

THEORY AND INNOVATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2023-4-6>

TRUST AS THE BASIS OF A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Tetyana Kadlubovych,

Candidate of Political Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations and Political Consulting, Open International University of Human Development "Ukraine" (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2021-2070

ktanka17@gmail.com

Daryna Chernyak,

Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Kyiv National University of Technology and Design (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1515-6070

daryna1804@gmail.com

Abstract. The article is devoted to the study of the problem of trust in today's unstable social life. The relevance of the research is determined by the crisis processes taking place in the modern world, the development of the world democratic community, Ukraine's orientation towards integration into the European Union and NATO. A thorough analysis of the scientific literature was carried out, on the basis of which the essence and nature of the phenomenon of trust were determined, the conditions for the formation of a culture of trust, the factors that destroy it were revealed. The role of trust in the life of society and the individual is outlined, the specifics of the formation of trust in democratic and totalitarian societies are shown. In the course of the research, methods of analysis, synthesis, and comparison were used, and a survey of student youth was conducted. Young people's perceptions of trust/distrust were analyzed, factors were identified that, according to students, influence the formation of trust and lead to its loss.

Key words: trust, mistrust, democratic society, culture of trust, culture of cynicism, «democratic code», quasi-trust.

Introduction. The realities of the 21st century posed new questions and challenges to humanity. The events that are taking place prove that the world and people's living conditions are becoming increasingly uncertain and unpredictable. Violations of stability, unpredictability of events lead to crisis states of an individual and society as a whole. One of today's problems is the loss of trust in relationships between people, the problem of trust in the institutions of society, its maintenance and restoration.

The study of the phenomenon of «trust» has a long history and is interdisciplinary in nature. The philosophical aspect of trust is revealed in the works of A. Seligman, J. Habermas, etc., economic factors of trust formation are the subject of research by J. Hosking, F. Fukuyama, etc., trust in the political plane is considered, in particular, by J. Alexander. Of course, trust is the basis of social capital and solidarity, as evidenced by the research of R. Putnam, J. Coleman, and P. Bourdieu. The classic sociological research on trust is considered to be the works of P. Sztompka, R. Dahrendorf, etc..

Over the last decade, the problem of trust has gained popularity among domestic scientists. It is worth mentioning the works of Y. Shaigorodskiy (2021), O. Kozhemiakina (2020), D. Lysenko (2018), O. Serdyuk (2017), A. Kaverina (2017), and others. The concentration of attention on this issue shows that science, in particular, sociology has not lost the ability to identify important social issues

and continues to work on the search for truths important to society. Polish sociologist P. Sztompka (Sztompka, 1999) wrote about this in his book «Trust – the basis of society» long before the tragic events of the beginning of the 21st century.

The purpose of the article is to study the problem of trust in today unstable social life, to analyze the attitude to trust as a social phenomenon of student youth.

Main part. Trust divides the world into «us» and «them», makes it moral or immoral, light or darkness, determines the «democratic code» of the development of society or causes the emergence of a «counter-democratic» code (Alexander, 2006: 344-345).

The generally accepted definition of trust is «belief in the reliability of a person or system, the confidence of an individual, group, society, nation that the environment does not intend to harm them» (Lisun, 2017). Social trust is «confidence in the reliability of a social object, based on perception or knowledge about it and associated with the ability to predict, forecast or influence the actions of this object, control its activities» (Ursulenko, 2008). Trust is considered as «the principle of constructing social relations», «one of the prerequisites of social order in society», «a component of social capital» (Ursulenko, 2008).

Trust, according to P. Sztompka, is «an important element of the quality of life» (Sztompka, 1999), a bridge that allows one to «feel more confident in an uncertain world» (Sztompka, 1999: 31), one of the criteria of a moral society, along with loyalty and solidarity (Sztompka, 1999: 45). When «networks of trust and reliability» prevail, – writes P. Sztompka (Sztompka, 1999), – the collective approaches the ideal of a society of high trust, imbued with a culture of trust, and when networks of distrust and suspicion dominate, the collective degrades in the direction of a society of low trust, imbued with a culture of cynicism».

The author notes that the culture of trust... is characterized by strength, inertia and is not subject to rapid economic changes (Sztompka, 1999), it is formed due to certain macro-social conditions, the main of which are norms, stability, transparency of social organizations and institutions, familiarity of the environment and responsibility society and government. The bearers of such a culture, which J. Alexander calls «democratic personalities» (Alexander, 2006: 345-346), possess qualities that allow building «open, trust-based» relationships.

