

Trust and its role in the modernization development of the region



**Tat'yana Anatol'evna
GUZHAVINA**

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Leading Research Associate, Federal State-Financed Scientific Institution the Institute of Socio-Economic Development of Territories of the Russian Academy of Sciences (78, Victory Avenue, Cherepovets, 162614, Russian Federation, Labch1@mail.ru)

Abstract. The purpose of this article is to analyze theoretical approaches to the concept of social trust, to assess the level of confidence, to show its role in the modernization and development of the region. According to the author, trust is a set of socially responsible and socially confirmed expectations of individuals in relation to other individuals, organizations, institutions, rules and regulations that constitute the fundamental content of life and support sustainability and cohesion of society. Based on the popular typology of trust proposed by Anthony Giddens, the author analyzes the state of institutional trust in the Vologda Oblast. Using the data of the public opinion monitoring carried out by ISEDT RAS, the article analyzes the Vologda Oblast residents' trust in major political institutions. The author identifies factors that generate trust, studies the composition of the groups of people according to trust, and shows the effects of a low level of institutional trust. They are manifested in the lower level of social activity and in the fact that the people are not ready to unite and interact with each other. Besides, the author points out that civil society is atomized. The article also raises the problem of low efficiency of the structures of civil society, despite the fact that there is a significant amount of NCOs in the region, according to the statistics. Based on the data of ISEDT RAS polls, the article points out an extremely low assessment of performance of NCOs, a low involvement of citizens in their activities and a low level of awareness concerning the existence and activities of these organizations. The author notes that the development of the region, and implementation of effective modernization on its territory require not only assessment of available social resources and, first of all, social capital, the main indicator of which is the trust, but also the development of targeted policy to increase the level of trust in the regional community, to overcome the factors that generate and support a culture of distrust.

Key words: region, trust, institutional trust, distrust culture, modernization.

A factor such as social trust is becoming more important in the life of society in general, in the activities of its political and economic structures and the everyday life of individuals. The unfolding processes of modernization attract attention to this phenomenon [1, 8, 18]. The population's readiness to support modernization initiatives is largely based on the level of trust in the institutions established to solve problems of this type. Trust is present "in all directions of modernization of economy and politics, social and spiritual life of society. Trust or its temporary absence temporarily determines (narrows or expands) the strategies chosen by the subjects of the change" [5].

Social trust is important due to its ability to provide a predictable nature of the world around us. Trust that exists in the society strengthens cognitive stereotypes and attitudes, ensuring and maintaining intergroup understanding, tolerance and cooperation. Trust is especially crucial, as the modernization processes in the regions acquire its specificity due to their differences and features thus determining plural modernization. This thesis is based on the concept of multiple modernities developed by Sh. Eisenstadt and others [20].

Trust reflects interaction processes in politics and economics, in institutions, in different groups (professional, territorial, ethnic, socio-economic, organizational). The various branches of knowledge are interested in trust; it emphasizes the multidimensionality of this phenomenon. Trust is studied in terms of economic, socio-psychological, cultural, political and sociological paradigms.

The researchers consider various aspects of this phenomenon, such as the analysis of causes, characteristics of types, levels, forms of trust, analysis of its functions and identification of features of the culture that causes trust.

Many scientists of the past and the present have been paying attention to this issue. J. Locke, I. Kant, A. Smith, E. Durkheim, M. Weber considered it in the context of the social contract concept; P. Blau and J. Homans – the social exchange theory; E. Giddens, N. Luhmann, R. Putnam, A. Seligman, F. Fukuyama – the transformational change concept. P. Sztompka used the sociocultural analysis to study trust.

According to A. Seligman, "trust is a consequence of the role uncertainty associated with the structural opacity of roles in the situation when systemically certain expectations are no longer viable" [13]. Anthony Giddens defines social trust as a connection of faith and confidence based on knowledge [2]. The field of trust includes political and economic relations, extends to social institutions and organizations and the social order, in general. This can be the government, insurance, banking transactions, democracy principles, scientific or professional knowledge, etc.

P. Sztompka considers trust as a "guarantee" (confidence and actions based on it), indicating that the uncertain future actions of other people or the operation of equipment or institution will be useful for us" [19]. He identifies vertical and horizontal trust, noting that trust in state and its institutions is defined as "public or vertical trust, as opposed

to horizontal that exists between citizens” [19]. The category “vertical trust” means that trust exists between partners at different levels of social hierarchy. It is citizens’ trust in government that controls people’s actions, even against their will, and restrict the range of their actions (legitimacy). Any government has to justify citizens’ trust. So, there is a set term of office to evaluate the authorities’ performance and an electoral system for people to solve their “further fate”.

The study of the nature of trust and the identification of its essence, the factors that influence it, the practices that cause, strengthen or weaken trust, the features of its formation depending on the cultural environment, the opportunities for trust-building is an important direction of modern sociology of trust.

