of Russian Culture Europeanization. *Culturology analytics*, (10).

Bezgin V.B. (2012) Legal culture of Russian village (2nd half of XIXcent. – beginning of XX cent.). Tambov Technical University. Russia: Tambov.

Bizhit (2014) Users of Runet: statistics. Accessed 22 April 2014 at [http://www.bizhit.ru/index/users\\_count/0-151](http://www.bizhit.ru/index/users_count/0-151)

Börzel, T. (1999), “Towards Convergence in Europe? Institutional Adaptation to Europeanization in Germany and Spain”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39:4, 573-96;

Bordachev, T., & Moshes, A. (2004). Is the Europeanization of Russia over?. *Russia in Global Affairs*, 2(2), 90-102.

Bragina E. V. (2012) The European Neighbourhood Policy: a process of Europeanization.

Buxbaum, H. L. (2005). German Legal Culture and the Globalization of Competition Law: A Historical Perspective on the Expansion of Private Antitrust Enforcement. *Berkeley J. Int'l L.*, 23, 474.

- Belonosov V.O. & Nekrasov A.P. (2013) Legal pluralism: theoretical aspect. *Vektor Nauki*, № 1(23), 2013
- Berman, H. (1983) *Law and Revolution*. Harvard University press
- Berman, P. S. (2009). The new legal pluralism. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 5, 225-242.
- Belyaeva D.A (2013) FORMS AND METHODS OF LEGAL CULTURE INCREASE THROUGH EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN POLITICAL AND LEGAL CULTURE FORMATION. Conference, 23-24 October 2013, Saint Petersburg, Russia.
- Coppieters, B. (Ed.). (2004). *Europeanization and conflict resolution: case studies from the European periphery (Vol. 3)*. Academia Press.
- Drautzburg, T., Gawrich, A., & Melnykovska, I. (2008). Institutional Convergence of CIS Towards European Benchmarks (No. 0082). CASE-Center for Social and Economic Research.
- Dezalay, Y., & Garth, B. (2001). The Import and Export of Law and Legal Institutions: international strategies in national palace Wars. *Adapting Legal Cultures*, 241.
- Dupret B. (2007) Legal pluralism, plurality of laws, and legal practices: theories, critiques, and praxiological re-specification. *Eur. J. Legal Stud.* 1:1. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.ejls.eu/1/14UK.pdf>
- Dorogova L.N., Pykhanov Y.V., Mareyeva E.V., Mareyev S.N. and Ryabchun N.P. (2002) *Culturology ('Kulturologiya')*. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.ido.rudn.ru/ffec/cult/cu3-7.html>
- ESTIEM (2014) ESTIEM. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <https://www.estiem.org/>
- IdushieVmeste (2014) Archive web-site. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://web.archive.org/web/20021019010503/http://idushie.ru/rus/about/index.php>

EYP Russia (2014) EYP Russia. Accessed 15 April 2014 at [http://eyp-russia.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=34&Itemid=55](http://eyp-russia.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=34&Itemid=55)

EUY (2014) Eurasian Union of Youth. Accessed 15 April at <http://rossia3.ru/>

EYP (2014b) EYP Overview. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.eyp.org/area.3.About-EYP.html>.

EYP Russia (2014) History. Accessed 15 April 2014 at [http://eyp-russia.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=37&Itemid=58](http://eyp-russia.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=37&Itemid=58).

EYP (2014a) EYP Overview. Accessed 15 April 2014 at  
<iframe src="//player.vimeo.com/video/29754193" width="500" height="400" webkitallowfullscreen mozallowfullscreen allowfullscreen></iframe>

Hine, C. (2000) *Virtual Ethnography*, SAGE Publications, University of Surrey.

Franke, A., Gawrich, A., Melnykovska, I. & Schweickert R. (2010) The European Union's Relations with Ukraine and Azerbaijan, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 26:2, 149-183

Gorard, S. (2003). *Quantitative methods in social science research*. Continuum.

GolosRossii (2013) Azarov: Europe demands legalization of gay marriages. Accessed 15 April 2014 at [http://rus.ruvr.ru/news/2013\\_12\\_14/Azarov-Ukraina-ne-dolzhna-bit-pridatkom-Evropi-9308/](http://rus.ruvr.ru/news/2013_12_14/Azarov-Ukraina-ne-dolzhna-bit-pridatkom-Evropi-9308/)

Griffiths, J. (1986). What is legal pluralism?. *The journal of legal pluralism and unofficial law*, 18(24), 1-55.