The conditions for creating a culture of trust are norms, customs, traditions, and laws. Of course, this condition can apply only in a legal state, under a democratic political regime, when social relations correspond to the «democratic code» and are characterized by openness, truthfulness, the civil position of each member of society, and equality before the law. In such a state, the organization of public power is based on the principles of respect for the individual, his rights and freedoms, and the main civil rights are guaranteed. The system of bodies and institutions of such a state guarantees and protects the functioning of civil society. Social life becomes safe, orderly, predictable, because each member of society knows his role in it and fulfills it, thereby satisfying the expectations of others. In such a society, the need for «existential safety and security» is realized (Sztompka, 1999). People who are carriers of a culture of trust, a «democratic code» are «symbolically constructed as rational, reasonable, calm and realistic», they know how to think critically, «their motives are determined by conscience and honesty» (Alexander, 2006: 344-345). The «counter-democratic code», or the code of oppression, on the contrary, motivates people to be greedy, suspicious, and follow the orders of others. In societies dominated by such a «code», there are no standards of behavior that would ensure trust in the environment, institutions are created that are «controlled by arbitrariness», «use brute force», «prefer hierarchy over equality» (Alexander, 2006: 346).

Another condition for the formation of a trust culture is stability, under which the type of social order «has a strong and unchanging character, ... stable relations are created in social life, a sense of security is born, which provides ... psychological comfort» (Sztompka, 1999). At the same time, according to P. Sztompka, social changes should take place gradually, regularly, be understandable,

slow, and have a constant direction towards a defined goal. Revolutions disrupt such stability, destroying the «existential fabric of social life» (Sztompka, 1999).

The transparency of public organizations and institutions can also be mentioned among the conditions for the formation of a culture of trust. It is transparency that allows society to have access to information about the functioning of state bodies, their effectiveness, achievements, miscalculations and shortcomings. In this case, people have a good understanding of the functioning of these bodies, and therefore trust in them increases. A huge role in such a process is played by mass media, whose activities can contribute to increasing the level of trust, forming a culture of trust, raising and discussing questions of moral choice with the help of cinematography, public debates, etc. It is through the means of mass communication that «citizens receive information about policies formulated by elites who create public opinion» (Sztompka, 1999). If the elites enjoy authority, then their opinion forms trust in the state, if not, mistrust is formed.

But mistrust of the state and authorities does not mean the absence of a culture of trust in society. If society is united, organized, citizens trust each other, that is, there is a civil society, there is an opportunity for resistance, protest, civil disobedience. A democratic system presupposes the existence of institutions of civil disobedience.

The culture of trust is also supported by a «sense of familiarity» (Sztompka, 1999), which is, according to E. Giddens, its main motive. The sense of familiarity, for example, is embodied in political life with the help of well-established procedures and rituals: regular elections of authorities, the existence of the opposition, which constantly analyzes the activities of the authorities, monitors them, criticizes them, pointing out shortcomings in the work and the ineffectiveness of its decisions, the cyclical nature of elections and the struggle for gaining power, etc. «Guarantees of democratic government accountability are elections, separation of powers into three branches, mutual control and balances, as well as the constitutional system and the rule of law...» (Sztompka, 1999). The system of checks and balances allows the branches of government to function effectively, to maintain political balance in society, to prevent the monopolization of power, and its abuse. The responsibility of the authorities lies in the regularity of the established procedures, when people can file a complaint about certain actions and know how to do it. They gain confidence that their rights are protected, and therefore a sense of security arises.

The education system also establishes a culture of trust. «To build trust, it is necessary to create an educated and knowledgeable public person» (Sztompka, 1999), and the formation of trust begins at the early stages of personality development. Let's recall that E. Erikson in the book «Childhood and Society» (Erikson, 1993) notes that trust in the world arises in a child already at the first stage of his psychosocial development. Parents and close friends play a leading role in the formation of trust. The school, as an institution of socialization, adhering to the principles of humanism, cultivates trust during the study of humanitarian courses. Therefore, it is important to increase the share of history, literature, social disciplines in educational programs of educational institutions. There should be time for conversations and discussions of both situations of trust and moral and universal values and norms. Very often, there is not enough time for «frank» conversations due to the overload of the program and the large number of students in classes and student groups. And schoolchildren, especially teenagers, need such conversations, discussions with «significant others», authoritative people for them. Education ensures the formation of traditional values, values of humanism, tolerance and humanity. The culture of trust should also be taught through practical means, examples of the fact that trust is rewarded.

