Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 5 (2010 3) 754-763
~ ~ ~

УДК 316.4, 316.654

Dynamics of Social Trust in Social Institutions in the Characterization of Social and Cultural Portrait of the Krasnoyarsk Territory

Anna V. Nemirovskaya*
Siberian Federal University
79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia [1]

Received 6.10.2010, received in revised form 13.10.2010, accepted 20.10.2010

This paper analyzes the results of comparative sociological studies having been conducted in the Krasnoyarsk Territory from 1991 to 2010. In 2010 the study of social trust of the population of the region in various social institutions and communities, presented in the paper, was held in the course of the nationwide project "Socio-cultural portrait of the region" by Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. Submitted data characterizing the specific features, inner structure and dynamics of social trust in the region were analyzed with the help of multivariate statistical techniques (factor and correlation analysis).

Keywords: Socio-cultural Processes, Region, Mass Consciousness, Trust, the Dynamics of Trust in Social Institutions, Factor Analysis, Correlation Analysis.

This study was supported by the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation, grant № 10-03-00001a.

Social trust in different social institutions and communities is an important characteristic of mass consciousness in the region. It is not only a key factor of designing public relations, but also an important component of their sustainability, and therefore undoubtedly an indicator of the moral and psychological well-being of the population and social conditions in general. Lack of trust or its absence marks an ailing situation in the regional social life; it is also a symptom of the desintegration of the region from the state and the social problems and has a negative influence on social behavior and social well-being. Thereat for a comprehensive socio-cultural characteristization of the local situation it is essential to pay attention to social trust, the component of socio-cultural portrait of the regional society. The degree of social trust is the most important characteristic of mass consciousness of the population; this study focuses on a large population of the Siberian region of the Krasnoyarsk region.

N. I. Lapin, the director of the project "Socio-cultural evolution of Russia and its regions" of Center for the Study of socio-cultural change, Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences (hereinafter RAS), notes the growing confrontations in the evolution of modern Russian society. "On the one hand, – he believes, – there exists strengthening power vertical, authority of the center at the expense of

* Corresponding author E-mail address: annanemirov@gmail.com

regions, supposed to improve the controllability of the evolution of society. On the other hand, conservation of social contrasts increases, major distrust in the legislative and executive authorities, including law enforcement structures, as well as political parties and trade unions, maintains. The background is the deviating drift of moral values in the motivational space. These trends undermine the effective management and support the threat of public safety" [1].

As Yu. A. Levada pointed, the category of "trust" means the most common, and therefore the most uncertain positive relation of man to the social phenomena of various kinds [2]. In general, the phenomenon of trust is considered at several sociological levels: basic, personal, social and cultural [3]. In addition, the subject (the individual, the social group, the organization, the social institutions) determines a type of trust investigated. Thus, sociology singles out trust in social institutions (institutional or depersonalized trust), generalized trust (social or general trust), and interpersonal trust. In this study generalized trust will be discussed on the base of responses to a question: "Could you tell, please what is the measure of your trust in…?" Alekseeva does not associate generalized trust with a particular situation of interaction and a specific contracting party, it is rather an attitude expressing the willingness of an individual to regard others as credible people [4]. Generalized trust is the indicator of cultural trust in society, and it can be considered as the indicator of *"social health"*.

Here we should note a number of important studies on issues of trust and socio-political climate in society. So, S. Rose-Ackerman emphasizes the absence of a clear relationship between confidence in the people within a given organization and generalized trust in other people, as well as between generalized trust and confidence in social institutions. Despite the fact that data from the World survey of the values (the World Values Survey) held in 1990 and 1996/1997 confirm the relationship of the generalized trust with the stable democratic regime and apparent mutual reinforcement of these two phenomena it can be argued that an increase in generalized trust will promote democracy [5]. Thus, the study of the New Democracies Barometer in post-socialist countries in general and Russia in particular shows that the level of generalized trust is high: in 2000 66 % of Russians admitted that the majority deserved credit, in 1998 the number of such respondents was 34 %. However, this type of trust is not necessarily converted into the government's credibility. In 2000 Russians demonstrated a very low level of confidence in virtually all social institutions, except the army and the president. Moreover, in some countries the level of interpersonal trust is high, while confidence in social institutions is extremely low, whereas in other countries, by contrast, the population trusts at least in some social institutions and experiences a low interpersonal trust [6]. A. Oleinik's opinion that the combination of high-interpersonal and low institutional trust can be viewed as "itermediate option" and the worst option is a low level of both types of trust, implying a threat to the integrity of society is indisputable [7]. The most optimal state of social systems is characterised by high levels of institutional and interpersonal trust.