Gurvitch, G. (1947). *The sociology of law*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hertogh, MLM. (2009). *Living Law: Reconsidering Eugen Ehrlich*. Hart Pub.

- Héritier, A. et. al. (2001), *Differential Europe. The European Union Impact on national Policymaking* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield)
- Itzovich, G. (2012). Legal order, legal pluralism, fundamental principles. *Europe and its law in three concepts*. *European Law Journal*, 18(3), 358-384.
- Inwood, M. (1998) *Hermeneutics*. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Version 1.0 pp. 3502-3505). London and New York: Routledge
- Irkutskaya V.I. (2010). International experience and specifics of education in Russia.. *Herald of Tomsk State Pedagogic University*: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/mezhdunarodnyy-opyt-i-spetsifika-obrazovaniya-rossii>
- Ivanova S.U. (2013) FORMING OF RUSSIAN IDENTITY AND LEGAL CULTURE AS A CONDITION OF ENSURING OF HUMANITARIAN SECURITY IN MULTIETHNIC REGION. *ECONOMICS SCIENCE*, (1), *Herald of North-Caucasus Federal University* 100-115.
- Justman, M., & Gradstein, M. (1999). The industrial revolution, political transition, and the subsequent decline in inequality in 19th-century Britain. *Explorations in Economic History*, 36(2), 109-127.
- Kost'kin D.A. (2008) Moral upbringing: Soviet past and modernity. (*Nravstvennoe vospitanie: sovetskoe proshloe I sovremennost'*). *Herald of Penza State Pedagogical University named after V.G.Belinskiy*. Accessed 14 April 2014 at <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/nravstvennoe-vospitanie-sovetskoe-proshloe-i-sovremennost>
- Kruglashov A. (2011) Eurointegration course of Ukraine and Moldova: problems and opportunities of constructive cooperation. *Conferința științifică internațională „Identitate civică și integrare europeană – factoria și consolidări și statalitate în imoldovenesti”* (Chișinău, 5-6 octombrie 2011).



- Kolobova, L.V. (2009). Europeanization of education issues. Section 16 “Education and science as the most important resource of social and cultural dynamics”, 1508-1512, Orenburg State University
- Kalinichenko, P. (2012) Europeanization of Russian legislation
- Kostyuchenko (2013) Management of VK: we cooperate with K department of FSB for already few years. Accessed 22 April 2014 at <http://www.novayagazeta.ru/politics/57393.html>
- KievskiyVestnik (2014) Victims of the EU. Accessed 15 April 2014 at [http://kyiv-vestnik.com.ua/public\\_s7455.html](http://kyiv-vestnik.com.ua/public_s7455.html)
- Kasyanov, V.V. (2011) LEGAL CULTURE AS A FACTOR OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION OF YOUTH OF MODERN RUSSIA, Kuban State University
- Levada (2008) Knowledge of foreign languages in Russia. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.levada.ru/16-09-2008/znanie-inostrannykh-yazykov-v-rossii>.
- Luijten-Lub, A. (2007). Choices in internationalisation: how higher education institutions respond to internationalisation, europeanisation, and globalisation. University of Twente.
- Lukyanov F. (2014) Crisis of Eurointegration . Accessed 15 April 2014 <http://www.gazeta.ru/column/lukyanov/3359596.shtml>
- Ladrech, R. (1994). Europeanization and national politics. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marinichenko A.V. (2009) Geopolitics. Moscow: Infra-m. Accessed 14 April 2014 at <http://yourlib.net/content/view/11650/133/>
- Mau V. et al (1998) Economics of transitional period. Studies on Economic policies of Post-Soviet Russia 1991-1997. Accessed 14 April 2014 at <http://www.iep.ru/ru/ekonomika-pere-odnogo-perioda-ocherki-ekonomicheskoi-politiki-postkommunisticheskoi-rossii-1991-1997.html>