Trust in the state is defined by P. Sztompka as vertical or public trust, which in political science can be considered as the legitimacy of power (Sztompka, 1999), which creates a social base of support for power institutions. Of course, the legitimacy of power, according to M. Weber, can be of different types – from traditional to rational-legal. The study of differences in trust in societies with differ-

ent types of authority legitimacy can become the subject of further scientific research. But citizens' trust in the authorities «reduces the cost of governance» (Sztompka, 1999), because, according to E. Giddens, it is a «crucial component» of political legitimacy (Giddens, 1992: 194).

Based on the research of other authors, P. Sztompka concludes that trust mobilizes human subjectivity, releases creative, independent, innovative, energetic actions in relation to others, reduces uncertainty and risk, increases the possibility of action (Sztompka, 1999), in particular the desire to be politically active. Trust stimulates camaraderie, enriches connections between people, and increases what scholars call «moral cohesion», «social capital», and «civic engagement» (Sztompka, 1999). Trust promotes communication and a sense of tolerance, overcomes the syndrome of «pluralistic ignorance», stops intergroup hostility, makes disputes civilized, affects the sense of identity and creates collective solidarity, predisposing people to cooperation, mutual assistance and even to the willingness to sacrifice themselves for the benefit of others (Sztompka, 1999). «When citizens trust the state, they are more willing to pay taxes, buy government bonds ..., join the army, ... emigrate less often» (Sztompka, 1999). Thus, the culture of trust can be considered a component of the spiritual-ideological subsystem of the political system of society, which forms the political order.

In totalitarian societies, there is also a culture of trust, but it «requires blind trust, prohibits criticism, skepticism, does not allow monitoring and verification of partners», leads to conformity and does not leave opportunities for the emergence of diverse views and opinions (Sztompka, 1999). It can be said that trust in a totalitarian society is a consequence of a «special political order» (Sztompka, 1999). It is, in fact, a quasi-trust. Quasi-trust can be based on paternalism, when people begin to «dream of the authority of a strong autocratic leader» (Sztompka, 1999), who will establish order, save from «suspicious» and «strangers». Such a leader becomes «an object of blind irrational trust» (Sztompka, 1999). He seeks to extend his reign, and his will supersedes the constitution.

H. Arendt, analyzing totalitarian regimes, notes that as early as the 19th century, the Russian historian Mikhail Pogodin admired the bureaucratic machine of tsarist Russia: «A huge machine, built on the simplest principles, which is controlled by the hand of one person... who at any moment lets it into move in one movement, whatever direction and speed she chooses. And this is not just mechanics – the machine is completely animated by inherited feelings, which are submission, boundless trust and devotion» (Arendt, 2017: 337-338). H. Arendt notes that «...totalitarian regimes, while they are in power, and totalitarian leaders, while they are alive, «enjoy mass support» until the very end (Arendt, 2017: 408). This can be explained by the fact that under totalitarian regimes there is no civil society as a political entity, and totalitarian «customs» turn the country's population into masses, a crowd, the characteristics of which make evil and the commission of crimes attractive.

G. Lebon talks about the possibility of transforming an entire nation into a spiritual crowd and notes that this can happen under the influence of certain influences (Lebon, 2020: 132). The crowd has its own characteristics, the so-called collective soul, or spirit of the crowd, arises, which makes individual individuals, whatever they may be, whatever their way of life, occupation, character or mind, «feel, think and act quite differently, than everyone would think, act and feel individually» (Lebon, 2020: 133). The collective soul erases individuality, intellectual abilities of individuals, stupidity and stupidity accumulate. The crowd endows individuals with an awareness of irresistible power, a sense of irresponsibility, infects individuals with certain feelings that allow them to sacrifice their own interests for the sake of the collective. «Becoming part of an organized crowd, a person descends several steps lower on the ladder of civilization» (Lebon, 2020: 137). The crowd thinks in images that are not logically connected; the crowd does not separate the objective from the subjective. The mob respects only force, and therefore the sympathies of the mob have always been on the side of tyrants (Lebon, 2020: 151). G. Tarde complements the features of the crowd, naming among them terrible intolerance, funny pride, painful susceptibility, a sense of impunity, the illusion of omnipotence, and a loss of sense of proportion. «And a trifle is enough for adoration to turn into eternal curse» (Tarde, 1969).