Different conceptual approaches give us an opportunity to single out the most interesting and promising aspects of its analysis. First, various factors have an impact on the level of trust. They can be grouped by the sphere of its application: political, social, legal, psychological, etc. In each specific case there can be different combinations and the dominance of factors over each other. The issue of dominant factors and their underlying conditions remains little studied in sociology, and especially trust in terms of a region. Second, the representatives of various social groups are carriers of trust. Traditionally sociology singles out groups by socio-demographic, political and economic characteristics. However, today the processes of globalization and informatization of the society are unfolding, which create other

reasons for the formation of communities and their identity. The social society and social space structures are changing. The issue how trust is developed and widened remains unstudied. Third, there is a change in the sources of trust. The society evolution leads to the emergence of other sources of trust; the new types to be studied appear. Fourth, it is important to consider the impact of regional characteristics in terms of historical and cultural characteristics, traditions and values more profoundly. In most cases, the state of trust in the regional society is just identified and compared with the all-Russian. This article tries to analyze the factors that can be singled out at the regional level on the basis of available social data.

The complex structure of the society results in different types of trust. Moreover, the typology of trust can be multivariate in nature. Some types of trust are based on internal structural factors, others – on outside factors. Our research takes into consideration the popular typology by A. Giddens. There are two main types of trust: personalized or interpersonal trust and trust in abstract systems [2]. Trust in abstract systems, as a product of “late modernity”, performs an essential function in the society – ensures the sense of reliability in everyday relations. E. Giddens’ ideas lead to the conclusion that the sphere of trust covers political and economic relations, institutions and organizations, that is, the entire social order.

Trust helps to set up formal institutions and organizations, start households and families, as well as constitute a network of

friends and acquaintances. In addition, despite the technological progress and significant increase in knowledge about the world, the modern society still remains a “risk society”. In this case, trust is a constructive response to risks, means of overcoming uncertainty. N. Luhmann believes that trust becomes a necessary condition for social development due to people’s growing diffidence caused by the increased complexity and opacity of modern society [21].

As a combination of socially sound and socially confirmed expectations of individuals in relation to other individuals, organizations, institutions, norms and rules that constitute the essence of life, trust supports sustainability and integration of the society. It acts as a basis for horizontal and vertical social relations.

In the conditions of Russian reality, characterized by a considerable diversity of social and cultural factors developed in different regions of the country it is interesting to study how the phenomenon of trust is extended in the specific regional social space. We consider a Russian region as a unity of social, economic, political, cultural and territorial principles. At the state level due to this integrity it is a subject of socio-economic relations that performs certain functions in the domestic division of labor and forms (as a socio-political entity) certain political relations with the Center and other regions. Moreover, these relations are not reduced to the dichotomy “dominance – submission”. The region can be viewed as a dynamic self-organizing, self-replicating system (autopoiesis) [10].

The state of social trust of a territorial community, such as the Vologda Oblast

residents, and the underlying factors are studied in the public opinion monitoring carried out by ISEDT RAS¹. We should mention that the Vologda Oblast is a rather developed region economically, and it has strong industrial potential. The population numbers about one million one hundred ninety thousand people, or almost 1% of the entire population of Russia. Despite all the difficulties created by the economic crisis the Vologda Oblast ranks higher by many indicators in comparison with other regions of the country. In terms of GRP per capita in 2013 the region ranked 38th in Russia [12].

Being industrially developed, the region makes a significant contribution to the socio-economic life of the country. The Vologda Oblast can be considered as a miniature model of Russia, even reproducing the configuration of geographical boundaries.

The territorial community gives its region predominantly positive assessment: two-thirds of the Vologda residents (75%) are “happy” and “satisfied in general that they live in their region”. Defining their attitude to the region, the residents mentioned its “beautiful

¹ The article uses data for the 2000–2013 period. The survey was conducted by ISEDT RAS (Vologda) by a representative sample. The sample is purposeful and quoted. Representativeness of the sample is ensured by the observance of the proportions between the urban and rural population, the proportions between the inhabitants of settlements of various types (rural communities, small and medium-sized cities), age and sex structure of the oblast’s adult population. The polls are in Vologda, Cherepovets, Babayevsky District, Velikoustyugsky District, Vozhegodsky District, Gryazovetsky District, Kirillovsky District, Nikolsky District, Tarnogsky District and Sheksninsky District. The volume of a sample population is 1500 people aged over 18. The method of the survey is a questionnaire poll by place of residence of respondents. Sampling error does not exceed 3%.

nature” (about 60%), kindness and warmth of people (about 30%), considered the region as “perspective for life” (about 20%). The residents of Cherepovets, a major industrial center where the metallurgical giant Severstal is located, singled out characteristics such as “the region’s perspective for life” (48%), “many opportunities for enterprising people” (38%) [16].

Against this background there forms trust in the main political institutions, both at the federal and regional level. In such circumstances it is important to analyze institutional trust on the example of trust in the state, as it generates and maintains the standards and rules that organize the life of society. Institutional trust manifests itself most vividly through trust in the Government and the President. At the regional level institutional trust is revealed in trust in

regional authorities, government departments and non-governmental organizations.