- Makukh, V. (2006) Comparative analysis of Eurointegration dynamics of ENP member states. *Central Asia and Caucasus*, 6 (60).
- Melnykovska, I.(2008). Ukraine: Europeanization from abroad or inside? Chance and Challenge for the European Union. In ECSCA-Canada 2008 Biennial Conference “The Maturing European Union.
- Medvedev, S. (2008) Discourses of alienation: “sovereignty” and “Europeanization” in relations of Russia and the EU. *Higher School of Economics: Moscow*.
- Model UN (2014) Moscow Model of United Nations. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.modelun.ru/ru/vchera-segodnya>
- Morgan, W. J., & Kliucharev, G. A. (eds.) (2012). Higher Education and the Post-Soviet Transition in Russia. *European Journal of Education*, 47(1), 3-8.
- Mkrtchiân, T., Huseynov, T., & Gogolashvili, K. (2009). The European Union and the South Caucasus: Three Perspectives on the Future of the European Project from the Caucasus. Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Nashi (2014) About Project. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://nashi.su/projects>
- Nelken, D., & Feest, J. (2001). *Adapting legal cultures*. Hart Pub.
- Nelken, D. (2008). Eugen Ehrlich, living law, and plural legalities. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 9(2), 443-471.
- Nelken, D. (2004). Using the concept of legal culture. *Austl. J. Leg. Phil.*, 29, 1.
- Party of People’s Freedom (2011) Putin. Corruption. Independent report. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.putin-itogi.ru/f/Putin-i-korruptsiya-doklad.pdf>
- Neuman W.L. (2007) *Social Research Methods*, Pearson Education

- Petrov, R., &Kalinichenko, P. (2011). The Europeanization of Third Country Judiciaries through the Application of the EU Acquis: the Cases of Russia and Ukraine. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 60(2), 325-353.
- Popescu, L. (2011). Challenges at EU's New Eastern Frontier Twenty Years after USSR's Fall. *Romanian Journal of Political Sciences*, (02), 4-38.
- Petersen, A. H. (2012). The European Neighbourhood Policy—A case study of the European Union's Relations with Ukraine and Azerbaijan, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 26:2, 149-183
- Radaelli, C. (2003), 'The Europeanization of Public Policy', in Featherstone, K. and Radaelli, C. (2003) (eds.)
- Raik, K. (2011). From attraction to Europeanisation—Moldova's slow movement towards the EU. *Eastern Partnership Review*, (2).
- Risse, T., Cowles, M. G. and Caporaso, J. (2001), "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction", in Cowles, M. G., Caporaso, J. and Risse, T. (eds.) (2001), *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research* 2nd edition.
- Somekh, B., &Lewin, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Research methods in the social sciences*. Sage.
- Sade-Beck, L. (2004). Internet Ethnography: Online and Offline. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(2).
- Savin V.N. (2011) Legal culture of students in modern conditions: sociological analysis. Dissertation. Ural State University named after Gorkiy. Yekaterinburg
- Gurova (2013) Legal education as a factor of formation of legal culture of students. Orenburg State University

- Nefedov & Nefedova (2006) Criterion of formation of new legal culture of students. Polzunov Herald.3, 1
- Ryazanova M.N. (2014) Legal culture of students of economic specialities.
- Saakyan, M.G. (2009) Legal upbringing and education as a measure of formation of legal culture. Herald of Adygeya State University.
- Schwarzkopf-Stiftung (2014) European Youth Parliament, accessed 28 January 2014 at <http://www.schwarzkopf-stiftung.de/page.1.694.European-Youth-Parliament.html>
- Sociologysoul (2014) Sociology research on hobbies of youth from Saratov. Accessed 15 April 2014 at <http://www.sociologysoul.ru/tpts-840-2.html>.
- Sibac (2014) Research on hobbies of youth in Orsk city. <http://sibac.info/index.php/2009-07-01-10-21-16/4286-2012-10-19-18-25-46>
- Stuzhinskaya, O. (2013). Belarusian youth: Europeanisation on the agenda. *European View*, 12(2), 279-287.
- Snyder, F. G. (Ed.). (2000). *The Europeanisation of Law: the legal effects of European integration (Vol. 1)*. Hart Publishing.
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (2008). Understanding legal pluralism: past to present, local to global. *Sydney L. Rev.*, 30, 375.
- Trenin D. (2004) identity and integration: Russia and West in XXI cent. *Pro et Contra*, 8, №3
- Tsuladze, L.(2012). *The Youth Discourses on EU-ropeanization in the New European Countries and the Margins of Europe (Working paper)*.
- Visegrády, A. (2013). On European legal cultures. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos*, (107).

Varpahovskis, E. (2013) LATVIAN NON-CITIZENSHIP: ISSUE OF STATELESSNESS?.International conference in Bashkir State University. Ufa, Russia

Van Hoecke, M., & Warrington, M. (1998). Legal cultures, legal paradigms and legal doctrine: towards a new model for comparative law. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 495-536.

