

PAWEŁ STAROSTA
University of Lodz*
KAMIL BRZEZINSKI
University of Lodz**

THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL TRUST IN POST-INDUSTRIAL CITIES OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Abstract

Despite numerous publications and empirical studies devoted to social trust as an abstract concept, it still arouses considerable controversy in scientific discourse. This controversy stimulates new theoretical reflection and empirical research devoted to this notion.

It has also inspired this article whose main cognitive objective is to determine the structure of trust attitudes in post-industrial cities under study, i.e. to capture similar and different coincidences among the main forms of this phenomenon.

The methodological objective of the article is to examine the consistencies and inconsistencies among the three basic forms of trust (generalized, horizontal and vertical) and the directions of relationships among them. Therefore, in addition to presenting the results of the level of social trust in the studied cities, an important part of this article will be capturing coincidences occurring among the three basic forms of trust, which will play an important role in future empirical research methodology. Demonstrating significant coherence of attitudes among the three mentioned forms, will provide an argument in favor of their use for designing more synthetic indexes, while the lack of such consistency would suggest some restraint in such proceedings.

Key words: post-industrial city, social trust, generalized trust, horizontal trust, vertical trust, structure of social trust

* e-mail: starosta@uni.lodz.pl;

** e-mail: kamilbrzezinski84@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that trust belongs to that class of abstract concepts like community, solidarity and social capital, which do not lend themselves to direct observation and which continually stimulate theoretical reflection and empirical research. The importance of trust in society was pointed out as early as 2,500 years ago by Confucius, who considered it a primary condition for all worthwhile social relationships [Möllering, 2006]. Georg Simmel wrote at the beginning twentieth century that “without general trust that people have for each other, the society would be disrupted” [Simmel, 1997: 144]. The similar view was expressed by Alfred Marshall [1920: 165 in Möllering, 2006: 2], recognized as the founder of neoclassical economics. He believed trust to be the foundation for the functioning of society. According to him it “permeates all life, like the air we breathe: and its services are apt to be taken for granted and ignored, like those of fresh air, until attention is forcibly attracted by their failure”. In the late seventies of the last century, Niklas Luhmann [1979: 20] formulated the famous slogan “Without trust, everyday life would be impossible; indeed one would not even be able to get out of bed in the morning”.

Reference to these early philosophical, sociological and economic observations can be found in many of the works of many prominent contemporary academicians dealing with the state of the risk society in the era of globalization, social capital, social exchange, and the sociology of everyday life. Out of the abundance of works on trust in modern societies there emerge essentially three general assertions. The first of them, present in the works of James Coleman [1994], Karen Cook [2001] and Robert Putnam [2008] suggests that today we face an erosion of trust and maintains a rather pessimistic future perspective in this regard, while the conclusions drawn from the works of Barbara Misztal [1998], Anthony Giddens [2002] and Piotr Sztompka [2007] are that in a globalizing and reflective society there is a great need for trust as a factor reducing the sense of danger and uncertainty – the foundation of social organization. Piotr Sztompka writes [2007: 45] “To actively and constructively face the future, we must show trust”. This view is challenged by Russell Hardin [2009] – the representative of the third option, who points out that modern society is no more vulnerable to the phenomenon of destruction and uncertainty than in the past, when the continuance of the community was threatened by violence and rape, not only because of armed conflicts but also due to commonplace behaviors which we define today as criminal. In this respect the results of historical analyses of daily life in the towns and villages of the pre-industrial period are interesting and pertinent

[Litlejohn, 1974]. These suggest that the attitudes of resentment and hostility were not uncommon, and trust towards people even from one's own circles as well as external groups was not as common as sociologists often believe.

Hardin is neither convinced about the supposed clear decline in public trust in the present nor about an increasing risk and uncertainty in the framework of the globalizing world.

Also the representatives of theories of conflict and competition argue that a certain degree of uncertainty and unpredictability is an integral part of social life. In fact, the general thesis about the increasing uncertainty of social life in the era of globalization, whether in terms of random factors or in the sense of humans' limited knowledge about the mechanisms of social life, does not seem to be sufficiently well-argued. There is also no convincing evidence that the competence gap that separates the average person today from the modern technical instruments is much larger than the distance between man in the period of early industrialization and the then-new technical solutions. However, there are arguments to legitimately claim an increase in uncertainty in two aspects. The first aspect concerns the progressive erosion of social relationships resulting from stabilized social structures in post-modern societies. The second aspect concerns the socio-economic development of those societies which had previously functioned within the framework of the welfare state. Since falling into a serious economic crisis many have applied, as an exit strategy, ultraorthodox neoliberal economic solutions which accept unlimited growth in social inequality. These are primarily the societies of the former socialist bloc, which together with their economic transformation underwent a fundamental political and structural transformation.

The adherents of rational choice theory and liberals point out, rightly it would seem, that while trust is indeed a factor which contributes to the resolution of many social problems and strengthens the stability of the existing order, its universal scope is not a prerequisite for the effective functioning of various social structures, especially in politics. On the contrary, a certain degree of distrust seems necessary to maintain social order. It is necessary firstly because human activities are not only governed by pro-social and ethical motivations. Secondly, politics and economics are areas of conflicting interests among various social groups. A certain degree of mistrust in government, for example, is a prerequisite for more precise control over its actions and, as a result, reduces the likelihood of government engaging in activities adverse to those whose interests are not adequately represented by the power elite. The point in question is not therefore whether everyone should trust everyone else or not, but rather the proper balance between trust and mistrust in peoples' social awareness. Certainly, extreme situations do not have a positive

impact on the functioning of certain social orders. The excessive confidence of the German society in the program and activities of the Nazi regime proved to be as disastrous as the permanent lack of confidence in governments in Italy. In the first case this led to a destructive war, and in the second to the embedding of mafia structures in public life.

Reflections and theoretical controversies around the issue of trust have inspired a number of empirical studies, among which three strands can be clearly distinguished. The first, present mainly in social psychology, is focused on conducting experiments explaining the mechanisms of trust formation in interpersonal interactions. The second, present mainly in sociology, focuses on survey studies aimed at determining the scope of the phenomenon of trust in particular collectivities. In the third stream, involving economists, sociologists and political scientists, researchers are trying to determine the relationships between the level of development of a community and the level of trust present in a given community. To this end statistical data is combined with the results of survey studies as well as existing data, and historical analyses are applied.

Two issues are prominent in the analyses based on sociological surveys. The first concerns the extent of the phenomenon of trust and/or its various forms in different types of collectivities, and the second issue focuses on the analysis of the relationship between the level of trust and economic growth and development in the context of democratization processes. In this latter respect, the most influential studies are comparative analyses carried out at the macro level using data for many countries simultaneously. Most commonly this data comes from the GSS, WVS and ESS. The general conclusion drawn from these studies is that while the general level of social trust, measured mainly using the questions proposed by the National Center for Public Opinion Research in the United States [Hardin, 2009] is of course differentiated among countries, nevertheless a deepening deficit of trust in many of them is clearly observable. [Hall, 2002]. It was found that the highest level of trust is noted in the Nordic countries and the lowest in the Third World and Eastern European countries [Rossteutscher, 2008]. In a number of studies a significant, though not always strong, correlation has been found between the level of generalized trust in a society and the level of economic development, as measured by GDP per capita and other measures [Knack and Keefer, 1997; Raiser, 2008], as well as a significant correlation between the level of generalized trust and the level of advancement of the processes of democratization in a given society. One of the difficulties in comparing the research results is the fact that the researchers understand trust in terms of three basic, but different, forms; namely generalized trust, vertical and horizontal trust.

The most common notion in theoretical reflections is the notion of generalized and vertical trust, alternatively quite unmarked definitions and corresponding indicators are applied.

There are relatively few studies showing the directions of the relationships between the above forms of trust, and even fewer analyses showing the basic patterns of interdependence among these three forms which constitute certain types of social trust structures. As the above-cited Russell Hardin [2009: 26] wrote, the assumption of many researchers that trust has a coherent character “has not been proven, so it is waiting for a conclusive study that would confirm it”. He further suggests that “no one in their right mind equally trusts everyone and with respect to every situation” [Hardin, 2009: 68]. In other words, it appears advisable in empirical studies to pose the question not only of the scope and conditioning of trust in various collectivities, but also of the scope of consistency and inconsistency of attitudes of trust and of certain patterns of relationships that exist between the three basic forms defining its structure.