The analysis of the public opinion polls results in the division of political institutions into groups. The first group includes the institutions with a relatively high level of trust (the President and the RF Government). At the level of regional structures it is the Governor and the regional government. The second group with an average level includes representative authorities – the State Duma and the Federation Council. At the local level this can include bodies of local self-government (LSG). The third group where the estimates are quite low includes public organizations, trade unions and parties (*tab. 1*).

The first group is the most influential. There are several reasons. The institutions represent the executive power in the state and in the region. It is that very power with which

Table 1. Distribution of answers to the question “Please, indicate your attitude to the government bodies and social structures” (the response options are “I trust completely” and “I trust basically”; in % of the total number of respondents)

Answer	Survey year					
	2000–2006 (average)	2007	2008	2009	2010	2013
President	51.1	60.3	65.2	51.6	56.7	44.6
Government	38.9	41.9	60.2	46.7	52.3	38.6
Federation Council	29.1	34.9	47.6	35.9	38.3	32.7
State Duma	24.5	29.5	42.0	33.5	34.8	31.1
Oblast authorities	30.8	40.6	48.6	34.9	41.1	36.4
Local self-government	26.6	32.3	40.9	33.1	34.3	31.6
Trade unions	26.5	28.6	35.9	28.1	30.2	25.3
Public organizations	20.0	24.4	32.6	23.8	27.7	24.1
Political parties	14.7	17.6	26.8	20.0	23.7	18.1

Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISEDT RAS in 2010–2013.

we associate the state, we ask for help and support and with which we can be unsatisfied. It is the structures that have real power and material resources.

Despite the apparent downward trend in the level of people's trust in the higher authorities, nevertheless occupies a leading position among other institutions and social structures. Almost all major groups of the population associate their interests with the state to a certain extent. It is this institution that consolidates the social space of the region, giving a sense of involvement in the social space of the country.

However, this is not the only factor that supports a high level of trust in the state and the people it represents. The second aspect, in our opinion, is rooted in the political history of Russia. The method to transfer power is the following: the ruler obtains power "by fact" If earlier it was an inheritance mechanism, in the modern history it is elections. But even now politician receives power at first and then the elections are launched. There is no practice of power rotation, providing its transition to opposition political force. There have been no cases of such power delegation in the modern history of the country. This means that there is no ruler participating in the election who has not been in office before, as well as there is no opposition in the European sense of the word. There is the same practice at the regional level.

What is more, cultural memory stores the traces of events such as the Time of Troubles and the Civil War, supplemented by remembrance of "the raucous 1990s". In fact, trust is endogenous in nature, i.e. based on domestic factors. The modern history has experienced

economic crises. In the public consciousness these periods are associated with anarchy or serious difficulties in the government performance.

In the end any authorities are viewed as a lesser evil than its absence. However, nowadays the idea to elect the highest Russian officials has begun to develop in the society as the current generation grew up in totally different social and political conditions. The events on Bolotnaya square and Sakharov prospect demonstrated that this requires, first of all, "fair elections". As for the electivity mechanism, the Russians trust it.

We share L. Gudkov's point of view about institutional trust: trust in the institutions of an authoritarian character is higher and trust in the institutions of a democratic character is lower. Thus, according to the survey conducted by Levada-Center, in October 2012 fifty-two percent of the Russian population expressed their trust in the President, 50% – in the Government, 22% – in the Federation Council, 21% – in the State Duma, 23% – in local authorities, 16% – trade unions and 10% – in political parties [4]. The same trend is observed in the Vologda Oblast. The low level of trust of the region's residents is not a phenomenon or local specificity. The institutional matrices concept by S.G. Kirdina considers this aspect [6]. According to this concept, Russia is characterized by the predominance of the X-matrix, which tends to the unitary organization of power structures and formation of the vertical of power. In the Russian conditions these institutions are more efficient, as they are more common and take into account historical and cultural features of the country.

The economic and social factors along with political and historical are sources of trust. First and foremost it is economic prosperity.

Economically prosperous social groups of the population trust the institutions that provide them with this economic status. According to the public opinion monitoring carried out by ISED T RAS, 60% of the respondents with high and average income level have trust in the highest authorities (tab. 2). According to the research results, this level has been maintained since 2000. The level of

trust in the Government in this group is also above average and amounts to approximately 50% for this period. The level of trust in other structures is higher than in other groups. As a whole it is higher than the average level for the region as a whole.