YASCO (2014) Youth council. Accessed 15 April at <http://www.forumsco.com/?lng=en&module=pages&action=view&id=20>

Zelenova T.G. (2009) Development of youth activity by participation in International Projects.Collection of articles from all-Russian conference, Federal commission on youth policy and tourism, Moscow. Accessed 15 April 2014 at [http://vmo.rgub.ru/files/analitika\\_sbornik\\_rabot\\_zaochnoj\\_konf-146-2.pdf](http://vmo.rgub.ru/files/analitika_sbornik_rabot_zaochnoj_konf-146-2.pdf)

Zubok, I. A., &Chuprov, V. I. (2007). The Legal Culture of Young People from the Standpoint of Transformation Strategies. *Russian Education & Society*, 49(7), 73-91.

## **6. Appendix**

### **6.1. APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE TRANSLATED**

#### **1. How old are you?**

Less than 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Over 23

**2. Please indicate your sex**

Male

Female

**3. Please indicate the country that you currently live in**

\*Country of permanent residence is a country where you live 3 months or more.

Russian Federation

Other country

**4. Please choose the statement that you agree with more than others**

“Laws determined by traditions of my people/family are more important to me than National laws”

«National laws are more important to me than laws determined by traditions of my people/family»

Hard to say

**5. Please choose the statement that you agree with more than others**

“Laws determined by traditions of my people/family are more important to me than International laws”

“International laws are more important to me than laws determined by traditions of my people/family”

Hard to say

**6. Please choose the statement that you agree with more than others**

“National laws more important to me than International laws”

“International laws more important to me than National laws”

Hard to say

**7. Please choose the statement that you agree with more than others**

“Laws determined by traditions of my people/family are more important to me than National laws even if they contradict each other”

“National laws are more important to me than laws determined by traditions of my people/family even if they contradict each other”

Hard to say

**8. Please choose the statement that you agree with more than others**

“Laws determined by traditions of my people/family are more important to me than International laws even if they contradict each other”

“International laws are more important to me than laws determined by traditions of my people/family even if they contradict each other”

Hard to say

**9. Please choose the statement that you agree with more than others**

“National laws more important to me than International laws even if they contradict each other ”

“International laws more important to me than National laws even if they contradict each other ”

Hard to say

**10. Please continue the statement «In my opinion solution of issues/goals with help of gifts (products, money etc.) to responsible people in my country/city/area/culture...**

Is acceptable"

Is acceptable, but unlikely”

Is unacceptable (never used such methods)”

Is unacceptable, but I have to use such methods because in my country/city/area/culture it is a common practice”

Hard to say

**11. Please continue the statement «In my opinion solution of issues/goals with help of gifts (products, money etc.) to responsible people abroad (other city/country...»**

Is acceptable"

Is acceptable, but unlikely”

Is unacceptable (never used such methods)”

Is unacceptable, but I have to use such methods because in there it is a common practice”

Hard to say

**12. Imagine that one of your family members was insulted in the street of your city. Please continue phrase with statement that you find the most suitable. “In my opinion...»**

Conflict can be solved without involving policy/without implementation of legal norms”

Conflict should be solved in accordance with official legislation”

It is better to solve the conflict with the help of legislation, but it is acceptable to solve it without official involving of authority representatives”

Hard to say

**13. Imagine that one of your family members was insulted in the street of city that is abroad. Please continue phrase with statement that you find the most suitable. “In my opinion...»**

Conflict can be solved without involving policy/without implementation of legal norms”

Conflict should be solved in accordance with official legislation”

It is better to solve the conflict with the help of legislation, but it is acceptable to solve it without official involving of authority representatives”

Hard to say



**14. Imagine that your acquaintance asked you to lend him big sum of money (for instance, your half-year budget) and you have this sum. What would you do in this situation?**

Will lend money unofficially

Will lend money under receipt (officially confirmed)

Will not give money

Hard to say

**15. Imagine that your relative asked you to lend him big sum of money (for instance, your half-year budget) and you have this sum. What would you do in this situation?**

Will lend money unofficially

Will lend money under receipt (officially confirmed)

Will not give money

Hard to say

**16. Your neighbor are making noisy in the night even after you asked them not to do so. What will you do in this situation?**

Report to police (act in accordance with law)