Some attempts in this respect have been undertaken in the Polish literature. One should mention the work of Katarzyna Growiec [2011], who studied, *inter alia*, the relationship between generalized trust and confidence in particular types of institutions in European countries, and Kamil Brzezinski [2012], who analyzed the relationship between generalized, vertical and horizontal trust in the population of the Lodz Region. Research into patterns of trust in European countries has been undertaken by Gerry Mackie [2001] and Gabriel Badescu [2003]. However, the former author understands, under the term ‘pattern’, not the constellations of different forms but rather the level of declared generalized trust by citizens of their own country with comparison to citizens of other European countries. In other words, the object of analysis in this case is not the extent of coherence of different forms of trust, but the symmetry and asymmetry of the same form with respect to citizens of different countries. The latter researcher studied the relationships between generalized trust and horizontal trust (relatives, friends) and found correlations at the level of ($\Lambda = 0.30$) for the Romanian society.

1. PROBLEMS, HYPOTHESES AND DATABASE

The increase in Central and Eastern Europe of factors creating a sense of economic uncertainty and the individualization of social life, lower than the level of trust in the Western Europe, as well as the increasingly important role

of local institutions after 1990 provided impulses for us to join the debate on the structure of social trust in these countries. Our analyses do not apply to the macro perspective. Instead we will analyze this phenomenon on the mezzo scale in selected postindustrial cities of five post-socialist countries, i.e. Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Russia and Romania, hence in environments where the transformation costs and the effects of the global crisis proved to be most severe for the local populations. In these cities, the initial spontaneous optimism was followed most deeply by attitudes of disappointment and social passivity. Due to the specific character of the studied population, the analyses presented do not claim and cannot claim to make generalizations as to the whole set of urban environments in these countries, much less with respect to the entire populations.

This article aims to achieve two objectives. The cognitive objective boils down to determining the structure of attitudes of trust in the surveyed cities and capturing some similar coincidences and different manifestations of the main forms of this phenomenon. The domination of similarities reflects the primacy of macro-social conditions resulting from their similar paths of development, both in the past and present. In contrast, the identification of clear differences indicates the predominance of significant local and national particularities.

The second objective is of a methodological nature. The study of the coherence and incoherence of the three basic forms of trust and the directions of relationships among them is designed to determine the extent to which generalized trust, measured by the question “Can most people can be trusted...?” makes sense as a separate cognitive category, and the extent to which it is a duplicate of the attitudes expressed towards members of one’s informal circles and institutional structures. The demonstration of significant coherence of attitudes among the three forms of trust would be an argument in favor of their use in the construction of more synthetic indicators, while the lack of such a coherence would suggest a careful interpretation of the results of such studies.

With respect to the structure of our study, we do not limit ourselves to studying exclusively the level of trust and its potential determinants. Such analyses are quite commonly undertaken by centres of public opinion research and panel social surveys. We rather intend to capture the similarities and differences occurring among the three basic forms – generalized, vertical and horizontal trust. However, before determining certain patterns of coherence and incoherence, i.e. consistency and inconsistency, we depart from presentation of the level of the phenomenon in its three forms. Together, we focus on trying to resolve three major issues.

The first issue concerns the direction and varying levels of generalized, vertical and horizontal trust in the studied collectivities. In other words, we attempt to determine whether, and which of the three forms of trust reaches the highest and the lowest level, and whether there are convergent or divergent trends in this regard in the surveyed cities.

The second issue refers to the relationships occurring among the three forms of trust and, consequently, to determining the extent to which each of the forms is determined by the presence of the other two. The third issue refers to the structure of the attitudes of social trust. We will try to answer the question whether, in the collectivities of the respondents, there prevailed consistent or inconsistent attitudes. In other words, this is an attempt to verify the hypothesis of directional transitivity of the attitude of trust. It takes into account two interrelated issues. One comes down to the question whether a certain level of trust in one of the three dimensions implies similar levels in the two other dimensions. The second issue boils down to whether this degree of coherence is greater within a given form or among the forms. According to the formulated problems and questions, we assume the following hypotheses:

1) Based on the results of research carried out by other authors, we recognize that social trust in the three forms studied will be positive or close to ambivalence. Given the heritage of the recent the past in these countries and cities, we believe that the most limited trust occurs with regard to institutional structures (vertical), while the highest trust will occur with respect to members of the closest informal circles (horizontal trust). We also believe that the direction and level of trust attitudes will be very similar in all the studied cities. In other words, we recognize the dominant role of macro-social heritage in the economic and political spheres over local and national particularities.

2) In our second hypothesis we assume that horizontal trust will determine to the greatest extent the occurrence of generalized and vertical trust and generalized trust will be the main determinant of horizontal trust. We also believe that generalized trust is reducible neither to horizontal nor vertical trust, and therefore constitutes a distinct form as a social phenomenon.

3) In the third hypothesis, we assume that in the studied cities consistent attitudes with a small positive charge will prevail. This means that the phenomenon of transitive trust attitudes appears both within the particular forms and among them. We also assume that differentiation of the levels of trust within its specific forms will be lower than among the forms.

We understand the concept of horizontal trust as encompassing attitudes and expectations with respect to persons who belong to our inner circles, i.e. our clos-

est family members, neighbours, co-workers and friends. Vertical trust relates to one's attitudes toward institutional structures. General trust, on the other hand, refers to the general attitude and orientation one takes with respect to subjects outside his or her personal experience. Hence general trust may be understood as one's attitude toward society at large.

We analyzed the situation in selected cities which, as a result of globalization and transformation lost much of their former industrial function. For our research we selected the following cities: In Poland, Lodz with a population of 700,000 citizens; in Russia Ivanovo with a population of 400,000 citizens; in Romania Oradea with a population of 230,000 citizens. In these cities the textile industry was predominant in the past. In Hungary, we analyzed the situation in Miskolc, a city with a population of 160,000, dominated in the past by engineering and spa services, while in Lithuania we selected the city of Panevezys with a population of 110,000, dominated in the past by the electromechanical industry. All these cities had fallen into a deep economic crisis in the late 1980s and early 1990s. As a consequence in the case of Lodz, Oradea, Miskolc and Panevezys there appeared high unemployment and significant waves of emigration abroad, while in the case of Ivanovo there was significant internal migration to Moscow and St. Petersburg. The percentage of the formally registered unemployed in 2012 was 11% for Lodz, 12% for Panevezys, 11% for Miskolc, 17% for Ivanovo, and 18% for Oradea. Lodz and Panevezys are cities with a very high degree of ethnic, religious and cultural homogeneity, while Ivanovo and Oradea are strongly heterogeneous cities in terms of culture, ethnic structure and religion, which contain numerous ethnic and national minorities and a wide variety of religious groups. Miskolc is located in a middle position between the two indicated poles. The research in Miskolc, Panevezys, Ivanovo and Lodz was conducted in late 2012/2013 under the project NCN – HS6 / 02538 “Revival of post-industrial cities: peripherals”¹. The study in Oradea was carried out in 2013 within the statutory research of the University of Lodz. In all the cities an identical questionnaire interview with the same set of questions was used. The questionnaires were double-translated. Phase one consisted of direct translation from Polish into Hungarian, Russian and Lithuanian, and then the responses back from those languages to Polish. Phase two consisted of indirect translation from Polish to English, and then from English to Russian, Lithuanian, Hungarian and Romanian and vice versa. In Oradea only indirect translation was

¹ NCN research was also conducted in the Turkish city of Adapazari. however, due to issues of consistency of political and cultural traditions of the results, the studies were excluded from this analysis.

used. In all the cities the survey covered random sampling of the adult population aged 18–70 years. In Lodz and Miskolc random sampling was done from the list of residents (Lodz) and the list of voters in the most recent election (Miskolc). In Ivanovo, Panevezys and Oradea the random route method was used. The size of the samples were 700 respondents in Lodz, 400 in Panevezys, 400 in Miskolc, 437 in Ivanovo, and 428 in Oradea. For comparison purposes, we will also refer to the results of other empirical studies, in particular to the study of the 6th round of the 2012 ESS.