In our opinion, trust of this population group is mostly rational and based on the understanding of the effectiveness of the state policy. However, according to the monitoring data, the share of those who belong to this group is about 40% of the respondents. It consists of wealthy people, confident

Table 2. Distribution of answers to the question "Please, indicate your attitude to the government bodies and public structures" (the response options are "I trust completely" and "I trust basically" – among the respondents with high and average income level)

Answer	Social identity: high and average income level						
	2000	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	April 2014
<i>RF President</i>							
I trust	62.1	64.2	69.0	57.2	62.3	60.6	62.7
I do not trust	8.0	10.1	3.6	8.4	11.4	12.8	10.7
<i>FR Government</i>							
I trust	48.5	43.1	50.3	52.0	59.0	53.8	54.0
I do not trust	16.3	24.3	15.3	11.8	12.4	17.2	17.3
<i>State Duma</i>							
I trust	27.4	32.4	36.8	39.6	43.0	43.7	40.3
I do not trust	30.9	30.9	23.9	18.5	21.4	21.6	25.2
<i>Oblast authorities</i>							
I trust	33.7	39.2	46.9	42.3	48.8	49.1	41.0
I do not trust	22.7	25.3	17.5	18.2	18.7	17.9	27.5
<i>Local self-government</i>							
I trust			40.8	42.2	45.5	42.9	38.5
I do not trust			21.6	20.0	21.0	21.9	29.9
Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISED T RAS in 2010–2014.							

in the future: the business environment, professionals and employees. This is the potential to rely on when implementing modernization in the region. We should pay attention to entrepreneurs, a social group that provides economic growth and can contribute to the creation of a representative layer of socially responsible citizens. Today, according to the government estimates, small and medium business amounts to about one-third of total employment in the economy [3]. Investment and support for small business will develop. For this group trust has a multi-factor value. It provides interaction within business networks; it is required in cooperation with various state agencies. Thus, this group requires the most careful study. There will be research in this direction in the future.

The low level of institutional trust as a whole has noticeable consequences, with the low level of the population’s social activity being one of them (*tab. 3*).

Fifty percent of the Vologda residents consider their participation in public and political life as passive and rather passive. Such decrease is caused by the fact that people do not share the goals the state and social structures are pursuing. There are no target programs at the state or regional

level, which can unite people. Moreover, the population does not participate in social activities, as this type of activity has lost its relevance at the society level. Such activity is not encouraged any more; it is discussed neither in society, nor in the media. If the Soviet period considered public activities as a feature of a citizen and had sustainable institutional forms for its implementation beginning with little stars and ending with the party or the state leadership, nowadays civil activity remains unclaimed.

The public organizations either solve concrete problems of the organization or exist formally. Both the low level of citizens’ activity and the low efficiency of public organizations indicate the alienation of these subjects from the state, authorities and public life. The formation of civic society in this country and in the Vologda Oblast, in particular, is a long and complicated process.

Citizens’ activity in other areas decreases as well. The study conducted by ISEDT RAS in 2008–2010 in the framework of the project “Socio-cultural portrait of the region” [9, 14] revealed the changes in the way the region’s residents spend their free time. People visit public places and cultural establishments less frequently; there is an obvious decline in demand for cultural services. And this trend

Table 3. Distribution of answers to the question: “How would you assess the degree of your participation in public and political life?” (in % of the number of respondents)

Answer	2011	February 2013
Active and rather active	27.1	23.0
Passive and rather passive	48.3	49.8
Difficult to answer	24.6	27.2

Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISEDT RAS in 2010–2013

Table 4. Distribution of answers to the question: "Do you feel responsible for the state of affairs?"* (in % of the number of respondents)

Indicator	2011	2013	2014	Dynamics (+ / -) 2014	
				to 2013	to 2011
<i>In your family</i>					
Yes	77.9	80.4	82.0	+2	+4
No	13.3	10.5	10.5	0	-3
Index	164.6	169.9	171.5	+2	+7
Difficult to answer	8.8	9.1	7.5	-2	-1
<i>At your work</i>					
Yes	52.7	49.1	48.3	-1	-4
No	27.8	29.5	31.8	+2	+4
Index	124.9	119.6	116.5	-3	-8
Difficult to answer	19.5	21.4	19.9	-2	0
<i>In your house, in the neighborhood, where you live</i>					
Yes	38.0	37.2	38.2	+1	0
No	40.7	38.1	43.4	+5	+3
Index	97.3	99.1	94.8	-4	-2
Difficult to answer	21.3	24.7	18.4	-6	-3
<i>In your city, district</i>					
Yes	15.6	10.9	14.8	+4	-1
No	57.1	57.6	60.5	+3	+3
Index	58.5	53.3	54.3	+1	-4
Difficult to answer	27.3	31.5	24.7	-7	-3
<i>In the Vologda Oblast</i>					
Yes	9.2	5.8	8.2	+2	-1
No	63.5	61.4	66.0	+5	+3
Index	45.7	44.4	42.2	-2	-4
Difficult to answer	27.3	32.8	25.8	-7	-2
<i>In the country in general</i>					
Yes	9,8	4,9	7,8	+3	-2
No	62,9	60,9	66,2	+5	+3
Index	46,9	44,0	41,6	-2	-5
Difficult to answer	27,3	34,1	26,0	-8	-1
* The question is asked once a year. Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISEDT RAS in 2010–2014.					

is universal and does not depend on the type of settlement. The region's residents prefer passive forms of leisure, such as watching TV, using the Internet [16].