Institutionalization of trust in totalitarian societies, notes P. Sztopka (Sztopka, 1999), is carried out with the help of political socialization, censorship, strict political control, violence, punishment of dissent, criticism, even doubts. There is also indoctrination of society – i.e. filling the consciousness of the broad masses of the population with beliefs, images, attitudes and stereotypes of a social, ideological, political and psychological nature that are beneficial for the ruling class.

Quasi-trust is formed with the help of totalitarian propaganda. It uses proven techniques, in particular, the concealment of certain facts, and it is known that «everything hidden... acquires enormous importance regardless of its true significance» (Arendt, 2017: 463). This secrecy, concealment became a certain criterion in the selection of topics for propaganda. «Starting from the 1930s...», writes H. Arendt, «one secret world conspiracy is replaced by another» (Arendt, 2017: 463). The effectiveness of this kind of propaganda confirms that under a totalitarian regime, instead of a civil society, there is only a crowd that «does not believe in something visible, in the reality of their own experience. They don't believe their eyes and ears, but they believe their own imagination» (Arendt, 2017: 464).

However, with the help of terror, only those people who are isolated from each other can be controlled. In this case, these people are powerless, since the power is always with those who act unitedly (Arendt, 2017: 615-616), they are separated from each other, they feel fear and insecurity in their own strength.

P. Sztopka contrasts the culture of trust with the culture of cynicism. In contrast to him, H. Arendt claims that in a society dominated by the masses, there is a mixing of trust and cynicism, which allows the masses to believe and disbelieve everything at the same time. A mixture of trust and cynicism “distinguished the makeup of mob thinking before it became a permanent characteristic of the masses” (Arendt, 2017: 501). «Mass propaganda found that its audience was ready ... to believe ... and did not mind being deceived...» (Arendt, 2017: 501). Moreover, if people find out that they were deceived, they will use cynicism and will claim that they knew about the false information, but admire the «higher tactical wisdom» of the ruler. «A mixture of trust and cynicism is common at all levels of totalitarian movements, and the higher the level, the more cynicism prevails» (Arendt, 2017: 501).

Consonant with such assessments are reflections on the bearers of the «counter-democratic code» by J. Alexander. He notes their irrational and dependent nature, mistrust in social relations, which does not prevent them from showing respect for those in power (Alexander, 2006: 345-346).

The objectives of the research, conducted on the basis of the Kyiv National University of Technology and Design, were to study the ideas of student youth about the phenomenon of trust, to determine the factors that influence the formation of trust, and to determine the dominant «code» of student youth. The research methods were analysis, synthesis and generalization of survey results, elements of statistical analysis of results. 201 students of the 1st-2nd courses of study took part in the survey, who answered the questions of the proposed questionnaire. It used questions of open and closed types, which made it possible to obtain more reliable results. In addition, elements of projective methods were used, which helped to consider not only rational, but also associative connections with the studied concept.

The disposition «trust – mistrust» is one of the codes of a democratic society. That is why the survey was started by finding out with which words the concepts of «trust» and «distrust» are associated. The results of the survey showed that the associations with the concept of «trust» are as follows: 129 respondents (64.2%) named honesty, 92 (45.8%) – reliability, 86 (42.8%) – openness. Trust is also associated with the concepts of «loyalty» (34.8%), «closeness» (30.3%), «sincerity» (27.4%), «confidence» (25.4%), «security» (23.4%), «peace» (18.9%), «respect» (17.4%), «mutual assistance» (12.4%), «responsibility» (11.4%). Mistrust is associated among students with the concepts of «lies» (123 students; 61.2%), «betrayal» (107 students; 53.2%), «doubts» (87 students; 43.3%). Among the associations with the concept of «distrust» are also named «uncertainty» and «disappointment»

(39.3% each), «anxiety» (36.8%) and «suspicion» (32.8%), «fear» (20, 4%). As we can see, the dispositions «trust – mistrust» reflect the subjective ideas of students about relationships and emotional states that are experienced.

Interesting results were obtained in the analysis of students' answers about which color they associate the concepts of «trust» and «distrust». The concept of «trust» is associated mainly with green (45 students; 22%) and yellow colors (40 students; 20%) among students. The psychological meaning of green color, according to M. Lüscher (Lüscher, 1949), is the will to act, perseverance and zeal. Green color is the embodiment of firmness, constancy, strength. «Green behavior» is a desire to improve the conditions of social life. The green color symbolizes the flexibility and originality of the mind, and therefore it can be assumed that students are characterized by critical thinking. Yellow color, according to M. Lüscher (Lüscher, 1949), reflects unlimited expansiveness, liberation from bonds, discharge. Yellow evokes joy, cheerfulness and happiness. A «yellow» person is a source of energy. Yellow expresses hope, expectation, direction to the future. Thus, the students' choice of these colors demonstrates their understanding of the concept of «trust» as an expectation, hope, and emotion, which correlates with the views of F. Fukuyama (Fukuyama, 1995) on trust as the expectation of a certain community that the behavior of its members will be honest, directed for mutual assistance, will correspond to certain norms and values.