Tried to solve problem by myself with legal methods

Would endure but later would implement legal methods

Would endure but later implement methods that find acceptable (even those that contradict official law)

Endured and did nothing

Hard to say

**17. Please choose the answer that you personally find the most suitable. "If I'm asked where I come from I primary associate myself with ...**

Country where I was born"

Country where I live"

Country where I was born and live"

With particular city/area where I was born”

With particular city/area where I live”

With particular city/area where I was born I live”

Other (please mention in the next question)

Hard to say

**18. If in the previous question you chose “other” you can define your answer here:**

**19. Have you ever participated in events conducted by European Youth Parliament (EYP)?**

Yes

No

Hard to say

**20. Have you ever participated in events conducted by other European/ International youth organizations? (if yes, please name them)**

## **6.2. APPENDIX 2: OVERALL STATISTICS**

### *Age*

The age of survey participants split in the following way: 22 respondents (11,5% of whole sample) participated in the survey and they were aged between 14 and 17 at the moment of taking this survey. People of this age are school students. Second group of participants consists of university/college/institution students aged between 18 and 21. This group is composed of 115 participants (60% of whole poll share). Third group consists of people aged between 22 and 27, these people are young professionals, master students, Ph.D students. Number of survey participants for the third group is 55 (28,5%). As far as there were no limits and quotes on age of participation (excluding that people should be aged between 14

and 27) it will be no conclusion made on the basis of age factor, because of small sample size for the age groups.

### *Sex*

Sex split of participants is following: males – 52 participants (27%) and 140 female participants (73%). Gender indicator was not quoted as well, so conclusions made on the basis gender cannot be delivered as reliable.

### *EYP participants*

*By participation in the EYP is understood participation in at least one European Youth Parliament event.*

There were 64 (33%) EYP participants among respondents and 128 (66%) respondents who never participated in EYP events. Number of participants and non-participants of EYP events was quoted and conclusion will be taken into account results for both groups – participants of EYP and non-participants of the EYP.

### *Traditional laws vs National laws*

*By “Traditional laws” here and further are understood tradition-based norms (“living laws”), in the questionnaire “Traditional laws” term is interpreted as “traditional laws of my family or people”. In this interpretation are used words ‘Zakony’ for “laws” (it implies meanings norms, laws, regulations) and ‘narod’ for “people” (it implies that people are representatives of ethnic group).*

85 survey participants (45,5%) highlighted that traditional laws are more important for them than national legislations, while 74 (38,5%) respondents noticed that national law for them is more important than traditional laws. 31 (16%) respondents stated that it was hard to say.

### *Traditional law vs International laws*

This question was answered the following way: 91 participants (47%) stated that traditional laws are more important than International laws, while importance of international laws over traditional laws was mentioned by 80 (41,5%) participants and 21 (11%) stated that it was hard to say.

#### *National laws vs International laws*

Importance of national laws over international laws was highlighted by 103 (53,5%) participants, while International legislation was considered as more important by 71 (37%) respondents. Question was found difficult to answer by 18 (9,5%) participants.

#### *Traditional law vs National laws – contradiction*

*Here and further “contradiction” means situation when norms/laws oppose each other.*

Despite the possible contradiction to national law, traditional law was considered as more important by 75 (39%) respondents, while 76 (39,5%) found national laws more important in case of contradiction to tradition laws. 41 (21,5%) highlighted that it was hard to say which laws are more important to them personally in case of contradiction.

#### *Traditional law vs International laws – contradiction*

In case of contradiction of traditional laws to international laws preferences as to more important legislation were given to traditional laws, 89 (46 %) participants underlined importance of traditional laws over international ones, while importance of international legislation was highlighted by 73 (38%) respondents. 30 (15%) respondents had difficulties in deciding which law is more important for them in case of contradiction.

#### *National laws vs International laws - contradiction*

For 95 (49,5%) respondents national law in case of contradiction is more important than International one, while 66 (34%) highlighted importance of

International law over national in case of contradiction. For 31 (15,5%) survey takers it was hard to say.

#### *Corruption-homeland*

*By homeland is meant Russia*

According to survey 17(9%) participants find it “acceptable” to solve issues occurring at homeland in official authorities by bribing, 51 (26,5%) find it “acceptable but unlikely”, 61 (31,5%) participants of the survey find such way of solution of issues as “unacceptable and never did it”, while 51 (26,5%) find it unacceptable but had to bribe due to local traditions. Only 6 (3%) had difficulties in answering this question.