The innovative activity of the population reduces as well. According to the supervisor of the project "Socio-cultural portrait of the region" Doctor of Economics A.A. Shabunova, "over the last 5 years 14% of the Vologda Oblast residents have taken part in the creation or introduction of something new, of which 4% have been organizers, and 10% have participated on the equal basis with the others. The question has remained unclear for one in five Vologda residents. However, it should be noted that 14% is a kind of a standard for active participation in innovation. So, the innovation activity of the population in the region is close to the standard; at the same time, the low index of innovativeness suggests that the population does not use their potential fully [17].

The negative consequences of the low level of institutional trust are the following: reduced responsibility of the citizens for what is happening in the country, region, city, etc. – the wider the scale of social space is, the lower the self-esteem of the citizens and the higher the level of alienation from what is happening around them are. People take into account the interests of their family, friends and work.

The state of alienation that accompanies the low level of institutional trust, leads to the fact that the Vologda residents demonstrate a higher level of unwillingness to participate in the public life of the country and a lack of faith in their own strength. The data presented in *table 4* fully correlate with the data in *table 5*,

which indicate that the Vologda citizens do not believe in the opportunity to influence the state of affairs around them.

Moreover, this indicator will decrease in the future.

These data allow us, on the one hand, to get additional information regarding the level of trust in public institutions, and, on the other, to identify the state of affairs in the community where interpersonal communication is manifested. In this regard, it is interesting to evaluate interpersonal trust, which is a basis for institutional trust (*table 6*). Trust is formed due to interpersonal interaction and cooperation, exists in formal and informal institutions. That is why it becomes a basis for creating social networks, contributes to the strengthening of trust in existing institutions. Personalized trust appears as a source of "feeling of honesty and authenticity of a person" [2].

In other words, according to Giddens the trust mechanism minimizes the threat of "the loss of personal meaning".

It is necessary to distinguish the assessment of people's activity and willingness to participate in the activities of any communities (*tab. 7*). Therefore, the increase in the level of willingness of people to interact, unite with others can be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, it is the potential that helps to improve the effectiveness of civic society structures. It requires the work of NGOs and local authorities, considered as a boundary structure between the civic society and the state. Local government reflects the level of the society–state integration, the boundaries of citizens' participation in the discussion of the issues important for the state.

Table 5. What do you think, you can personally influence the state of affairs today?* (in % of the number of respondents)

Answer	2011	2013	2014	Dynamics (+ / -) 2014.	
				to 2013	to 2011
<i>In your family</i>					
Yes	77.1	76.9	77.5	+1	0
No	12.7	12.8	13.2	0	+1
Difficult to answer	10.1	10.3	9.3	-1	-1
<i>At your work</i>					
Yes	50.7	42.9	40.9	-2	-10
No	29.6	36.1	38.3	+2	+9
Difficult to answer	19.7	21.1	20.9	0	+1
<i>In your house, in the neighborhood, where you live</i>					
Yes	35.6	34.5	33.5	-1	-2
No	42.7	41.1	47.1	+6	+4
Difficult to answer	21.7	24.5	19.4	-5	-2
<i>In your city, district</i>					
Yes	12.3	7.1	9.4	+2	-3
No	62.1	65.7	68.6	+3	+6
Difficult to answer	25.7	27.2	22.0	-5	-4
<i>In the Vologda Oblast</i>					
Yes	7.7	3.0	4.1	+1	-4
No	66.6	69.1	73.3	+4	+7
Difficult to answer	25.7	27.9	22.5	-5	-3
<i>In the country in general</i>					
Yes	6.6	2.5	3.7	+1	-3
No	67.4	69.5	73.5	+4	+6
Difficult to answer	26.0	27.9	22.8	-5	-3
* The question is asked once a year. Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISEDT RAS in 2010–2014.					

Table 6. Distribution of answers to the question: “Who can you trust?”*
(in % of the number of respondents)

Answer	Date	Vologda	Cherepovets	Districts	Oblast
Nowadays you can trust nobody	Apr. 2014	26.8	24.6	30.3	27.9
	Feb. 2013	25.1	21.6	32.5	27.9
	Dec. 2011	27.9	23.3	24.0	24.7
	Aug. 2010	18.7	22.6	31.3	26.1
Only close friends and relatives	Apr. 2014	57.9	55.2	50.0	53.4
	Feb. 2013	51.5	61.5	48.3	52.5
	Dec. 2011	57.5	54.1	57.3	56.5
	Aug. 2010	67.8	63.4	51.1	58.1
I can trust most people I know	Apr. 2014	11.2	15.2	11.1	12.2
	Feb. 2013	19.6	14.8	13.3	15.2
	Dec. 2011	11.8	20.7	15.7	16.1
	Aug. 2010	10.9	12.5	13.8	12.8
It is necessary to trust all people without exception	Apr. 2014	2.1	0.8	5.0	3.1
	Feb. 2013	1.9	0.5	2.0	1.6
	Dec. 2011	2.3	1.8	2.9	2.5
	Aug. 2010	0.9	1.0	3.5	2.3

* The question has been asked since 2010.

Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISEDT RAS in 2010–2014.

Table 7. Are you ready to cooperate with other people for any joint action to protect common interests? (in % of the number of respondents)

Answer	2011	2013	2014	Dynamics (+ / -) 2014	
				to 2013	to 2011
Ready and rather ready	47.1	43.0	54.6	+12	+8
Not ready and rater not ready	25.2	19.9	15.1	-5	-10
Index of readiness to cooperate	121.9	123.1	139.5	+16	+18
Difficult to answer	27.7	37.1	30.3	-7	+3

Source: data of the monitoring of the economic situation and social well-being of the population in the Vologda Oblast carried out by ISEDT RAS, 2010–2014.

On the other hand, the increased index of readiness to cooperate can indicate a higher degree of dissatisfaction with the activities of local governments and state bodies. This is potential for cooperation aimed at expressing people's own interests.

It is very important to identify which social groups can support the processes of modernization and become their subjects. The study of institutional trust in the region can help identify these groups. We have noted above that the middle class can be considered as support. The support group includes the residents of Vologda and Cherepovets, two largest cities in the region, its administrative, cultural and industrial centers. They give their assessments most actively. This suggests that they are aware of the performance of state bodies and public organizations, have cooperated with them or monitored their activities. About 70% of the citizens express their attitude to the institutions. But almost 30% of the respondents find it difficult to answer, or trust no one, or refuse to answer this question. As for rural areas, the share of those expressing trust/distrust to different structures is less than half (about 45%). A large part of the population abstains from evaluation.

This fact can testify not only languor of the villagers, but also a lack of necessary information. It is possible that the residents of small towns and rural settlements do not expect positive changes due to the authorities' performance. The low estimates and assessment activity in rural areas requires a deeper analysis of the current situation and can indicate reduced social capital in communities of this type and a lack of

conditions to realize their potential due to the loss or limitation of physical, social and cultural resources [7]. Trust contributes to the accumulation of various assets in society, such as social, political, economic and cultural. They ensure the society reproduction in a particular area.

Let us consider those assets, which are formed in the political sphere, as an example. The institutions of an authoritarian nature are supported. They are the state, the military, the Church.

The activities of the civic society structures are weak; however, the statistics reveals a significant number of NGOs in the region. Thus, according to the Civic Chamber of the Vologda Oblast, 1892 NGOs function there. Among them there are public associations (507), trade unions (332), religious organizations (140), regional branches of political parties (38), public associations (17), social movements (14) and public funds (9) [10]. Although the nonprofit organizations are numerous, the level of trust on the part of the population is low (*tab. 8*).

In our opinion, there are several reasons. First of all, NGOs express interests of a narrow circle of people. Organizations for veterans, people with disabilities, stamp collectors, animal lovers, etc. work mainly with those who belong to their group by the main indicator (veteran, disabled, amateur). Their activity is characterized by the focus on concrete interests of the group and unwillingness to unite with other structures to solve common tasks. Most organizations do not direct their effort to meet the needs of the general public. Hence, we get extremely low assessments of NGOs, observe citizens'

Table 8. Vologda citizens' notion of the activities of public organizations
(in % of the number of respondents)

Do you know about the activities of non-governmental organizations (regional offices of political parties, trade unions, religious, human rights, charitable organizations, societies, etc.) in the Vologda Oblast?				
I have interacted with them, I definitely know	11.2	9.9	3.3	7.1
I have heard something	34.0	35.4	37.1	35.9
I do not know anything	35.3	42.3	31.9	35.5
Difficult to answer	19.5	12.4	27.6	21.5
Do you take part in their activities? Are you a member of any of them?				
I am a member of the organization	4.7	7.1	3.8	4.9
I participate as a volunteer	5.5	10.1	4.9	6.4
I do not participate and I am not a member	88.6	79.0	90.6	87.0
What do you think, to what extent non-governmental organizations affect life in the region?				
They have a great impact	5,2	5,6	5,3	5,3
They have a little impact	22,6	23,0	20,0	21,5
They have no effect	25,7	37,0	17,2	24,6
Difficult to answer	46,5	34,4	57,5	48,6
Source: ISEDT RAS monitoring data (news release, no. 12 (1068), 2014).				

low participation in their work, low awareness of the existence and activities of these organizations.

It reduces both the potential of civic society and the level of social capital of the region.

Summing it up, we should note that to develop the region and launch the effective modernization processes it is necessary to assess current social resources and social capital, with trust being their main indicator. Trust can not be considered as static. It is very dynamic in nature, diverse in forms and social functions. The carriers of trust are different actors. To build modernization policy it is important to understand what social groups are carriers of the modernization potential, how they are ready to use it.

It is important to understand the reverse side of the process: the level of trust of government structures in its citizens. This would give an opportunity to assess the level and nature of the existing reciprocity. The study of government's trust in the population would place the partners on equal footing.

