

Interpersonal Trust as a Factor in the Formation of Social Capital

V. V. Melsitov
Department of History and Philosophy
KubSTU
Krasnodar, Russia

N. L. Sergienko
Department of Sociology, Law and Human Resources
KubSTU
Krasnodar, Russia
sergienko_00@bk.ru

L. B. Temnikova
Department of Foreign Languages №1
KubSTU
Krasnodar, Russia

Abstract — The article analyzes the issue of interpersonal trust, its formation and influence on social capital. Two basic theoretical approaches to trust, forms and types of trust are considered. Particular attention is paid to interpersonal trust, which is considered as one of the main components of social capital. The results of a sociological survey according to which young and middle-aged respondents are sensitive to themselves and their abilities, make estimates and do predictions are given, but their attitude to the world, to other people, to the whole society should be assessed as not fully trustworthy. Once again the older generation is the most prone to show trust. Interpersonal trust, both near and distant social distances, forms the conditions, arguments for building institutional trust, which is interpreted in the same way as social capital or as one of the fundamental base of civil society.

Keywords — Social capital, trust, forms of trust, types of trust, interpersonal trust, social distance

INTRODUCTION

The problem of trust is considered as one of the most urgent problems in modern society. In the last decade, representatives of various humanitarian disciplines are increasingly turning to the problem of trust. This is due to the fact that trust is unanimously understood as an internally necessary condition for the emergence and development of interpersonal and social relations, the effectiveness of the vital activity of any socio-psychological and social system, that is, trust is a kind of indicator of public health [1; 2; 3]. There are two fundamental theoretical approaches which consider trust as an element of faith. At first, the main representatives of which are E. Giddens [4] and F. Fukuyama [5], think that trust is a kind of certainty in certain expected behavior of other people. And this confidence is explained not by rational facts, but by a cognitive mechanism that includes certain feelings and emotions in relation to the object of trust or mistrust. The second approach says that trust is a rational process, based on specifics and pragmatics. This position was followed by N. Luman [6], J. Coulman [7], P. Shtompka [8]. Anyway, with completely different approaches to the study of trust, theorists are united by a common idea, the main essence of which is

that trust is "the way to prosperity". The functions of trust are extremely diverse, since trust is a way of harmonizing a person's relationship with the world and with himself. Socially, trust facilitates people's interaction and makes possible collective action. Socially, trust facilitates people's interaction and makes possible collective action. Still E. Giddens [9] has defined trust as the basic motive force of progress, having characterized its memory mechanism in a society. It is difficult not to agree with this statement, because each of us has faced and continues to face a number of problems on the basis of trust, we constantly ask questions to ourselves: is it worth believing the words of this or that person, is it justified by my trust in political power, is it worth believing in commercials I will not be deceived by my own team, etc.

The concept of trust is used in psychology, sociology, philosophy, history, anthropology and other sciences, and it is difficult to find a universal definition of the concept of trust. There are many forms and types of trust. Within the framework of this work, we considered interpersonal trust. Interpersonal trust is considered as one of the main components of social capital. Trust in interpersonal relations is a way of integrating relations between people, acting as a kind of communication channel, helps to strengthen the links between the factors entering into interactions with each other, i.e. interpersonal trust involves an equivalent exchange between the parties in the presence of a certain time interval or in other words a focused orientation toward the future [10].

A sociological study was conducted using the method of questionnaire, the main purpose of which was to determine the extent of the spread of trust relations in modern society (as the example of Krasnodar). The survey involved 890 people of 3 age grades: from 18 to 25 years old, from 25 to 45 years old and from 45 to 65 years old. Also within the framework of this work, the technique of A.B. Kupreychenko "Trust (distrust) of the individual to the world, to other people, to himself" [11]. The starting point of the analysis was the question "Do you trust people", to which respondents aged 18 to 25 answered as follows: 17% of respondents chose the position "Yes, I trust", 50% believe that people should always be cautious and 33 %

believe that the degree of trust in people depends on certain conditions ". Respondents aged between 25 and 45 are also in most cases convinced that interacting with people requires vigilance and caution. The representatives of the older generation are more optimistic, 60% of respondents are sure that in modern time it is necessary and can be trusted.