According to the all-country monitoring of values and interests, conducted by Center for the Study of socio-cultural change, Institute of Philosophy, RAS, from 1990 to 2006, the maximum trust was experienced by the personified institutions of power – the President of the Republic, the Governor of the Territory, while the maximum distrust was felt by political parties and their regional offices. Similar distrust was felt by the police and the parliament [8]. The same results were got after all-Russia research

held by S. V. Tumanov, a renowned expert on the analysis of mass consciousness; he supposes that the credibility of most social institutions in Russia has been devalued [9].

Resembling results were obtained in the process of sociological studies having been conducted in the Krasnoyarsk region since 1991. The results of these studies suggest the fall of social trust in the region in the most of the social institutions and structures [10].

Since trust is a complex, multilayered phenomenon in mass consciousness of the population, its study is supposed to concentrate on two levels of mass consciousness: a) level of social stereotypes that are very mobile and have little effect on social behavior, i.e. surface level; b) level of much more stable, but little conscious representations that are directly related to actual behavior, i.e. deep level [11]. Traditional polls, whose results are widely published in the media, reflect only the upper, unstable layer of mass consciousness at any given time. Much more in-depth information is obtained by studying the "lower" layers of mass consciousness with the help of various kinds of psychological tests or statistical data analysis techniques, in particular, correlation and factor analysis. Thus, considering the phenomenon of trust in mass consciousness in the unity of consciousness itself and mass unconscious, its rational and emotional components, structure and dynamics of social trust can be analyzed thoroughly to reveal "complexes" of trust in mass consciousness of people in the region.

This study presents an analysis of trust of people of the Krasnoyarsk region in various social institutions and communities, conducted by the methods of factor and correlation analysis of dynamics from 1991 to 2010. The study is based on the analyzed data of 1991- 2006 sociological monitoring in the Krasnoyarsk region, conducted by sociologists of Krasnoyarsk State University with the direct participation of the author of the article (a survey of a formalized interview of 1000 respondents, representative sample). In 2010 the study has been supplied with the results of a sociological study conducted in the Krasnoyarsk region in 2010 in the course of the nationwide project "Socio-cultural portrait of the region" held by Institute of Philosophy, RAS (the method of formalized interview with 1000 respondents; stratified, multi-zoned, quota and representative in the terms of gender, age and educational level sampling).

Comparison of the results of the survey of population of the Krasnoyarsk region in June 1991 with the data obtained in June 1992 showed the decline of trust in the majority of structures selected. The drastic fall of trust during this period was suffered by trade unions, political parties in general and by the unifying party "Democratic Russia" and the Communist Party in particular, and, finally, by the Parliament. It should be noted that the trust in "Democratic Russia" fell more significantly than in the Communists. These data reflect the political apathy of the population, the disappointment in the ability of the current power to lead the country out of the crisis. People lost some trust in government and the media, as well as in neighbours. If the attitude towards the government and the media does not need to be commented, the growing distrust in neighbours indicates the weakening of social ties and increasing social and psychological tension and estrangement. This is a very dangerous symptom, the extreme degree of hostility and distrust in society. The church and the clergy, the army and, to some extent, the police almost retained their positions. These are social institutions that continue to enjoy the confidence of the population and could play a stabilizing role in the case of growing political tension and economic dislocation. The degrees of trust were 60 %, 65 % and 45 % respectively. But first and foremost in

1992 people trusted in God (63 %), their family and relatives – 94 %, themselves – 93 %. The minimum degree of trust was born by political parties: 20 % people trusted in "Democratic Russia" and 12 %. – in the Communist Party.