In this context it is necessary to develop and implement the program focused on the revival of social trust, containing measures that can improve civic engagement. Such a program should be based on the social policy of regional authorities. This document should highlight the following areas of their activity: providing citizens with the environment to create a decent life and realize creative potential; ensuring access to quality education; minimizing social

risks and protecting certain social groups; guaranteeing social partnership and balance of economic freedom and public interests; forming the middle class and reducing the levels of social polarization; developing local self-government, the main indicator of real democracy.

The elaboration of such a program requires not only the analysis of the situation,

but also the search of the ways to influence the actors: on the one hand, to improve competence and promote innovation activity and, on the other hand, to reduce the level of aggressiveness. The program should result in the assessment of the achieved level of trust, the maturity of the civic society and the achievement of the modernization objectives.

Cited works

1. Belyaeva L.A. Regional Social Capital and Multiple Modernization in Russia. On Defining the Problem. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 108-115.
2. Giddens A. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Moscow: Izdatel'skaya i konsaltingovaya gruppa "Praksis", 2011. Pp. 211-218.
3. *State Support of Small and Medium Enterprises*. Available at: <http://vologda-oblast.ru>
4. Gudkov L. Social Capital and Ideological Orientation. *Pro et Contra*, 2012, May–June, pp. 6-31.
5. Dregalo A.A., Ul'yanovskii V.I. *Sociology of Regional Transformations: in 2 Volumes. Volume 2. Regional Society in 1999–2008: from Disappointment to Hope: Monograph*. Arkhangel'skii Severnyi (Arkticheskii) federal'nyi universitet, 2010. 407 p. P. 63.
6. Kirdina S.G. *Institutional Matrices and the Development of Russia: 2nd Edition, Revised and Supplemented*. Novosibirsk: IE i OPP SO RAN, 2001. 307 p.
7. Kozhina T.P. People's Confidence in Governmental and Public Institutions: Regional Aspect. *Problems of Development of Territories*, 2013, no.3(65), pp. 100-115.
8. Lapin N.I. On the Strategy of Integrated Modernization. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 26-35.
9. Shabunova A.A., Gulina K.A., Lastochkina M.A., Solov'eva T.S. *Modernization of the Region's Economy: Socio-Cultural Aspects: Monograph*. Vologda: ISERT RAN, 2012. 158 p.
10. *Official Website of the Public Chamber of the Vologda Oblast*. Available at: <http://www.op35.ru/>
11. Ryazantsev I.P., Zavalishin A.Yu. *Territorial Behavior of the Russians*. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt "Gaudeamus", 2006. P. 30.
12. *Ranking of the Subjects of the Russian Federation according to their Socio-Economic Condition. The Results of 2012*. Moscow, 2013. Available at: <http://www.riarating.ru/>
13. Seligman A. *The Problem of Trust*. Translated from English by I. Myurberg, L. Soboleva. Moscow: Ideya-Press, 2008. 200 p. P. 21.
14. Socio-Cultural Portrait of the Region: a Model Program and Methodology. Ed. by N.I. Lapin, L.A. Belyaeva. In: *Proceedings of the Conference "Socio-Cultural Map of Russia and the Prospects of Development of Russia's Regions"*, Moscow, June 27 – July 2, 2005. Moscow: IF RAN, 2006.
15. *Reference Book on the Regions for 2013. November 2013. ATON*. Available at: <http://www.rcb.ru/data/analytics/>
16. Shabunova A.A., Gulina K.A., Okulova N.A., Solov'eva T.S. *Socio-Cultural Aspects of Development of the Territory*. Vologda: ISERT RAN, 2009. Pp. 66-76.
17. Shabunova A.A. Socio-Cultural Portrait of the Vologda Oblast. In: *Social Capital as a Resource of Modernization in the Region: Problems of Formation and Assessment. Materials of the Inter-Regional Research-to-Practice Conference, October 16–17, 2012*. In 2 Parts. Part 1. ChGU, 2012. Pp. 44-58.

18. Sztompka P. Modernization as Social Becoming (Ten Theses on Modernization). *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 2013, no.6, pp. 119-126.
19. Sztompka P. *Trust: the Foundation of Society*. Translated from Polish by N.V. Morozova. Moscow: Logos, 2012. 440 p.
20. Eisenstadt Shmuel N. Multiple Modernities. *Daedalus*, 2000, no. 129 (1), pp. 1–30.
21. Luhmann N. Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. *Trust-Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988. Pp. 94-107.