2. SOCIAL TRUST AND ITS FORMS

Most of the theoretical reflections and empirical research done into social trust in recent decades is connected with the rise in popularity of the concept of social capital. However, the relationship between social capital and trust is not treated in a uniform manner by researchers. One may speak of two dominant conceptual approaches. In the first, the so-called genetic approach, trust is treated in general as a phenomenon prior to the creation of social capital; hence social capital is not an integral component of social trust. In the second approach, the so-called ‘functional approach’, which dominates in empirical research, trust is usually treated as a specific component of inferential capital. In this text we adhere mostly to the functional approach.

The essence of trust is assumed to be a relationship of reciprocity and expectations reflected in the respective interests of the partners to an interaction. Mutual expectations in this case is a kind of platform for mutual understanding and the sharing of semantic meanings conveyed by the partners. Benjamin Barber [1988: 9] distinguishes three types of expectations generating basic meanings of trust: “The most general is the expectation of persistence and fulfillment of the natural and the moral social order. Second is the expectation of a technical component – the role of performance from those involved with us in a given social relationship and system. And third is the expectation that partners to an interaction will carry out their fiduciary obligations and responsibilities”.

It can therefore be concluded that trust is a positive attitude of A towards B because of the situation X, resulting from the knowledge or belief of A that B will not work to A’s disadvantage. This approach is consistent with the viewpoints of Barbara Misztal [1998: 24], who states that “To trust is to believe that the result of somebody’s intended action will be appropriate from our point of view”; and of Diego Gambetta [2000: 216] who writes that “trust (or distrust) is a particular

level of subjective probability by which an agent assesses that another agent or group of agents will perform a particular action, both before he can monitor such action [...] and in a context in which it affects his own action”.

From the sociological point of view, trust is a consequence of actual or presumed social interactions and as such cannot be referenced to the non-social world. It is thus an attitude in which the constitutive role is played by the information about the objects of attitude, the possibility of limited control over their actions by an agent, and the evaluation of the situation in which the agent is involved. This information is the basis for the description and understanding of the situation in which the agent finds him-/herself. This may be generated both by well-verified knowledge (personal and expertise), as well as by socially established stereotypes and beliefs built on these premises. Information is also the substance of trust in the case of keeping secrets or acts of lying [Simmel, 2005].

The possibilities of control result from power resources available to the agent in a particular social relationship and constitute the basis for the formation of credibility. The credibility of agents may thus result from the application of sanctions, both through the use of external coercive measures as well as those associated with authority and social recognition. It may also be the result of direct experience, as suggested by proponents of the theories of inherent benefits [Hardin, 2009] and of the processes of socialization [Walter, Markova, 2006]. Assessment of a given situation is made on the basis of shared norms and values.

It is worth noting however, that the category of ‘sharing’ has essentially two semantic meanings [Knight, 2001]. Firstly, sharing requires knowledge of the content of the norms, and secondly it requires taking a specific attitude towards them, involving not only cognitive elements but also emotional ones. In other words, evaluation takes into account the cognitive component contained in the content of norms but is not entirely reducible to it, since evaluation also assumes the presence of an emotional component. Moreover, as Jack Knight [2001] argues, norms may also constitute a basis for maintaining a generalized belief in a group or in society as to the behavior of others in certain social situations. That belief or faith is contained in the content of the norm. Thus, knowledge of the content of norm may itself create belief.

The above arguments do not, however, lead to reducing trust only to knowledge. For this reason we do not treat trust as a decision based solely on rational calculations, nor as action. Rational calculation may in fact only take place in the case when the agent is free from external pressure, when he/she has a complete set of alternatives related to solving a given problem, and when the object of reflection is free from emotional involvement. According to the general theory of

attitude, we assume that trust is rather a predisposition to take action rather than an action as such. We agree with the argumentation by T.K. Ahn & E. Ostrom [2008, 80] that “[t]rust itself is a kind of belief, but not an action per se”. Hence, while belief or conviction may therefore stimulate and very often does stimulate action, it is not a necessary condition for its undertaking.

Apart from the considerations on the nature and determinants of trust, in the literature one may also find typological approaches to this phenomenon, referring to its various forms [Misztal, 1998; Heimer, 2001] or varieties [Sztompka, 2007]. The first-cited author distinguishes three forms of trust: habitus, passion and policy [Misztal, 1998: 101]. They are a consequence of the analytical distinction of the three dimensions of social order contained in social organization, namely the stability dimension, cohesion and cooperation. In this case, the form of trust stems from its function. This then is a standpoint close to the view of Luhmann [1988], stating that the essence of trust is the reduction of complexity.

When writing about the forms of trust, Carol A. Heimer mentions faith, confidence, legal trust and trust. The basis for the distinguishing the above categories are, for Carol A. Heimer [2001] the degree of mental sensitivity of the agent, the degree of his/her uncertainty in a given situation, and the degree of influence that the agent has on the interaction partner. Piotr Sztompka [2007] distinguishes different varieties of trust based on the social addressees of these relationships. He writes, *inter alia*, about interpersonal, social, institutional, and systemic trust with respect to social roles, groups and technical systems.

However, most common in empirical studies is a typology based on the range of the impact of trust [Fukuyama, 1997] and/or the type of entity or phenomenon towards which the attitude of trust is taken. On this basis, horizontal, vertical and generalized trust are most often distinguished. What’s more, the above typology refers to the major theoretical perspectives within which the phenomenon of trust is analyzed – the theory of rational choice (horizontal trust), the functional and the neo-functional theory (vertical trust) and the theory of structurization (generalized trust) [Möllering, 2006].

The first of these concepts refers to the attitudes and expectations of people who are members of the inner circles and groups of reference for an individual. It is therefore a positive attitude towards members of one’s closest family, neighbours, co-workers or friends. Its source is most often direct experience, resulting from interactions with particular people. Horizontal trust can therefore provide the basis for the formation of processes of belonging and social identity. It is an important contribution to the development of informal relationships and interpersonal bonds. Some researchers, such as Karen Cook, Russell Hardin and

Margaret Levi [2005] and Ivana Markova [2006] consider this form to be the most appropriate for understanding the essence of trust in general. In their view, the concept should be related to real relationships – in which individuals are likely to know the intentions or motives of the interacting partner – and not to abstract and unified social systems. Furthermore, this occurs in a situation where one can choose a specific alternative to solve the problem. Therefore, horizontal trust is most often considered within the framework of the rational choice theory because it is based on knowledge and on the autonomy of the acting subject. It should be noted, however, that the primary criterion of rationality in this case is the attainment of broadly understood benefits.

Vertical trust usually refers to institutional structures and, therefore, social systems which do not remain in the scope of day-to-day and direct interaction of individuals. It plays an important role in the efficient satisfaction of needs, and regulation of social norms and power structures. Piotr Sztompka [2007] defines this type of trust as ‘public trust’, because it includes within its scope not only the relationship to certain actors having publicly defined roles, but also relationships towards abstract systems and “structural rules within which actions and interactions occur”, both within collectivities as well as among them. The basic problem which occurs in the theory of institutional (vertical) trust boils down to the question of the possibility of shaping attitudes towards a system with which an individual often has no direct contact, or where advanced technology disables the individual from making effective contact due to a lack of specific competences.

Neo-institutionalists [Rothstein, Stolle, 2008] suggest two ways to resolve this dilemma. Above all, they emphasize the need to distinguish between two types of institutions: namely, political institutions in the strict sense and institutions whose immediate task is to implement policies, that is, produce and distribute goods. In the case of the first type of institution, trust is generated primarily by the suitability or compatibility of the ideological principles represented by the institutions with the ideological principles accepted and approved of by the members of a society. In this case, trust (or its lack) is not a consequence of either knowledge or contacts, but only the convergence of individual and institutional value systems. In the second type of institution, certain systems of production and distribution of goods “reveal messages about societies’ overall principles and norms, which in turn mould and shape people’s beliefs and values about how the Institutions operate” [Rothstein, Stolle, 2008: 283] The most important thing in the relationship of the individual towards the system becomes not so much *direct* trust in the system, but as rather *indirect* trust, arising from the ability to control its functioning.