In 1995 respondents expressed the major trust in themselves – 77 % (24 positions were exposed all in all), in family and relatives – 72 %, friends – 33 %, God – 26 %, the army – 14 %, in co-workers – 11 % and in people of the same nationality – 10 %. Trust in social institutions on the verbal level was extremely low. The police got the full confidence of 1 %, Democratic Party – of 1 %, Zhirinovsky's party (Liberal Democratic Party of Russia) – of 2 %, the Communist Party – of 6 %, the Parliament (State Duma, the Federation Council) – of 1 %, the representative of the President in the Krasnoyarsk region – of 3 %, the Governor of the region – of 5 %, the Head of Administration of Krasnoyarsk – of 3 %. However, factor analysis showed that the main thing for most of the respondents was the unconscious desire to trust in the social institutions of power: the President of Russia, the Government, the State Duma, the Federation Council, the Governor of the region, the representative of the President in the Krasnoyarsk region, the Head of the city, the employer, the police and others. This is a manifestation of traditional Russian psychology, when people accuse the authorities behind their backs but are always ready to obey their instructions.

In 2001 respondents expressed absolute trust in the family and relatives – 79 % (27 positions were exposed all in all) and themselves – 75 %. Friends and God were on this interval of scale responses on the third and fourth place (45 and 33 % respectively). Trust in social institutions was still low. This indicates a high degree of desintegration of contemporary Russians from the state and society and their self-identifying with their own social microenvironment only.

The studies of 2004-2006 brought out that the highest level of trust was in respondents themselves -"full confidence" – 87 % *(2004 – 91 %, 2005 – 87 %),* their families – 84 % *(2004 – 87 % 2005 – 82 %)* and friends – 47 % *(2004 -56 % 2006 – 50 %).* Compared with the other institutions, quite high degree of complete trust in the President of Russia was claimed by 28 % *(2004 – 26 %, 2005 – 21 %)*, in co-workers – 19 % *(2004 – 26 %, 2005 – 22 %)*, in the church and the clergy – 18 % *(2004 – 23 % 2005 -10 %)*, in neighbours – 17 % *(2004 – 25 %, 2005 – 23 %.)* Low levels of trust were elicited in: the regional authorities – 11 % *(2004 – 7 %, 2005 – 8 %)*, the Legislative Assembly of Krasnoyarsk Territory – 5 % *(2004 – 10 %, 2005 – 7 %)*, Russian Government – 7 % *(in 2004 – 7 %, 2005 – 7 %)*, the Prosecutor's Office – 6 % *(in 2004 -11 %, 2005 – 5 %)*, the media (radio, newspapers, TV) – 6 % *(2004 – 7 %, 2005 -5 %)*, the State Duma of Russia – 6 % *(2004 – 7 %, 2005 – 4 %)*, the Federation Council of Russia – 4 % *(2004 – 5 % 2005 – 4 %)*, the police – 5 % *(2004 – 5 %, 2005 – 3 %)*, political parties -1 % *(2004 – 1 %, 2005 – 2 %).*

During the period from 2004 to 2006 the degree of social trust in various social institutions and communities across the region remained unchanged as a whole. In 2006 the most serious increase of trust was shown by trust in *the President of Russia* 6 %, *the church and the clergy* +8 % Trust in *the regional Administration* increased to some extent: +3 %. Most noticeable decrease was in the proportion of people giving full credence to such important social institutions and groups, as *neighbours* – 6 %, *friends* – 3 %, *workmates* – 3 %. This testifies the weakening of "horizontal" connections in the society, especially in micro-group relations, and the emergence of "human" disintegration trends in social medium. At the same time, the credibility of the highest secular and spiritual power increased to some extent.

However, more profound and detailed analysis of the data with the help of multivariate statistics gives somewhat different results. In 2004 with the help of the factor analysis the following inner structure of trust in different social institutions and the communities was established.

- The first factor describes trust in social institutions of power: *the President of the Russian Federation, the Administration of the Krasnoyarsk Territory, the Legislative Assembly of Krasnoyarsk Territory, the Head of Administration of the city (district), the church and the clergy.* This is the most powerful factor – its *descriptive* power is 23,4 %.
- The second factor, as well as all subsequent, is substantially behind the first of its importance and expresses high trust in *the State Duma, the Federation Council, political parties*, partly – in *the RF Government*. But people expressing such notions often do not trust themselves. The *descriptive* power – 11,9 %.
- The third factor is characterized by a high degree of trust in "power" structures and law enforcing structures: *the army, the Prosecutor's Office, the police*, and weaker trust – in *the media*. The *descriptive* power – 7,6 %.
- The fourth factor identifies as the main element trust in *friends*, as well as, to some extent – in *the media, fellow countrymen, themselves*. But there is obvious distrust in the church. The *descriptive* power – 5,7 %.
- The fifth factor describes very high trust in *co-workers* and *the employer (boss, master)*. The *descriptive* power – 5,2 %.
- The sixth factor is characterized by high degree of confidence in *the people of the same nationality, friends*, to some extent – in *the church*. The *descriptive* power – 5,0 %.
- The seventh factor unites trust in *the own family, themselves* and distrust – in *the media*. The *descriptive* power – 4,8 %.