The majority of students (120 – 60%) chose red (79 students; 39%) and black (41 students; 20%) colors to denote the concept of «distrust». Another 64 students (32%) chose dark shades of blue, gray, orange, and green. This «interpretation» of the word «distrust» demonstrates, firstly, the negative attitude of young people towards this social phenomenon, and, secondly, the symbolism of red is aggression, rejection, conflict; black in general symbolizes rejection, non-acceptance, disapproval.

Answers to the question «What contributes to the establishment of a climate of trust in society?» indicate that the vast majority of students are in favor of the «democratic code» of a society in which the rule of law functions. The students' answers are distributed as follows: «Stability, clarity, consistency of the system of rules» – 32 students, 15.9%; «Confidence that everyone will follow the rules of the «game» in society» – 25 students, 12.4%, «Transparency of public life» – 27 students, 13.4%. «Friendly environment in which social life takes place» – 99 students, 49.3%. These responses reflect critical and reflective relationships between people that allow for open relationships based on trust and sincerity.

Among the factors that destroy trust in society, students name lies, deception, understatement and misinformation (99 students, 49%), betrayal, failure to fulfill promises and failure to keep one's word, irresponsible behavior, violation of human rights and failure to fulfill obligations by both the state and citizens (59 students, 29%), arrogance towards others, disrespect, discrimination, lack of empathy, intolerant attitude (24 students, 12%). Corruption, greed, closed-mindedness and suspicion, fear and doubt, rumors and gossip are also mentioned among the factors that violate trust in society. That is, students pay attention to the fact that trust in society depends on both social and personal factors.

Conclusions. Thus, it can be concluded that the culture of trust is inherent in societies with different political regimes, with the only difference being that under a democratic regime, real trust is formed both at the interpersonal and social levels. Totalitarian regimes form quasi-trust, which is sometimes ostentatious, and sometimes reflects internal passivity, submission, reluctance to change one's own life and the life of society.

Trust is a factor that supports the stability and integration of society, contributes to the reproduction of «social capital», which is formed in a democratic society and is absent in a totalitarian one, because people are isolated and separated. Trust regulates social and cultural differences in society, makes it tolerant, and legitimizes power relations. Finally, trust is one of the forms of reaction to risk, it forms a sense of safety and security. According to P. Sztompka, «Trust is a necessary condition for both civil society and democracy» and is both «a fruit of democracy and a factor that strengthens it» (Sztompka, 1999).

The results of a survey of student youth may indicate that the «democratic code» of society is built on a culture of trust and is already a recognized fact of social life, depends on compliance with the «rules of the game» and the proper performance of social roles, and therefore on both social and personal factors.

References:

1. Alexander, J. C. (2006) *The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology*. Oxford University Press
2. Arendt H. (2017) *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Penguin UK., 752
3. Erikson, Erik H. (1993) *Childhood and Society*. W. W. Norton & Company, 448.
4. Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: the social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. N.-Y.: The free press.
5. Giddens, A. (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Stanford University Press Stanford, California, 222
6. Lebon, G. (2020) *Psykhohiia liudskykh spilnot (Psychology of human communities*. Lviv : Vyd-vo Lviv. politekhniky, 203 s. (in Ukrainian)
7. Lisun S. L. (2017) *Dovira yak osnovopolozhnyi pryntsyp vzaiemodii Natsionalnoi politsii Ukrainy z naselenniam (Trust as a fundamental principle of interaction between the National Police of Ukraine and the population)*. *Yurydychna psykhohiia*, (2), S. 176-184. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/urpp_2017_2_18
8. Lüscher, M. (1949). *Psychologie der Farben [Psychology of Colors]*. Basel (in English).
9. Sztompka, P. (1999) *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 214.
10. Tarde, G. (1969) *On Communication and Social Influence*, ed. and trans. T. (Mark. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
11. Ursulenko K. V. (2008) *Dovira sotsialna (Social trust)*. *Entsyklopediia Suchasnoi Ukrainy*. Retrieved from <https://esu.com.ua/article-20476>