The third form, generalized trust, consists of a general orientation we adopt to entities beyond the field of direct experience. It is, therefore, the attitude towards the social environment as broadly understood, expressing our generalized attitude resulting from the need for bonds rather than the achievement of individual interests. In other words, generalized trust “refers to beliefs in the trustworthiness of others” [Marcek, Markova, 2006: 176]. The specificity of generalized trust lies in the fact that it is not based on personal experiences and exchange processes, but on the basis of confidence in the existence of a positive human nature [Uslaner, 2008] shaped by processes of socialization (Simmel) and/or processes of social identification [Braithwaite, 1998]. In this approach, “[t]rust is a by-product of shared understanding, goals, and responsibility” [Braithwaite, 1998: 52] While in the exchange approach, which is the main theoretical framework for horizontal trust, attention is drawn to the benefits – material, social or psychological – as a source of trust in individuals and excluded from the group context, in the social identity approach, and consequently in generalized trust, there is no separation of the individual from the group. Valerie Braithwaite writes [1998: 52], referring to Victor Turner “there can be no individual identity without identification with a social group, and therefore ‘acting in terms of the self’ must incorporate both group and individual behavior”. In other words, “Trust is a by-product of shared social identity” [Braithwaite, 1998: 52].

One’s attitude toward generalized ‘others’ offers a good basis to assess the extent of the ‘culture of trust’ and/or the ‘culture of cynicism’ in a society [Sztompka, 2007]. Manifested a priori, it often leads to cooperation and certainly to reducing social tensions. It allows to overcome prejudice and intolerance. On the other hand, unwarranted optimism, not drawn from previous experiences and the results of social activities, can also lead to naivety and being easily manipulated. In an era of growing risks in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe generalized trust, or its lack, sometimes becomes, in the absence of access to certain information, a substitute for cognitive competence.

3. THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL TRUST IN THE SURVEYED CITIES

The adoption of an understanding of trust in terms of attitude assumes the application of certain indexes with reference to each form of trust.

As indicators of horizontal trust, four questions were chosen concerning the degree of trust in the members of one’s immediate family, neighbours, co-workers and residents of the city. In the case of vertical trust we asked about the degree

of confidence in a set of twelve institutions in each studied city. These were such institutions as the city council, president/ mayor of the city, clergy from local churches, private companies operating in the city, the courts operating in the city, the police in the city, the banks in the city, health institutions in the city, educational institutions in the city, and the political parties in the country, the current state government, and the president of the country.

In the case of generalized trust we used three questions as indicators, taken from the WVS and ESS and asked in a standard way in almost all survey studies. However, in the first of these questions we introduced some modifications, under the influence of certain criticisms of WVS and ESS. The point is that the question "Can the majority of people be trusted or should one be cautious?" is not in logical opposition. As the proponents of rational choice theory rightly argue, caution in relationships with others is not an accurate opposition to trust. In other words, it is argued that trust is often a consequence of caution in dealing with others. As a result, our questions/ indicators were as follows: 1) "Using the scale where 1 means no trust and 7 absolute trust, please indicate to what extent you trust most people?", 2) Using a scale where 1 means dishonesty and 7 honesty, please indicate whether the majority of people are dishonest or honest persons? and 3) Using the scale where 1 means taking care of one's own interests and 7 providing assistance to others, please indicate whether the majority of people are persons who care about their own interests or persons who help others?

We should add that while this is the most widely used set of questions to study generalized trust, it is not, however, the only one. Yamagishi & Yamagishi [1994] and Marcek & Markova [2006], next to the question about the general level of trust in most people and the credibility of the majority of people took into account also a question regarding a cautious approach (the majority of the population are hypocrites) and the knowledge about interaction partners (I trust more those that I know than those whom I do not know)

Each of the respondents assessed their degree of confidence on the seven-point scale from +3 to -3, where -3 meant a complete lack of trust, +3 absolute trust, and "0" half trust and half distrust.

According to the results of many survey studies, the level of horizontal trust is generally high, although not very high. On a scale from -3 to +3, average measurement for the whole set and all items in our study amounted to .463. This overall positive trend is, however, the consequence of three distinctly different types of attitudes. The residents of the studied cities almost uniformly declared their trust in family members. In this case, the values fluctuated around 2.5 points on the 3-degree scale. The results for Lodz clearly deviated from this dominant

trend, and trust in family members in Lodz was declared to much lower extent. In all the studied cities lack of trust in other citizens was noted. At the same time, the highest lack of trust in this regard was reported in Ivanovo, and the lowest lack of trust in Panevezys.

TABLE 1. Mean values of horizontal trust on the scale of min -3 to max 3. Theoretical middle of the scale = 0, Average for the entire set $x = .463$; MD = .500, SD 1.095

Social circles	Cities					Total	F
	Panevezys	Lodz	Oradea	Ivanovo	Miskolc		
Family	2.537	1.381	2.467	2.490	2.245	2.124	111.61
Neighbours	.756	-.037	.369	-.320	.283	.174	29.21
Co-workers	.945	-.041	.570	-.355	.405	.254	54.22
Residents of the city	-.132	-.547	-.720	-1.307	-.857	-.701	41.56
General value of horizontal trust index for studied cities	1.023	.189	.672	.127	.519	.463	

Attitudes towards neighbours and co-workers differed in two subgroups of the studied cities. In Lodz and Ivanovo the dominant attitude was mistrust while in the other cities there was an attitude of trust. In total, the residents of Ivanovo expressed a similar, but lower level of confidence, while the inhabitants of Oradea and Miskolc also demonstrated a similar but much higher level of trust. In contrast, the residents of Panevezys declared the clearly highest level of horizontal trust. It should be added that the level of confidence in the inhabitants of Lodz to family, and especially to neighbours and co-workers, was much lower than in the nationwide Polish population [CBOS 2012]. These differences are, in the case of the family – 24%, neighbors – 41%, and co-workers – 52.5%.

The Fischer statistics values given in Table 1 indicate that differences in levels of trust among the studied cities were greatest in the case of trust in family members.

In contrast to horizontal trust, the vertical trust level was more consistent, with respect to both cities as well as individual institutions. However, the direction of attitudes is clearly negative for all cities and with respect to all institutions.

TABLE 2. Average values of trust in institutions in the surveyed cities on a scale from minimum -3 to maximum +3. Theoretical middle of the scale = 0 Average for the whole set -.535; MD = -250, SD, 764

Institutions	City					Average for all institutions
	Panevezys	Łódź	Oradea	Iwanowo	Miskolc	
City council	-.360	-.159	-.783	-.146	-.368	-.339
City mayor	-.425	-.210	-.185	-.211	-.470	-.287
Clergy from local parishes	-.915	-.326	-.014	-.339	-.455	-.393
Private companies in the city	-.636	-.337	-.771	-.112	-.278	-.414
City courts	-.570	-.590	-.668	-.261	-.758	-.568
City police	-.955	-.716	-.355	-.168	-.922	-.625
City banks	-.537	-.560	-.756	-.403	-.560	-.562
City healthcare institutions	-1.223	-.340	-.881	-.387	-.760	-.666
City educational institutions	-1.297	-.804	-.119	-.908	-1.022	-.820
Political parties in the country	-.322	-.131	-1.640	-.064	-.175	-.432
Current government in the country	-.625	-.625	-1.486	-.309	-.312	-.543
President of the country	-.902	-.903	-1.799	-.487	-.390	-.775
Mean index of vertical trust for studied cities	-.730	-.404	-.789	-.316	-.539	-.535

The data contained in Table 2 indicates a general lack of vertical trust both in local and national institutions. In none of the cities did any of the institutions listed receive a vote of confidence from their inhabitants. The obtained result is not surprising. Responsibility for various types of failures and crises in society is, according to residents, placed on institutional structures, i.e. the people involved in these structures or the rules governing these structures.