It is important that the trend of 2006 marked on the verbal level of mass consciousness had been identified in mass unconscious two years earlier. In 2004 already trust in social institutions (especially government) was often contrasted at the level of mass unconscious with trust in small social groups making up the communication microenvironment.

In 2005 the results of factor analysis were significantly different; only 4 factors were allocated. Deeper internalization of values and norms, implemented by social institutions and communities, strengthening the ties in the community, became evident. The study of 2006 showed that the assimilation of such norms and values contributed to the growing crisis of everyday life, disruption of horizontal connections in society, especially within the social microenvironment.

- The first factor expresses trust in important power institutions and their leaders: the President of Russia, the Government of RF, the RF State Duma, the Federation Council, political parties, the regional administration, the Legislative Assembly of Krasnoyarsk Territory, the Head of Administration of city (district). The *descriptive* power – 25 %.
- The second factor describes the population's trust in power institutions it faces in everyday life, including "power" structures, as well as communities, which constitute its social microenvironment: the Head of the Administration of the city (district), the church and the clergy, the media, the Prosecutor's Office, the

police, the army, fellow countrymen, friends, neighbours and the people of the same nationality. The *descriptive* power – 21 %.

- The third factor describes the confidence in those elements of society, which constitute its professional microenvironment: the employer (boss, master) and co-workers. The *descriptive* power – 10 %.
- The fourth factor is trust in the own family and themselves. The *descriptive* power – 9 %.

Each of the factors identified in the 2005 expresses specific social orientation of the respondents, which is manifested in the adoption of certain norms and values transmitted by certain segments of their social micro- and macroenvironments. Thus, the first factor is focused on the adherence to norms and values of social macroenvironment, which includes, in particular, the state power institutions. The second factor specifies behavior in accordance with the norms and values of the nearest social microenvironment, as well as law enforcement structures. The third factor focuses on the professional environment. The fourth – targets own activity in the combination with the values of family microgroups. It is characteristic that a number of modes of trust identified certain groups of people aimed at each of the four selected factors. In particular, almost all respondents in 2005 trust to an extent on an unconscious level in: *the President of Russia, the RF Government, the media, the army, fellow countrymen, friends, the employer (master, chief), people of the same nationality.* These are social institutions and communities, which in some way strengthened the social space of the region. Similar results were obtained after factor analysis in 2006, when differences were found only in the descriptive power of the different factors.

The study of 2010 showed that the highest level of absolute trust was experienced by people themselves, their families and relatives (see Table 1). Also, a high degree of complete trust was in God, the church and the clergy and the President of Russia. The inhabitants of the Krasnoyarsk Territory rely less on the Government of Russia and the colleagues. In general, the respondents trust (the sum of answers "trust completely" and "trust probably" exceeded the sum of responses "do not trust fully" and "distrust") in *family and relatives* (90 %), *themselves* (87 %), *the President of Russia* (55 %), *colleagues* (55 %), *God* (47 %), *neighbours* (45 %), *court* (43 %), *the Governor* (43 %), *the church and the clergy* (41 %), *the Government of Russia* (40 %), *fellow countrymen* (36 %), *the employer (administration, management)* (32 %) and *the army* (30 %). Characteristically, as for the degree of social trust the President of Russia with the church and the clergy fall into the category of high trust, as well as nearest people of the microenvironment – *family, friends, colleagues, neighbours* and people *themselves*. This is one of the most important features of the mass political consciousness of contemporary Russians.