#### *Corruption-abroad*

*By “abroad” is meant all other countries besides Russia.*

According to survey 18(9,5%) participants find it “acceptable” to solve issues occurring abroad in official authorities by bribing, 43 (22,5%) find it “acceptable but unlikely”, 108 (56%) participants of the survey find such way of solution of issues as “unacceptable and never did it”, while 19 (10%) find it unacceptable but had to bribe due to local traditions. Only 4 (2%) had difficulties in answering this question.

#### *Insult – homeland*

In case of insult of relative in the street at home 105 (54,5%) would prefer to solve the problem without usage of national legislation or involving representatives of official authority, 74 (38,5%) of participants would like to solve the situation with the help of official authority, but solution without involving official authority is also acceptable. 11 (5%) stated that issue should be solved in accordance to national law. 2 (1%) faced difficulties in answering this question.

#### *Insult – abroad*

In case of insult of relative in the street abroad 81 (42%) find it possible to solve the situation without application of official legislation or involving representatives of official authorities, 72 (37,5%) would like to use official legislation to solve the situation but find it acceptable to solve the issue without involvement of official legislation. 33 (17%) find it necessary to solve the situation with the help of official legislation. 6 (3%) stated that it is hard to say.

#### *Owing money – acquaintance*

According to results of the survey 52 respondents (27%) will not owe money to well-known acquaintance. 37 (19%) will lend money without demanding any official confirmation. 89 (46%) respondents will owe money on receipt (official confirmation). 14 (7%) respondents found it difficult to answer the question.

#### *Owing money – relative*

20 (10%) will not owe money to relative, 101 (52,5%) respondents are ready to owe money to relative unofficially, 55 (28,5%) will owe money to relative on receipt. 16 (8%) stated that it is hard to say.

#### *Neighbor*

In situation when neighbors are making too much noise at night even after respondent made a complain to neighbor and asked to be more quiet 51 (25,5%) respondents will try to solve the situation within legislation but without calling to police, 77 (40%) respondents will report to police, 27 (14%) respondents will bear it for some time and then report to police, 21 (11%) respondents are ready to solve the situation even by illegal methods. 10 (5%) will endure it, 6 (3%) had no answer for this question.

#### *Association*

When respondents are asked where do they come from they associate themselves with “country where they were born and live” (77 respondents – 40%), “with country where they were born” (16 respondents – 8%), “with country where they

live (21 respondents – 10%), “with city/area where they were born and live” (28 respondents – 14,5%), “with city/area where they were born” (29 respondents – 15%), “with city/area where they live” (10 respondents – 5%). 7 (3,5%) respondents chose “other” option, and 8 (4%) respondents mentioned that it is “hard to say”.

#### *Participation in other international youth organizations*

There were 30 participants (14,5%) of other international youth organization and 162 (84,5%) respondents didn't take part in international youth organizations.

### **Empirical findings for EYP participants**

#### *Age and sex*

EYP participants who took part in this survey split in the following way: first age group (14 to 17 years old) consisted of 8 respondents (13%), second age group (18-21 y.o.) consisted of 42 (66%) respondents and the third group (22- over 23) consisted of 13 (21%) respondents. Split by gender was following: 47(74%) respondents indicated their gender as female and 16 respondents (25%) indicated own gender as male. As far as there was not aim to make a research on the basis of gender behavioral models there was no quotation on gender put and no generalizations based on the gender or age factors should be made.

#### *Traditional laws vs National laws*

20 (32%) EYP participants who participated in the research highlighted that traditional law is more important for them than National law, while 32 (50%) respondents of current group highlighted National legislation importance over traditional laws. 11 (18%) respondents stated that it is hard to say which type of laws are more important for them.

#### *Traditional law vs International laws*

According to results of the survey 27 (43%) of respondents who participated in the EYP events find Traditional laws as more important than International ones,

while 32 (50%) of respondents find international legislation as more important than traditional laws. 4 (6%) survey takers stated that it is hard to decide for them on which laws are more important.

#### *National laws vs International laws*

26 (41%) of respondents who participated in EYP events stated that International legislation is more important than national one. While 34 (54%) respondents found National laws more important than International. Only 3 (5%) respondents had problems with answering this question.

#### *Traditional law vs National laws – contradiction*

29 (46%) of EYP participants find National laws as more important than traditional ones in case of contradiction of these legal systems to each other. 20 (32%) respondents highlighted importance of traditional laws over national legislation in case of contradiction. 14 (22%) respondents found it difficult to answer the question.