By far the least trust in the central and local institutions was noted by the residents of Oradea and Panevezys, while residents of Ivanovo and Lodz showed the least lack of trust in the listed institutions, and the residents of Miskolc positioned themselves between these two pairs of cities. The highest trust deficit was recorded with respect to the educational institutions, the country's president, healthcare institutions and the police functioning within the surveyed collectivities. The lowest level of mistrust was reported in the case of local institutions

of power, such as the mayor, city council and the local clergy of churches and religious associations. It is easy to notice that the lack of confidence mainly refers to the institutions responsible for security and public order (police, healthcare, courts) as well as those associated with access to future careers (educational institutions) at the local level, and to the central level political institutions. The lower level of mistrust in the institutions of local government rather than in the political institutions of the country, and the simultaneous higher level of mistrust in the local institutions of security and public order suggests that urban residents experiencing crisis to a greater extent link their sense of institutional mistrust with the functioning of the central government rather than the local government. Comparison of our results to the findings from the ESS studies suggests, in relation to the police and political parties, that the level of trust in the post-industrial cities under study is significantly lower than for the nationwide Polish, Russian and Hungarian populations.

The attitudes of vertical trust are more consistent than the attitudes relating to horizontal trust. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is in this case 0.864 and is very close to the value of Alpha coefficient calculated for the 24 European countries in the 2012 ESS study ($\text{Alpha} = 0.906$)² and the results of the regional study in the Lodz region in 2011 ($\text{Alpha} = 0.900$; Brzezinski, 2012). The very similar results from so many different communities in which very similar questions were used, but not identical quantities and types of institutions were listed, shows that in the public sphere we are dealing with the phenomenon of transitivity of the attitudes of trust and distrust.

As stated earlier, in the previous survey studies it was found that the level of trust in the various surveyed components was different in different countries. The largest amount of comparative data of components is available for generalized trust. The data from the European Social Survey results (Table 3) shows that Poland is among the countries with the lowest average generalized trust in Europe. In 2012 this level was lower than in the Hungarian society and Russian society in all three dimensions. In turn, generalized trust in Russia was slightly higher than in Hungary. It is difficult to do a comparison in the case of the Lithuanian and Romanian societies because these countries did not participate in the ESS.

² Own calculations/estimations on the basis of the ESS database for round 6.

TABLE 3. Average value of items of generalized trust for Poland, Russia and Hungary in 2012 on 11 point scale* and for Lodz, Ivanovo, Miskolc, Panevezys and Oradea (in parentheses) on a scale from -3 to +3

Country/City	Component items			Generalized trust index from the total of three subscales for cities/3
	The majority of people can be trusted in the Country (City)	The majority of people are honest in the Country (City)	The majority of people are helpful to others in the Country (City)	
PL (Lodz)	4.13 (0.34)	4.97 (0.09)	3.76 (-0.34)	(0.20)
RUS (Ivanovo)	4.80 (1.51)	5.06 (0.20)	4.77 (-0.43)	(0.43)
HU (Miskolc)	4.39 (-0.12)	5.12 (-0.10)	4.57 (-0.54)	(-0.25)
LT (Panevezys)	(0.27)	(0.10)	(-0.34)	(0.01)
RO (Oradea)	(-0.06)	(-0.16)	(-0.64)	(-0.29)
Total	4.44 (0.39)	5.05 (0.13)	4.37 (-0.46)	(0.04)
F	(99.99)**	(14.49)**	(9.74)**	(31.02)**

*data from ESS round 6 on the basis of own calculations.

** p.≤.000; Alfa Cronbach 0.758

As can be clearly seen, the results achieved for each of the components of the scale, where the minimum was -3, and the maximum +3, were not high in any of the cities studied. They indicate rather similarly ambivalent attitudes. with a majority of slightly negative beliefs in the statement “most people are helpful to others” and slightly positive attitudes with regard to the statements that “most people can be trusted” and “most people are honest”.

It is not inconceivable that such a general overall result is a consequence of the highly abstract nature of the question, requiring the respondent to refer to ‘most people’, which for many people may be interpreted as referring to a totally unknown universe, therefore contributing to the tendency to locate their answers in the ambivalent measurement area. We can therefore conclude that that even though the differences in trust levels were statistically significant, they were not very large.

Taking into account our methodological reservations, it is nevertheless worth paying attention to three issues. Firstly, the highest level of generalized trust was recorded in Ivanovo and Lodz, and the lowest in Miskolc and Oradea, with Panevezys located between these two pairs of cities with similar levels of trust as measured by Schefe’s test. In other words, residents of Ivanovo proved to be the most trustful in relation to others, and the inhabitants of Oradea the most distrustful.

We should add that the result achieved by the inhabitants of Lodz is, when compared with nationwide data for 2012, much more positive in relation to generalized trust than in the other categories. The CBOS data [2012] found the average value of the generalized trust index, on a scale from -3 to $+3$, to be $-.640$. The questions included in the CBOS index were not identical to the questions used in our research. In the CBOS study, next to the standard question: "Can most people be trusted ...?", questions were asked about trust in business partners and trust in strangers (whom the respondent meets). In our opinion, these are not good indicator questions with respect to the generalized trust index because in both cases the objects of attitudes have a clear empirical reference. In accordance with the prevailing theoretical concepts, the essence of generalized trust is with reference to the indeterminate universe of the objects of attitude. Hence, the comparison of these results should be treated with great caution.

Secondly, the most diversified attitudes were expressed towards the situation contained in the first question (on direct trust in others), and the most homogeneous (as indicated by the statistics F), albeit clearly negative, with respect to questions about willingness to help others. In other words, in all the studied cities the belief dominates that one cannot count on the help of others.

Thirdly, despite some differences in the levels of trust among the particular component items, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of $.758$ allows one to conclude that there was a high consistency of attitudes demonstrated in the responses to the three questions asked. In other words, among the inhabitants of the cities studied we find more consistency than inconsistencies with respect to attitudes of generalized trust. Similar results were also reported in other studies. The Alpha coefficient calculated for the 24 countries of the last round of the 2012 ESS was $.785$. Cronbach's Alpha of similar size was also obtained in studies of the inhabitants of the Lodz region [Brzezinski, 2012]. The very similar results in such diverse collectivities provide a solid basis for formulating the thesis that there is a considerable degree of consistency in terms of generalized behavior and the phenomenon of transitivity of attitudes is present in this component.

The data illustrating the level of trust within framework of specific categories allows for the formulation of several conclusions. First of all, a very low level of trust has been found in the framework of all three indexes. Only the average/mean index of horizontal trust gained positive result exceeding the ambivalence threshold. However, the final effect was clearly the result of the disparity between the high degree of trust in the family and the relatively low level of trust, or even distrust, in members of other social groups or circles.

Vertical trust is distinctly characterized by distrust. This result occurred in all cities and for all of the institutions included in the study. In turn, the level of generalized trust turned out to be very close to the ambivalence level, with a minimal prevalence of positive attitudes. The level of trust in the surveyed cities was, in three cases (Ivanovo, Lodz and Miskolc), lower than for the national populations.

The most homogeneous attitudes appearing among residents was towards their institutional structures and diverse members of informal groups and communities. Residents of Ivanovo and Lodz reported the highest level of generalized trust and at the same time the lowest level of distrust in institutional structures. Residents of Panevezys and Oradea demonstrated the highest level of horizontal trust and at the same time low rates of generalized trust and high vertical distrust.

4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN GENERALIZED, HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL TRUST

One of the more interesting issues with respect to the relationship between generalized, horizontal and vertical trust arises from the attempt to answer two questions. The first is the question of the form(s) that represent the basis for the explanation of other types of trust. The second issue relates to identifying the form of trust which is to the highest degree constituted by factors independent of the other forms. In other words, which has the highest degree of autonomy and irreducibility with respect to the other forms. In order to answer the above questions three regression equations were made for the particular cities, where the explanatory variables were successively the generalized trust, the horizontal and vertical trust indexes, and the explanatory variables were the two other forms.