The gap in the indicators is explained by the existence of a huge worldview chasm between different generations. Soviet time has passed, and with it the principles of equality, collectivism, friendship and comradeship have departed. Such life values as family, friendship, education, work gave way to material incentives, career and power. Determining the level of trust in interpersonal relationships involves measuring the level of trust in interaction with the family, a close environment, acquaintances, colleagues, partners, etc. We were interested in whether it's easy for respondents to get acquainted with new people, whether they often invite guests to them, and also call by phone and meet with relatives and friends. The most active in this regard are respondents aged 18 to 25 years old. Young people recognize that they easily get acquainted with new people, prefer noisy and cheerful companies, often invite guests to their home, meet their relatives with pleasure.

It is alerting that the younger generation does not refuse to communicate with peers, but does not deny that trust in these relationships is perceived as something unreal. Respondents of this age group are firmly convinced that people should always be cautious, and life in expectation of some kind of dirty trick from the people around you is difficult to call normal. Ultimately, mistrust of people can take a chronic form, which can lead to a change in the character of young people. They can become extremely suspicious, secretive and even deceitful. The feeling of mistrust can cause all sorts of psychological disorders. Respondents of the middle and older generation, for age and other reasons, are more difficult to get acquainted with new people, rarely invite guests, but quite often, as well as respondents aged 18 to 25, meet with family and friends. Relative friendly links play the most important role in people's lives, and these relationships characterize the highest level of trust, rather than the indicator of trust in the relationships of respondents with other people, whether they are acquaintances, colleagues at work, business partners, etc.[12]

A small number of respondents aged 18 to 25 believe that in their work / training team the level of trust can be assessed as high, only 45% of respondents recognize a high level of trust between people in the team, 35% are convinced that the level of trust in the labor (educational) team leaves much to be desired and 20% found it difficult to answer this question. The main reasons for the spread of distrust among colleagues at work or study are a sense of rivalry, envy, an unfavorable psychological climate, improper management of team leadership, etc.

The situation is different with respondents aged 45 to 65 years old, they are convinced that supporting a favorable atmosphere in staff is a pledge of effective work. Among the older generation, 65% of respondents acknowledge the high level of trust between people in staff, 25% are convinced that

the level of trust in the work (educational) team leaves much to be desired and 10 found it difficult to answer. Trust in this case is a kind of base for supporting order, implying a state of peace of mind, understanding and mutual respect. And this is not accidental, because the main function of interpersonal trust is to support and increase cooperation, as it is designed to facilitate the exchange of information, enriching relationships, increasing openness and mutual recognition, as well as resolving intra-group conflicts and minor problems. In the case of trust between the employees of the staff, the issue of detailed control and reporting is not an acute issue, which has important positive value for management, since a certain measure of freedom in the work (educational) team in most cases contributes to the expansion of creativity and motivation to improve the quality of work and the aspiration to innovations.

Further, we were interested in the respondents' opinion as to whether it is worth considering the increase in the level of interpersonal trust as one of the main tasks of social institutions, such as the state, family, school, university etc. The following answers were suggested: yes, I think this is the right course, since trust is the guarantee of a healthy society; no, increasing the level of trust is not the main task of social institutions; difficult to answer. In most cases, respondents are convinced that raising the level of trust is one of the main tasks of social institutions. The most confident in this necessity are representatives of the older generation, the choice of the first option is 70%.

This and the subsequent question, which concerned respondents' assessment of trust (distrust) of institutions of power and market institutions was not given casually, because there is an inextricable link and interdependence between interpersonal and institutional trust. Let's remind that under interpersonal trust is understood as trust to people in general, a high level of interpersonal trust expands the range of formal and informal links of the factor entering into interactions. Institutional trust is a trust in all kinds of organizations (government, media, trade unions, business structures, etc.). Entirely, a high level of interpersonal and institutional trust is one of the fundamental indicators of the stability and stability of the social system. According to P.M. Kozyreva "... the relationship to any institutions is based on the relationship to people who represent them, personify, with whom their activities are primarily associated" [13].