#### *Traditional law vs International laws – contradiction*

27 (43%) respondents stated that international legislation is more important for them in case of contradiction with traditional laws, while 25 (40%) respondents mentioned that traditional laws are more important than international ones. For 11 (17%) respondents it was hard to say which laws in contradiction case are more important for them.

#### *National laws vs International laws – contradiction*

In case of contradiction of National and International laws 22 (35%) respondents stated that international law is more important for them while 31 (49%) respondents found National law more important in this case. 10 (16%) respondents were unable to decide.

#### *Corruption-homeland*



When respondents were asked about the situation when bribing could be needed 4 (7%) EYP participants stated that bribing is “acceptable” practice for solution of some issues linked to official authorities, 13 (21%) survey takers that participated in the EYP stated that it is “acceptable but not likely”, 25 (40%) respondents found it unacceptable and never did it, and 21(33%) found it as unacceptable action but they have to use it because in country/culture it is considered as normal practice.

#### *Corruption-abroad*

For the question about corruption situation occurring abroad 5 (8%) respondents found it acceptable to bribe, 6 (10%) respondents found “acceptable but unlikely”, 42 (66%) respondents found it unacceptable and never did it, 8 (13%) respondents found it unacceptable but they had to bribe due to local norms, and 2(3%) respondents stated that it is hard to say.

#### *Insult – homeland*

In case of insult of or relative in hometown 37 (58%) respondents found it possible to solve the conflict without involving official authorities and official legislation, 24 (38%) respondents found it possible to solve the issue without inclusion official authorities while they would prefer to address the issue to official site. Only 2 (3%) stated that the issue should be solved in accordance to national legislation.

#### *Insult – abroad*

When the case of insult of a relative happens abroad 24 (38%) respondents of this group would prefer to solve the issue without involving official legislation, 26 (41%) respondents stated that it would be better to solve the issue in accordance with local legislation while solution without involving legislation is also possible. 9 (14%) respondents representing group of EYP participants highlighted that the case of insult should be solved in accordance to official legislation. For one (2%) respondent it was hard to say.

### *Owing money – acquaintance*

In case of owing money to acquaintance 12 (19%) respondents agreed to give money unofficially, 23(36%) respondents would only owe money under receipt, and 23 (36%) respondents would not owe money at all. 5 (8%) respondents had difficulties in answering this question.

### *Owing money – relative*

In case of owing money to relative 34 (54%) respondents agreed to give money unofficially, 14 (22%) respondents agreed to owe money to relative under receipt, 6 (10%) respondents of current group stated that they will not give money anyway and for 4 (7%) respondents it was hard to say.

### *Neighbor*

For the case with neighbor who is making a lot of noise in the night even after he was asked not do so the following answers on further actions were received: 17 (27%) EYPers stated that will try to solve the situation within legislation but without calling to police, 26 (41%) respondents will report to police, 8 (13%) respondents will bear it for some time and then report to police, 8 (13%) respondents are ready to solve the situation even with illegal methods. 3 (5%) will endure it and will do nothing, 1 (2%) had no answer for this question.

### *Association*

For the question on association when respondents are asked where do they come from the following answers were received: 9 (14%) respondents associate themselves with a country where they were born, 18 (28%) respondents associate themselves with a country where they were born and live now, 6 (10%) respondents associate themselves with a country where they live now. 8 (13%) associate themselves with particular area where they were born, 8 (13%) respondents associate themselves with particular area where they live, 7 (12%) respondents associate themselves with area where they were born and live now.

Other option was chosen by 2 (3%) respondents and 1 respondent (2%) found it difficult to answer this question.

#### *Participation in other international youth organizations*

16 (25%) of respondents who participated in EYP took part in other international youth organizations (mainly AIESEC and UN model).

### **Non-EYPers results presentation**

#### *Age and sex*

Non-EYPers who took part in this research according split in the following way by age criteria: first group (14 to 17 years old) consists of 14 (11%) respondents, second group (18-21) consists of 73 respondents (57%) and the third group (22 and older) consists of 41 (32%). Age split of non-EYP respondents is 93 female respondents (72%) and 36 male respondents (28%).

#### *Traditional laws vs National laws*

According to results 65 respondents (50%) of this group see traditional laws as more important in regards of national laws. 46 of respondents (37%) considers national laws as more important over traditional ones. 18 respondents (13%) stated that it is hard to say.