TABLE 4. Matrix of coefficients of determination R^2 for OLS linear regression equations in particular cities. The dependent variable is generalized trust and the independent variables horizontal and vertical trust

Cities	Determination coefficient		Horizontal trust		Vertical trust	
	R^2	p.	β	p.	β	p.
Panevezys	.300	.000	.477	.000	-149	.001
Lodz	.226	.000	.344	.000	-220	.000
Miskolc	.333	.000	.382	.000	-314	.000
Ivanovo	.315	.000	.559	.000	-.015	.703
Oradea	.309	.000	.372	.000	.290	.000

The data in Table 4 indicates a relatively high degree of determination of generalized trust by the horizontal and vertical trust variables in all the cities studied. In other words, in most of the cities studied, with the exception of Lodz, about 30% of the variation in the scale of generalized trust can be explained by the values of the other two forms. With some simplification, it can therefore be concluded that approximately 30% of the variation in the scale of generalized trust contained in the answers to questions like “Can most people be trusted?” is a consequence of the transfer of attitudes from the objects known to the respondent from the informal and institutional dimension to the indeterminate universe of “most people”.

The remaining 70% of the explanation is, however, using the terms of Barbara Misztal, beyond the emotional experience and rules of political cooperation and is located in established stereotypes, internalized norms and routine attitudes and actions rooted in the residents’ habitus. The levels of β coefficients indicate, however, that generalized trust is not determined to the same extent by the levels of horizontal and vertical trust. To a much greater extent it is a derivative of attitudes towards family members, neighbors, co-workers and residents (horizontal trust) rather than a derivative of trust in institutions (vertical trust). It is worth noting the significant similarity of this situation in all the cities studied. Only in Oradea (Romania) did we have a situation in which the impacts of both horizontal and vertical trust on generalized trust was similar.

The relationship between generalized trust and horizontal and vertical trust is very similar to that which exists between horizontal trust and generalized and vertical trust. Also in this second equation, as is clear from the data presented in Table 5, the coefficient of determination in all cities explains about 30% of the variability of the dependent variable. The relationship between generalized and horizontal trust is two-sided. This means that generalized trust is determined by horizontal trust, and horizontal trust by generalized trust, to a similar degree.

The β coefficients in Tables 4 and 5 for these relationships are very similar. Thus, trust in family, neighbours, co-workers and residents of the city generates trust in most people in a similar range, and trust expressed in relation to people in general is a basis for building trust in familiar people from informal circles. In the case of horizontal trust the exception is again the situation in Oradea, where the ‘contribution’ of generalized and vertical trust in explaining horizontal trust is positive and the most similar.

In other cities a negative relationship between vertical trust and horizontal was reported. This means that the greater the distrust in institutional structures, the higher the trust in people in the abstract sense and in specific members of in-

formal groups and communities. Referring to distinctions between collective and distributive identifications [Ossowski, 1967], it seems that in the studied cities the declared institutional distrust was not so much a consequence of a negative evaluation of people as of the rules of functioning in formal structures.

There thus emerges the conclusion that the requirements of one's social role and an institution's interests in its ritual and in the context of its functioning are stronger in the surveyed cities than the subjectivity of actors undertaking various roles in the structures. [Meyer, Rowan, 2006] As a consequence, this means residents' subordination to institutional structures, which in turn do not raise trust in them due to their insufficient fulfillment of explicit expectations and functions.

TABLE 5. Matrix of coefficients of determination R^2 for linear OLS regression equations in different cities. The dependent variable is horizontal trust and the independent variables are generalized and vertical trust.

Cities	Determination coefficient		Generalised trust		Vertical trust	
	R^2	p.	β	p.	β	p.
Panevezys	.319	.000	.463	.000	-.208	.000
Lodz	.249	.000	.334	.000	-.274	.000
Miskolc	.273	.000	.417	.000	-.178	.000
Ivanovo	.328	.000	.548	.000	-.115	.004
Oradea	.282	.000	.386	.000	.233	.000

As the data in Table 6 (below) shows, the determination of vertical trust by generalized and horizontal trust is much lower than the determination of generalized trust by horizontal and vertical trust and the determination of horizontal trust by vertical and generalized trust. This negative dependence suggests that mistrust in institutions is specifically compensated by more positive attitudes towards familiar people and human beings as creatures sharing certain basic norms and values. However, as it results from earlier presented data, this human world refers mainly to the closest family, and to a lesser extent to neighbours, co-workers or residents of the city. In other words, we are dealing with the mental process of withdrawal not only from the public and the formal sphere, but also the private sphere if it goes beyond family parochialism. This process is most visible in Lodz and Ivanovo.

TABLE 6. Matrix of coefficients of R^2 determination for linear regression equations in particular cities. The dependent variable is vertical trust and the independent variables are generalized and horizontal trust.

Cities	Determination coefficient		Generalised trust		Horizontal trust	
	R^2	p.	B	p.	B	p.
Panevezys	.150	.000	-.181	.001	-259	.000
Lodz	.195	.000	-.228	.000	-292	.000
Miskolc	.233	.000	-.361	.000	-188	.000
Ivanovo	.032	.000	-.022	.703	-.165	.004
Oradea	.239	.000	.319	.000	.247	.000

The values of the R^2 and β coefficients contained in Table 6 confirm the large gap between the world of people and institutions in the surveyed cities. This duality of the two worlds was most evident in Russian Ivanovo, and weaker but also clear in Lithuanian Panevezys and Polish Lodz. It was least visible in Hungarian Miskolc and Romanian Oradea. The presented results may provide some argument for support of the hypothesis of the significant influence of a common institutional heritage formed over a long period of time on one's perspective on the way of their functioning and their perception in modern times.

The analyses demonstrate that horizontal trust is the form that, from a statistical point of view, has the biggest 'share' in the development of other forms of trust. At the same time vertical trust is the most autonomous compared to the other two forms, which means that it is to the greatest extent determined not so much by the attitudes of trust in other component items but by the evaluation of activities carried out by institutional structures.

5. COHESION AND DOMINANT PATTERNS OF SOCIAL TRUST IN POST-INDUSTRIAL CITIES

As mentioned in the introduction, the issue of consistency of attitudes of trust is studied less frequently than the relationship of trust to economic development and the advancement of democratization processes. If such analyses are conducted at all, they mostly concern the correlation occurring within particular forms, and less frequently among those forms. The same applies to the analysis of certain patterns of links binding together specific values of the three basic forms of trust. In other words, we have more empirical data about the importance of trust for other phenomena than about the internal structure of these phenomena. The observations in the literature oscillate essentially around two positions.

Some researchers, e.g. Russell Hardin or Piotr Sztompka, are willing to accept the thesis of the inconsistency in the phenomenon of trust due to different types of attitudes, while others, like Valerie Braithwaite [1998] are rather inclined to the thesis of the transitivity of attitudes of trust, which means recognition of the principle of consistency.

The results in Table 7 do not entirely coincide either with the former or the latter viewpoint.

TABLE 7. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the particular forms of trust in the surveyed cities.

City and country	N	Alpha for horizontal trust – 4 component items	Alph for vertical trust –12 componentitems	Alpha for for generalized trust – 3 component items	Alpha for three indexes HT/VT/GT
PanevezysLT	400	.783	.700	.726	.166
Lodz PL	700	.802	.650	.813	.152
Miskolc HU	400	.846	.760	.742	.109
Ivanovo RUS	437	.780	.772	.766	.438
Oradea RO	428	.924	.789	.766	.703
Total	2365	.758	.864	.752	.346

It turns out that there were two distinct phenomena in the studied cities. On one hand we can observe a high level of consistency of attitudes within the individual indexes. This phenomenon occurred in all the cities studied in relation to each form of trust. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is, in these cases, so high that the items included in the respective indexes may be regarded as elements of the individual scales. On the other hand, however, a clear lack of consistency of attitudes of trust was identified if we take as the basis for such a conclusion the relationships among the three indexes characterizing the direction and force of trust among its forms. This trend is evident in Panevezys, Lodz, Miskolc and Ivanovo.

A certain divergence in this situation was reported only in Romanian Oradea, where there was a high degree of consistency of attitudes, but as to the direction these were attitudes of mistrust rather than trust. The high level of consistency of attitudes within the three forms of trust confirms the earlier findings by Kamil Brzezinski [2012] reported for the population of the Lodz region. The same trend with regard to generalized and vertical trust was recorded in the 6th ESS round for 24 European countries. In this case, the alpha for generalized trust was .785, while for vertical trust it was .912.