References

1. Belyaeva L.A. Regional'nyi sotsial'nyi kapital i mnozhestvennaya modernizatsiya v Rossii. K postanovke problemy [Regional Social Capital and Multiple Modernization in Russia. On Defining the Problem]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz* [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast], 2014, no. 1, pp. 108-115.
2. Giddens A. *Posledstviya sovremennosti* [The Consequences of Modernity]. Moscow: Izdatel'skaya i konsaltingovaya gruppa "Praksis", 2011. Pp. 211-218.
3. *Gosudarstvennaya podderzhka malogo i srednego predprinimatel'stva* [State Support of Small and Medium Enterprises]. Available at: <http://vologda-oblast.ru>
4. Gudkov L. Sotsial'nyi kapital i ideologicheskie orientatsii [Social Capital and Ideological Orientation]. *Pro et Contra*, 2012, May–June, pp. 6-31.
5. Dregalo A.A., Ul'yanovskii V.I. *Sotsiologiya regional'nykh transformatsii: v 2-kh t. T. 2. Regional'nyi sotsium 1999–2008: ot razocharovaniya k nadezhde: monografiya* [Sociology of Regional Transformations: in 2 Volumes. Volume 2. Regional Society in 1999–2008: from Disappointment to Hope: Monograph]. Arkhangel'skii Severnyi (Arkticheskii) federal'nyi universitet, 2010. 407 p. P. 63.
6. Kirdina S.G. *Institutsional'nye matritsy i razvitie Rossii: 2-e izd., ispr. i dopoln.* [Institutional Matrices and the Development of Russia: 2nd Edition, Revised and Supplemented]. Novosibirsk: IE i OPP SO RAN, 2001. 307 p.
7. Kozhina T.P. Institutsional'noe doverie: regional'nyi aspekt [People's Confidence in Governmental and Public Institutions: Regional Aspect]. *Problemy razvitiya territorii* [Problems of Development of Territories], 2013, no.3(65), pp. 100-115.
8. Lapin N.I. O strategii integrirovannoi modernizatsii [On the Strategy of Integrated Modernization]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz* [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast], 2014, no. 1, pp. 26-35.
9. Shabunova A.A., Gulin K.A., Lastochkina M.A., Solov'eva T.S. *Modernizatsiya ekonomiki regiona: sotsiokul'turnye aspekty: monografiya* [Modernization of the Region's Economy: Socio-Cultural Aspects: Monograph]. Vologda: ISERT RAN, 2012. 158 p.
10. *Obshchestvennaya palata Vologodskoi oblasti. Ofitsial'nyi sait* [Official Website of the Public Chamber of the Vologda Oblast]. Available at: <http://www.op35.ru/>
11. Ryazantsev I.P., Zavalishin A.Yu. *Territorial'noe povedenie rossiyan* [Territorial Behavior of the Russians]. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt "Gaudeamus", 2006. P. 30.
12. *Reiting sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo polozheniya sub"ektov RF. Itogi 2012g.* [Ranking of the Subjects of the Russian Federation according to their Socio-Economic Condition. The Results of 2012]. Moscow, 2013. Available at: <http://www.riarating.ru/>
13. Seligman A. *Problema doveriya* [The Problem of Trust]. Translated from English by I. Myurberg, L. Soboleva. Moscow: Ideya-Press, 2008. 200 p. P. 21.
14. Sotsiokul'turnyi portret regiona: Tipovaya programma i metodika [Socio-Cultural Portrait of the Region: a Model Program and Methodology]. Ed. by N.I. Lapin, L.A. Belyaeva. In: *Materialy konferentsii "Sotsiokul'turnaya karta Rossii i perspektivy razvitiya rossiiskikh regionov", g. Moskva, 27 iyunya – 2 iyulya 2005 g.* [Proceedings of the Conference "Socio-Cultural Map of Russia and the Prospects of Development of Russia's Regions", Moscow, June 27 – July 2, 2005]. Moscow: IF RAN, 2006.

15. *Spravochnik po regionam Rossii za 2013 g. Noyabr' 2013. ATON* [Reference Book on the Regions for 2013. November 2013. ATON]. Available at: <http://www.rcb.ru/data/analytics/>
16. Shabunova A.A., Gulin K.A., Okulova N.A., Solov'eva T.S. *Sotsiokul'turnye aspekty razvitiya territorii* [Socio-Cultural Aspects of Development of the Territory]. Vologda: ISERT RAN, 2009. Pp. 66-76.
17. Shabunova A.A. Sotsiokul'turnyi portret Vologodskoi oblasti [Socio-Cultural Portrait of the Vologda Oblast]. In: *Sotsial'nyi kapital kak resurs modernizatsii v regione: problemy formirovaniya i izmereniya. Materialy Mezhhregional'noi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii, 16–17 oktyabrya 2012 g.* [Social Capital as a Resource of Modernization in the Region: Problems of Formation and Assessment. Materials of the Inter-Regional Research-to-Practice Conference, October 16–17, 2012.]. In 2 Parts. Part 1. ChGU, 2012. Pp. 44-58.
18. Sztompka P. Modernizatsiya kak sotsial'noe stanovlenie (10 tezisov po modernizatsii) [Modernization as Social Becoming (Ten Theses on Modernization)]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz* [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast], 2013, no.6, pp. 119-126.
19. Sztompka P. *Doverie – osnova obshchestva* [Trust: the Foundation of Society]. Translated from Polish by N.V. Morozova. Moscow: Logos, 2012. 440 p.
20. Eisenstadt Shmuel N. Multiple Modernities. *Daedalus*, 2000, no. 129 (1), pp. 1–30.
21. Luhmann N. Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. *Trust-Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988. Pp. 94-107.