The highest degree of distrust manifests itself in following social institutions: political parties (and their regional offices), the police, municipal and local governments, the Legislative Assembly, the State Duma of Russia, trade unions, the media and the Prosecutor's Office. In general, residents of the Krasnoyarsk Territory do not trust (the sum of answers "do not trust fully" and "distrust" exceeded the sum of responses "trust completely" and "trust probably") in *the police* (49 %), *the media* (47 %), *political parties (and their regional offices)* (45 %), *municipal and local governments* (41 %), *the Legislative Assembly* (39 %), *the State Duma of Russia* (34 %), *the Prosecutor's Office* (34 %), *the Government of the Territory* (30 %) and *trade unions* (30 %). As seen from the above figures, trust in social

Table 1. Distribution of the responses to the question: "Could you tell, please what is the measure of your trust in…?" (in %) in 2010.

	trust completely	trust probably	hard to say exactly	do not trust fully	distrust	don't know	refuse to answer
1. Court	8	35	26	17	6	4	4
2. Governor	8	35	26	17	6	4	4
3. Trade unions	5	18	29	16	14	12	6
4. Prosecutor's Office	5	21	29	22	12	7	4
5. Police	3	15	25	30	19	5	3
6. Regional administration	3	22	33	20	10	8	4
7. Political parties (their regional offices)	1	8	29	22	23	12	5
8. Legislature Assembly, regional Duma	2	14	30	24	15	10	5
9. Media (print, radio, TV)	2	20	24	33	14	4	3
10. Municipal, local governments	1	18	30	25	16	6	4
11. President of Russia	16	39	18	12	6	5	4
12. Russian Government	11	29	26	15	8	6	5
13. State Duma	5	20	29	20	14	7	5
14. Army	7	23	24	18	17	7	4
15. Church and clergy	16	25	27	7	10	10	5
16. God	32	15	21	3	6	13	10
17. Fellow countrymen	6	30	33	9	4	11	7
18. Employer (administration, management)	4	28	27	16	10	7	8
19. Co-workers	11	44	23	9	2	5	6
20. Neighbours	8	37	29	12	5	5	4
21. Family and relatives	67	23	3	1	1	2	3
22. Myself	71	16	3	1	1	3	5

and socio-political institutions (which estimates the expectant capacity of authorities and other social institutions to meet population's social expectations, that is the intention to realize their core values) is sufficiently low. The population of the Krasnoyarsk Territory, disillusioned with the support of social institutions, lives with the thought that people should rely on themselves, as well as relatives.

Using factor analysis established the following inner structure of trust of residents of the Krasnoyarsk region in various social institutions and communities in 2010. A total amount of 5 factors (groups of respondents on the basis of their views) reflected major complexes of trust in mass consciousness of the inhabitants of the Krasnoyarsk Territory.

- The first factor expresses trust in the power institutions: *the Government of RF, the President of Russia, the RF State Duma, the Governor, the Legislative Assembly, the regional administration of Krasnoyarsk Territory, municipal and local governments*, and *political parties*

too. The *descriptive* power of this the most powerful factor – 20,57 %.

- The second factor, as well as following, concedes to the first in importance. This factor is characterized by a high degree of trust in law enforcement and "power" structures. This group of respondents observes the residents of the Krasnoyarsk Territory tending to trust in *the Prosecutor's Office*, *the court*, *the police*, and to a less extent – *trade union* and *the employer*. The *descriptive* power – 13,74 %.
- The third factor is characterized by trust in *colleagues*, *neighbours*, *fellow countrymen*, and also, somewhat weaker trust in *the media* and *the employer*. The *descriptive* power – 12,18 %.
- The fourth factor contains only two, still noteworthy components: *God* and *the church and the clergy*. The *descriptive* power – 8,67 %.
- The fifth factor also includes only two components with considerable meaning and unites people's credibility to *themselves* and *their families and relatives*. The *descriptive* power – 8,01 %.

Thus, the factor analysis showed that the inner structure of trust of people of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in various social institutions and communities is somewhat different from data obtained by a simple summation of responses. At the level of mass unconscious trust in social institutions (especially government) was often contrasted with trust in the small social groups making up the communication microenvironment. Some people trust in different authorities, while others focus on their own microenvironment, including the professional. The results of the factor analysis brought to a light a group of respondents expressing confidence only in the religious institutions. It also revealed a group of respondents who trust in themselves only and their nearest – families and relatives.

It is essential to point out the phenomenology of trust of the people of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in social institutions and communities: using correlation analysis revealed that the respondents not confident about their future tend to rely on *local and municipal governments, the State Duma of Russia, the Legislative Assembly, the court, the Government of RF*, *political parties, the employer, the President of Russia, the Prosecutor's Office, the police, trade unions, the army,* and to a less extent – *colleagues* and *fellow countrymen*.