Thus there are good grounds to formulate the conclusion about the transitivity of attitudes of trust within its forms. The inconsistency of attitudes, confirmed

by low values of Cronbach's coefficient (.346 for the whole set) in our study, is a consequence of a complete lack of trust in institutional structures and in the residents of one's city of residence, a high trust in family members, and differentiated generalized trust and trust in neighbors and co-workers.

The alpha value was slightly higher for three similar indexes of trust in the research by Kamil Brzezinski (.512), but not high enough to allow to one to talk about a significant coherence between different forms of trust. In contrast, the alpha value calculated for two forms of trust (generalized and vertical) for 24 European countries (.387) was almost identical to our study. Thus, there are serious grounds for rejecting the hypothesis of transitivity of attitudes of trust among its three forms.

Based on the coherence of different values of three indexes of trust identified with the help of cluster analysis, we can distinguish five dominant patterns of social trust.

TABLE 8. Patterns of forms of social trust in post-industrial cities studied (in %).

Cities	Cluster 1 GT* 1.34 HT 1.17 VT -1.00	Cluster 2. GT -1.55 HT -.73 VT -.54	Cluster3 GT .19 HT -.37 VT -.29	Cluster 4 GT -.38 HT 1.08 VT -.65	Cluster 5 GT 1.21 HT 1.75 VT .34	Total % 1.b
Panevezys (LT)	29.3 (23.0)**	12.8 (11.7)	10.0 (6.9)	44.0 (27.2)	4.0 (8.3)	100 (400)
Lodz (PL)	24.1 (33.2)	15.9 (25.4)	38.1 (46.0)	17.4 (18.9)	4.4 (16.1)	100 (700)
Miskolc (HU)	17.8 (13.9)	21.0 (19.2)	21.0 (14.5)	36.0 (22.3)	4.3 (8.9)	100 (400)
Ivanovo(RUS)	24.9 (21.4)	19.9 (19.9)	30.9 (23.3)	11.4 (7.7)	12.8 (29.2)	100 (437)
Oradea (RO)	10.0 (8.4)	24.3 (23.8)	12.6 (9.3)	36.2 (24.0)	16.8 (37.5)	100 (428)
Total	(21.5)	(18.5)	(24.5)	(27.4)	(8.1)	100
N	509	437	580	647	192	2365

GT = Index of generalized trust, HT = Index of horizontal trust, VT = Index of vertical trust
**figures in brackets denote percentages in columns

As the data in Table 8 shows, the most common pattern is the one that combines a medium-low level of horizontal trust with a simultaneous low level of generalized and vertical trust (27.4%). In other words, it is an attitude of social closeness, reserving trust primarily for family and close acquaintances, indirectly proving a high sense of risk and uncertainty. Such an orientation is to some extent

typical for members of those communities who fear that their own resources will not be sustainable and therefore try to restrict the access of others to their own environment.

This occurs often in socially-excluded groups. Since the studied cities belong to the group of communities that suffered the most transition costs at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, it is not surprising that a high percentage of respondents demonstrated an attitude of trust only to their family and closest circles. This type of attitude of trust prevails mainly in Lithuanian Panevezys (44%), and to a lesser extent in Romanian Oradea (36.2%) and Hungarian Miskolc (36.0%). It occurred to a much lower extent in Polish Lodz and Russian Ivanovo. This means that in the latter two cities the sense of exclusion from institutionalized society is lower than in the first three.

Second, in terms of its occurrence (24.5%), the model pattern of social trust is close to an ambivalent attitude because it involves a very low level of generalized trust and combined with a low level of vertical and horizontal trust. A characteristic feature of this attitude is far-reaching caution, but not yet a definite lack of trust in the context of its three forms. This is declared by people slightly undecided about the direction of their attitude. It was visible most often in Lodz (38.1%) and Ivanovo (30.9%), and least visible in Panevezys (10.0%) and Oradea (12.6%).

The third type of attitude is a clearly contrast between the high levels of generalized and horizontal trust on the one hand, and a strong distrust of the institutional structures on the other. Its essence is a strong focus on human beings and at the same time a clear distrust of institutional structures. It is not only about positive attitudes towards people in one's inner circle, but also about a belief in the positive nature of man. Persons who, within the framework of this attitude, declare distrust of the institutional structures probably do so mainly because of the rules and principles of their functioning, and not because of the characteristics of persons performing the functions. The overall average of respondents who manifested this type of attitude was approximately 21.5%. It was most common among the inhabitants of Panevezys (29.3%) and Lodz and Ivanovo (24%), and least often in Oradea (10%).

The last two patterns distinguished on the basis of cluster analysis occurred the least frequently in the studied set. Pattern 4 (18.5%) is characterized by a lack of social trust in all studied forms. The fifth model (8.1%) is its opposite, that is, it takes into account generalized, horizontal and vertical trust. A complete lack of trust is most common in Oradea (24.3%) and Miskolc (21.0%), and least likely in Panevezys, Ivanovo and Lodz. The differences between the first two and the other three cities are not statistically significant. In turn, the largest percentage of

people manifesting complete trust were identified in Oradea and Ivanovo, while in Panevezys, Lodz and Miskolc the proportion of such attitudes was around 4%.

It can therefore be concluded that in the cities studied a high deficit of social trust is clearly observable. As many as 70% of all respondents demonstrated patterns in which there was a lack of trust in at least two of the three analyzed forms. The most common distrust was in institutional structures. This is a factor which impedes undertaking and implementing developmental activities by these structures and their representatives. Without regaining trust it will be difficult to carry out activities and initiatives that require some cooperation with the local population.

Therefore it may be concluded that social foundations for undertaking cooperation and mutual understanding, not only between local authorities and residents but also among the residents themselves, are fragile. Taking into account the coherences that occur among the three forms of trust with a predominance of positive attitudes, the studied cities can be divided into two categories. The first of these includes Ivanovo, Panevezys and Lodz, where the load of trust all forms in overall significantly higher than in Miskolc and Oradea.

CONCLUSIONS

We believe that the results of the empirical studies conducted in the five selected cities in post-industrial Central and Eastern European cities allow for formulating the following conclusions:

A generally low level of social trust in relation to all three studied forms was found. While in the case of generalized trust a low level of trust was found in Lodz, Ivanovo and Panevezys and a low level of distrust in Miskolc and Oradea, in the case of vertical trust relatively moderate and similar levels of distrust of the institutional structures in all the cities were observed, together with the relatively high levels of horizontal trust. It should be noted, however, that this last result is a consequence of the high trust in family members and an ambivalence, or even a lack of trust, in the members of other social groups and especially the local residents of the city where the respondents lived.

If one summarizes the three indexes for each city, it turns out that only in Panevezys did attitudes of trust outweigh attitudes of distrust. It should be noted however that the positive result for this city was mainly the result of a by higher attitude of trust in family members than in the other cities. If this component item was excluded from the analysis, then the situation in Panevezys would be similar

to the other cities, where the attitude of distrust prevailed over the attitudes of trust. The largest deficit of trust was recorded in Romanian Oradea, Polish Lodz and Russian Ivanovo.

The relatively low level of trust which is systematically noted in the post-socialist countries generally as well as in various districts thereof, for example in our research into selected cities, may be considered as the consequence of three main determinants. The first, albeit not the most important, is the growth of socio-economic inequality. The trust deficit with respect to both other persons and institutions that the residents lack a feeling of security. The second determinant is the ineffective functioning of social institutions, which were supposed to be, following the socio-cultural changes, guarantors of a more effective system of meeting social needs, not limited to the needs of the high-level social circles in the countries. Finally, the third determinant is the phenomenon of personalizing public authorities and political power, in certain areas encompassing the law itself. This is connected with specific social structures which have formed not as the result of impersonal laws and negotiations between various social groups and widely accepted by them, but as a result of the forced imposition of certain normative solutions and systems by powerful and dominant social circles on the remaining members of society.