Due to the fact that the level of interpersonal trust is closely related to cognitive or in other words psychological constants, we are also interested in such an interpretation of trust in which it is presented as a person's awareness of its own vulnerability or risk arising from the uncertainty of the motives, intentions and expected actions of people from which it depends on the components of our existence [14]. Thus, we were interested in studying trust not only as a social phenomenon, but also on the part of socio-psychological conditioning. By the method of A.B. Kupreychenko "Trust (distrust) of the personality to the world, to other people, to themselves"[14] respondents aged 18 to 25 years old by the criterion F 1 (trusting themselves in the ability to build relationships with the outside world and other people), respondents scored an equal number of points related to high

and the average gradation. Respondents positively assess their abilities in dealing with others, and also trusting oneself. As for the criterion F2 (distrust of other people as unrequited and unjust), the average indicator of mistrust to other people dominates, 67% of respondents scored from 7 to 11 points. Assessing the trust in other people's ability to cooperate and provide mutual assistance (F3) is also dominated by the average. Criterion F4 characterizes the trust in the ability to make assessments and make predictions, according to this criterion, the majority of respondents scored from 12 to 15 points, that is, the majority of respondents (53%) have a high level of confidence in themselves in assessing and making predictions. According to the last criterion F5, which shows distrust to the world and other people as dangerous objects, 73% of respondents assess the average level of mistrust of the world and other people as dangerous objects. Practically similar results were obtained as a result of an analysis of the answers of respondents aged 25 to 45 years old on the questions of this technique.

Summarizing the data obtained, we note that respondents aged 18 to 25 and 25 to 45 years old in most cases are trusted to themselves and to their abilities to make assessments and make predictions, but their attitude to the world, other people, the whole society should be assessed as a medium - distrust. Once again the older generation is the most prone to show trust. By criterion (F 3), 73% of the respondents scored from 12 to 15 points, which indicates the trust in other people's ability to cooperate and provide mutual assistance. Thus, analyzing the data obtained, we come to the conclusion that representatives of the older generation are more likely to express confidence than respondents between the ages of 18 to 45 and 45 to 65 years old. These results indicate a profound distrust that manifests itself at all levels of the relationship between the young and the middle generation. The Soviet time passed, and along with it, the negative stereotypes of perception of the world and behavioral attitudes were completely oblivious. Modern society lacks sincerity, goodwill, tolerance in relationships with people [15].

CONCLUSION

In modern society, the issue of increasing confidence, as an indispensable condition for the existence and functioning of

the entire system, becomes acute. Interpersonal trust, both near and distant social distances, forms the conditions, base for forming institutional trust, which is interpreted in the same way as social capital or as one of the fundamental bases of civil society.

References

- [1] Kuchenkova A. V. Interpersonal Confidence in Russian Society // Sociological Research. 2016. № 1. P. 26-36
- [2] Veselov Y.V. Trust and justice: the moral foundations of modern economic society. Moscow: Aspect Press, 2011. 231 p.
- [3] Belyanin A. V., Zinchenko V. P. Trust in the economy and social life. M.: Fund "Liberal Mission", 2010. 164 p.
- [4] Giddens A. The consequences of modernity. Stanford: Stanford univ. press, 1990. 186 p.
- [5] Fukuyama F. Trust: social virtues and the path to prosperity. M.: OOO "Publishing house ACT", 2004. 730 p
- [6] Luhman N. Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives // Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations / Ed. by D. Gambetta. Oxford: University of Oxford, 2000. Ch. 6
- [7] Coleman J. Capital, Social and Human // Social Sciences and Modernity. 2001. № 3
- [8] Sztompka P. Mistrusting Civility: Predicament of a Post-Communist Society // Real Civil Society. Dilemmas of Institutionalization / Ed. by J. C. Alexander. - Guildford, Surrey: Biddies Ltd., 1998/
- [9] Giddens A. Modernity and self-identity. Stanford (Col.) Stanford univ. press, 1991, Pp. 187-201
- [10] Kozyreva P.M. Legal Consciousness and Trust // Polis (Political Studies). 2008. № 4. P. 86-101.
- [11] Kupreychenko A.B. Psychology of trust and mistrust. M.: Publishing house "Institute of Psychology of RAS", 2008. 570 p.
- [12] Mukha V.N. Ethno-national identity of the Russians in the multiethnic environment: a case-study of the Krasnodar Region // Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2015. T. 214. C. 815-824.
- [13] Kozyreva P.M. Interpersonal trust in the context of the formation of social capital // Sociological research. 2009. № 1. P. 43–54.
- [14] Kupreychenko A.B. Trust and mistrust - general and specific psychological characteristics // Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Psychology and Pedagogy. 2008. № 2.
- [15] Zabolotnaya, G.M. Phenomenon of trust and its social functions // Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University. 2003. № 4-5. Pp. 79-85.