It can be concluded that the high level of confidence of the people of the region in social institutions mentioned above is dictated mainly by the influence of psychological defense mechanisms, when people "seek protection" from the uncertainty of life in all sorts of power structures, as well as representatives of social micro-environment whom they contact daily. The degree of trust in a particular social institution or community determines largely the perception or rejection of their norms and values. The high trust of the majority in themselves is an indicator of internal locus of control of these people, their willingness to take responsibility for their lives, rather than relying, as it was before, on the support of the state and society. However, the unconscious distrust of some respondents in themselves is distinguished enough to indicate their social and psychological troubles. The effect of psychological mechanisms associated with the desire of people to have a consistent worldwide is also remarkable. Perceiving the world through the prism of the various media primarily contemporary Krasnoyarsk citizens (as well as other Russians) cannot but trust subconsciously in those who present them this information,

forming their worldview. Otherwise, distrust would mean the common rejection of the world and the destruction of more or less coherent worldview.

References

1. Lapin N. I. Fundamental values, social well-being ant trust in power structures. // Economics modernization and social development, Vol. II. Edited by "Tekst", E. G. Yasin; Higher School of Economics, Moscow, 2007. P. 219.
2. Levada Yu. A. Searching for man: Essays in Sociology, 2000-2005. Moscow, 2006. P. 178
3. Myshlyaeva T. V. Trust in modern societies: approaches to the analysis / / Journal of the Nizhny Novgorod Lobachevsky University. Series: Social Science № 1. 2006. P. 301-307.
4. Alekseeva A. Confidence, generalized trust and interpersonal trust // Social reality № 7. 2008. P. 92.
5. Rose-Ackerman S. Trust, Honesty and Corruption: Reflection on the State Building Process // European Journal of Sociology. 2001. Vol. 42. P. 27-71.
6. Rose R., Haerpfer Ch. New Democracies Barometer V: A 12-Nation Survey (University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Studies in Public Policy 306, centre for the Study of Public Policy). P. 62-63.
7. Oleinik A. N. "Life on the concepts": the institutional analysis of everyday of ordinary Russians" / / Political Studies. 2001. № 2. P. 46.
8. Lapin N. I. Stagnant spheres of regional communities and their institutions of self-cultivation // Regions in Russia: the sociocultural portraits of regions in Russia's context / Institute of Philosophy. Center for the Study of sociocultural changes. Scientific Section Coordinating Council UN Sciences "Problems of sociocultural evolution of Russia and its regions" / Preparation and general wording of Lapin N. I., Belyaeva L. A. – Moscow, Academia, 2009. P. 783-784.
9. Tumanov S. V. Modern Russia: the mass consciousness and mass behavior (Experience of integrative analysis), Moscow, 2000. P. 141.
10. Nemirovskaya A. V. Values in mass consciousness: Structure and Dynamics. Krasnoyarsk, 2005.; Nemirovskaya A. V. The structure of the image of the regional authorities in mass consciousness of the population / / Sociology. – Moscow, 2005. № 2. P. 63-69.; Nemirovskaya A. V. Features of the application of statistical methods for the study of social trust in various social institutions / / Coll. of Abstracts II all-Russian Scientific Conference "Sorokin's readings"; "The Future of Russia: Development Strategy"; Moscow, Moscow State University, Faculty of Sociology, Russian Sociological Association , 2005. http://lib.socio.msu.ru/l/library?e=d-000-00---0sor--00-0-0-0prompt-10---4------0-1l--1-ru-50---20-about---00031-001-1-0windowsZz-1251-10&a=d&c=sor&cl=CL1&d=HASHda9426d24ec8afd05703c8.5.3.10
11. Ibid.

Динамика доверия населения социальным институтам в характеристике социокультурного портрета Красноярского края

А.В. Немировская
Сибирский федеральный университет
Россия 660041, Красноярск, пр. Свободный, 79

Статья посвящена анализу результатов сравнительных социологических исследований, проведённых в Красноярском крае с 1991 по 2010 гг. Изучение доверия населения региона различным социальным институтам и общностям в 2010 г. проводилось в рамках общероссийской программы Института философии РАН «Социокультурная эволюция России и её регионов». Представленные в статье данные, характеризующие специфические особенности, внутреннюю структуру и динамику доверия населения региона, получены с помощью методов многомерной статистики (факторного и корреляционного анализа).

Ключевые слова: социокультурые процессы, регион, массовое сознание, доверие, динамика доверия социальным институтам, факторный анализ, корреляционный анализ.