With regard to the second question, it may be concluded that horizontal trust determines, to the greatest extent and in a positive sense, the level of generalized and vertical trust. Between horizontal and generalized trust, a relatively high degree of symmetrical transition of attitudes was observed from one type of component item to another, and vice versa. However, the relationship between vertical, generalized and horizontal trust has a negative direction. By this we mean the perception of the social world in the surveyed cities in basically two incoherent areas: the institutionalized and formalised area, and non-institutionalized and formalised area. The hypothesis of the consistency of attitudes of trust has been verified positively, but only partially.

There was a high degree of consistency of attitudes within the individual forms in all cities, except for Romanian Oradea, where no sufficiently consistent attitudes among the three forms of trust were recorded. This means that the development of synthetic measures of trust relating to all its forms should be treated with large methodological caution. As a result, the dominant patterns of trust structures are those that take into account the positive attitudes of trust towards members of informal groups and distrust of institutional structures and other people, taking into account trust in people in general and the general distrust of institutional structures and members of informal circles. The prevailing deficit of trust in the

surveyed cities raises questions about the view that these structures should be developed by the active participation of citizens. The apparent duality of the social world in the post-industrial cities studied is the dominant attitude. It can therefore be hypothesized that the observed situation is more a consequence of the specific nature of the macro-social transformations that have occurred in these cities rather than their local paths of development.

REFERENCES

- Ahn T.K., Ostrom E.** (2008), *Social Capital and Collective Action*, [in:] Castiglione D. Van Deth J.W., Wolleb G., (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Capital*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Badescu G.** (2003), *Social trust and democratization in the post-communist societies*, [in:] Badescu G. Uslaner E.M. (eds.), *Social Capital and the Transition to Democracy*, London: Routledge.
- Braithwaite V.** (1998), *Communal and Exchange Trust Norms; Their Value Base and Relevance to Institutional Trust*, [in:] Braithwaite V., Levi M. (eds.), *Trust & Governance*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Brzeziński K.** (2012), *Zaufanie społeczne w regionie łódzkim*, [in:] Starosta P. (ed.), *Zróżnicowanie zasobów kapitału ludzkiego i społecznego w regionie łódzkim*, Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Coleman J.S.** (1994), *Foundations of Social Theory*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Cook K.S., Hardin R., Levi M.** (2005), *Cooperation without Trust?*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- CBOS** (2012), *Komunikat z badań. Zaufanie społeczne*, Warszawa: COBOS, marzec 2012.
- Fukuyama F.** (1997), *Zaufanie. Kapitał społeczny a droga do dobrobytu*, Warszawa: PWN
- Gambetta D.** (2003), *Can we Trust Trust?* [in:] Ostrom E., Ahn T.K. (eds.), *Foundations of Social Capital*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Giddens A.** (2002), *Nowoczesność i Tożsamość. „Ja” i Społeczeństwo w Epoce Późnej Nowoczesności*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Growiec K.** (2011), *Kapitał społeczny. Geneza i społeczne konsekwencje*, Wydawnictwo SWPS, Academica, Warszawa.
- Hall P.A.** (1999), *Social Capital in Britain*, „British Journal of Political Science”, vol. 29 (3), pp. 417–461.
- Hardin R.** (2009), *Zaufanie*, Warszawa; Sic!
- Heimer C.A.** (2001), *Solving the Problem of Trust*, [in:] Cook K.S. (ed.), *Trust in Society*, Russell Sage Foundation: New York.
- Knack S., Keefer P.** (1997), *Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation*, „Quarterly Journal of Economics”, vol. 112 (4), pp. 1251–1288.
- Knight J.** (2001), *Social Norms and the Rule of Law; Fostering Trust in a Socially Diverse Society*, [in:] Cook K.S. (ed.), *Trust in Society*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Littlejohn J.** (1974), *Class Relations in a Rural Parish; Westring*, [in:] Bell C. Newby H. (eds.) *The Sociology of Community. A Selection Readings*, London: Frank Cass Co.

- Macek P., Markova I.** (2006), *Trust and Distrust in Old and New Democracies*, [in:] Markova (ed.), *Trust and Democratic Transition in Post-Communist Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Markova I.** (2006), *Introduction: Trust/Risk and Trust/Fear*, [in:] Markova (ed.), *Trust and Democratic Transition in Post-Communist Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Misztal B.** (1998), *Trust in Modern Societies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Möllering G.** (2006), *Trust; Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Levi M.** (1998), *A State of Trust*, [in:] Braithwaite V., Levi M., „Trust & Governance”, New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Luhmann N.** (1979), *Trust and Power*, New York; John Wiley and Sons.
- Luhmann N.** (1988), *Familiarity, confidence, trust: Problems and alternatives*, [in:] Gambetta D., (ed.) *Trust; Making and Breaking Co-operative Relations*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ossowski S.** (1967), *Dziela T. IV. O nauce*, Warszawa; Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Putnam R.D.** (2008), *Samotna Gra w Kregle. Upadek i odrodzenie wspólnot lokalnych w Stanach Zjednoczonych*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne Spółka z o.o
- Rossteutscher S.** (2008), *Social capital and civic engagement*, [in:] Castiglione D., Van Deth J.W., Wolleb G., (eds.) *The Handbook of Social Capital*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Rothstein B.** (2001), *Social Capital in the Social Democratic Welfare State*, „Politics and Society”, vol. 29, pp. 206–240.
- Rothstein B., Stolle D.** (2008), *Political Institutions and Generalized Trust*, [in:] Castiglione D., Van Deth J.W., Wolleb G. (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Capital*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Sztompka P.** (2007), *Zaufanie. Podstawa społeczeństwa*, Kraków; Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Simmel G.** (1997), *Filozofia pieniądza*, Poznań, Fundacja Humaniora.
- Simmel G.** (2005), *Socjologia*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Uslaner E.M.** (2003), *Trust and Civic Engagement in East and West*, [in:] Badescu G., Uslaner E.M., *Social Capital and Transition to Democracy*, London: Routledge.
- Uslaner E.M.** (2008), *Trust as a moral value*, [in:] Castiglione D., Van Deth J.W., Wolleb G., (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Capital*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Watier P., Markova I.** (2006), *Trust as a Psychological Feeling; Socialization and Totalitarianism*, [in:] Markova (ed.) *Trust and Democratic Transition in Post-Communist Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Paweł Starosta
Uniwersytet Łódzki
Kamil Brzeziński
Uniwersytet Łódzki

STRUKTURA ZAUFANIA SPOŁECZNEGO W MIASTACH POSTPRZEMYSŁOWYCH EUROPY ŚRODKOWO-WSCHODNIEJ

Streszczenie

Zaufanie społeczne, jako jedno z abstrakcyjnych pojęć, mimo licznych publikacji oraz badań empirycznych, które zostały mu poświęcone, nadal wzbudza znaczne kontrowersje w dyskursie naukowym. Kontrowersje te pobudzają nowe refleksje teoretyczne oraz badania empiryczne poświęcone temu pojęciu. Przyczyniły się one również do powstania niniejszego artykułu, którego głównym celem poznawczym jest ustalenie struktury postaw zaufania w badanych miastach postprzemysłowych tj. uchwycenia pewnych podobnych i odmiennych koincydencji pomiędzy głównymi formami tego zjawiska. Z kolei celem metodologicznym jest zbadanie spójności i niespójności trzech podstawowych form zaufania (zgeneralizowanego, horyzontalnego i wertykalnego) oraz kierunków relacji zachodzących pomiędzy nimi. W związku z powyższym, oprócz prezentacji wyników dotyczących poziomu zaufania społecznego w badanych miastach, istotnym elementem niniejszego artykułu będzie uchwycenie koincydencji zachodzących pomiędzy trzema podstawowymi formami zaufania, co będzie odgrywało istotną rolę w metodologii przyszłych badaniach empirycznych, gdyż wykazanie znaczącej spójności postaw pomiędzy trzema wspomnianymi formami, stanowić będzie argument na rzecz ich wykorzystywania dla konstruowania bardziej syntetycznych wskaźników, podczas gdy brak takiej spójności sugerować będzie pewną powściągliwość w takim postępowaniu.

Słowa kluczowe: miasta postprzemysłowe, zaufanie społeczne, zaufanie zgeneralizowane, zaufanie horyzontalne, zaufanie wertykalne, struktura zaufania społecznego.