#### *Traditional law vs International laws*

64 respondents (50%) of this group highlighted importance of traditional laws over international ones, 48 of respondents (38%) see international laws as more important in comparison to traditional ones and 17 respondents (12%) faced difficulties in answering this question.

#### *National laws vs International laws*

45 (35%) of EYP non-participants highlighted International laws importance over national laws, while 69 (53%) noted that national laws are more important for

them than international ones. 15 respondents (12%) were unable to answer question.

#### *Traditional law vs National laws – contradiction*

55 of EYP non-participants consider (42%) traditional laws as more important to national laws even if these laws contradict to each other. 47 of respondents (36%) of these group highlighted importance of national legislation over traditional laws in case of contradiction and 27 respondents (21%) found it difficult to answer this question.

#### *Traditional law vs International laws – contradiction*

Importance of traditional laws over international ones in case of contradiction situation is considered by 64 respondents (51%) while 46 respondents (37%) highlighted importance of international laws over traditional laws and 19 respondents (11%)

#### *National laws vs International laws – contradiction*

In case of contradiction 44 respondents (35%) see International laws as more important over national while 64 (51%) respondents consider national legislation as more important and 21 respondent (13%) had difficulties in answering this question.

#### *Corruption-homeland*

Regarding bribing at home question the following results were demonstrated by group of EYP non-participants – 13 (7%) found it as “acceptable” to bribe official authority, while 38 respondents (29%) stated that it is “acceptable but unlikely”. 42 respondents (33%) found bribing at home as unacceptable practice, while 31 respondents (16%) found it unacceptable but necessary practice at home. Only 5 respondents (3%) had difficulties in answering this question.

#### *Corruption-abroad*

Regarding bribing abroad it was considered as “acceptable” by 13 (7%) respondents, while it was considered as “acceptable but unlikely” by 37 (19%) respondents. As unacceptable practice to bribe abroad was highlighted by 66 (51%), while 11 (6%) respondents found “unacceptable, but necessary due to local norm”. 2 respondents (1%) found it difficult to answer this question.

#### *Insult – homeland*

In case of insult of relative at home 66 respondents of non-EYP participants (51%) stated that they would prefer solution of conflict without involving of official authority representatives, 50 respondents (38%) would prefer to involve official authorities but solution without involving them is also possible. 9 of respondents (7%) insisted on solution through law application. For 2 respondents (1%) I was hard to say.

#### *Insult – abroad*

In case of insult of relative abroad 57 respondents (44%) of given group would prefer to solve it without involving official authorities, for 46 respondents (35%) it likely to involve official authorities but solution of the conflict without doing it is also acceptable. 21 respondents (16%) insist on solution of the conflict situation in accordance with local legislation. 5 respondents (4%) found it difficult to answer this question.

#### *Owing money – acquaintance*

Regarding question on lending of money to an acquaintance the results are following: 25 (20%) respondents stated that will lend money without any receipt. 66 respondents (51%) will give money only under receipt, 29 respondents (23%) will not give money anyway and 9 (7%) had difficulties in answering this question.

#### *Owing money – relative*

In case of lending money to relative it was stated by 67 (52%) respondents that they will give it without receipt, while 41 respondents (32%) will give money to relative under receipt. 10 respondents (7%) and for 11 respondents (8%) it was hard to say.

#### *Neighbor*

According to results regarding the actions of respondents in case of neighbor's noisy behavior the following results were shown by EYP non-participants: 34 respondents (27%) would prefer to solve the situation themselves within legal norms, 51 respondents (40%) would call police, 7 (5%) respondents would endure and do nothing, 19 (15%) would endure and then took action within legal norms, 13 (10%) would endure and take any actions needed (including illegal) and for 5 (4%) respondents it was hard to say.

#### *Association*

7 respondents (5%) associate themselves with a country that they were born in, 46 (35%) associate themselves with country that they were born and currently live and 15 respondents (12%) associate themselves with country that they live in. 21 respondents (16%) associate themselves with specific areas where they were born, 21 respondents (16%) associate themselves with specific areas where they were born and currently live in, 7 respondents (5%) respondents associate themselves with specific areas where they currently live. Other option was chosen by 6 respondents (4%) and for 6 respondents (4%) it was hard to say.

#### *Participation in other international youth organizations*

13 non-EYP participants (10%) participated in other international youth movements mainly organized by AIESEC or in United Nations models.