
ECONOMICS

Sociology

Zhan Toshchenko,
*Russian State University for the
Humanities,
Moscow, Russian Federation,
E-mail: zhtantosh@mail.ru*

Received: June, 2014
1st Revision: September, 2014
Accepted: November, 2014

**DOI: 10.14254/2071-
789X.2014/7-3/11**

JEL Classification: E03, P21,
Z13

Toshchenko, Z. (2014), Economic Consciousness in Russia: Contradictions and Paradoxes, *Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 7, No 3, pp. 141-154. DOI: 10.14254/2071-789X.2014/7-3/11

ECONOMIC CONSCIOUSNESS IN RUSSIA: CONTRADICTIONS AND PARADOXES

ABSTRACT. The article describes phenomenon of economic consciousness on different levels of social organization of Russian society – nation-wide, regional, units & organizations, and personal levels. The bases for the analysis were the data comparison from the national surveys of 1990 and 2012 and different other results of some Russian research centers. Main tendencies and specific features of evolution of the economic consciousness were revealed on all abovementioned levels.

Keywords: economic consciousness, activity, behavior, trust, economic reforms, public opinion.

Introduction

Talk about economic consciousness in Russia should be started with one of the statements of prominent French mathematician, physicist and philosopher B. Pascal (1623-1662): "What a chimera is this man? What an innovation, what a monster, a chaos, a bundle of contradictions, what a miracle! Judge of all things, imbecile worm of the earth; bearer of truth, cloaca of uncertainty and errors; the glory and stuff of the universe.... Learn, the proud, what a paradox you are! Be humble, powerless mind, shut up stupid nature; know that a man is infinitely superior to a man".

This is a figurative expression of the great thinker reflects an attempt to know a human being, its ambiguous nature, its place and part in solving urgent social problems. He, as the best human minds, turned to the man as the measure of all things and phenomena in all its contradictory nature.

And the first steps towards understanding human nature revealed previously unknown difficulties and anomalies, the disorder of a man with himself, with social institutions, whose activities he is involved in, with social organizations in which he operates, with the official teams, of which he is a member, i.e. with all the micro-, meso- and macro-world. This disorder can be characterized by a variety of indicators – from logical contradictions of knowledge and development to the extreme forms of contradictions, finding expression in the paradoxical nature.

The role of human personality cannot be reduced only to the subjective factor, as it is done in most cases by post-modernism in disclosing its essence, its nature and characteristics. This phenomenon is more extensive, wide, versatile in its manifestations, which entails the need to consider not only subjective, but also objective conditions for the functioning of social life.

Paradoxes and their role in the life of society attracted the thinkers long ago – in antiquity. But if B. Pascal expressed it in relation to a human being, trying to know its essence, the thinkers of ancient civilizations dealt with the paradoxical nature, with regard to the process of cognition, the processes of logical thinking.

The great merit of Pascal was that he was one of the first to apply the concept to the study of the real paradox of human existence, consciousness and behavior. He raised the question of the need to identify and explore the paradoxes and their manifestation in real life, in the implementation of various activities, for the paradoxical characteristic not only of the process of cognition, but reality itself. That approach, which emerged in modern times, has created a fundamentally new way of thinking: not only God, not only the state, not only the society have become the focuses of scientific understanding. Best minds turned to a man (human being) as a measure of all things and phenomena.

However, a new step in his study was implemented only in the twentieth century, when social thought attempted to learn the essence of man, to express its main features and characteristics in terms of economic, political and social changes taking place so deep and so fast that it could not effect on the consciousness and behavior. Trying to explain these changes, during this period there were such characteristics of its nature as "one-dimensional man" (G. Marcuse), "rebellious person" (A. Camus), "lonely man" (F. Kafka), "closed" (N. Elias), "man-beast" (J. Baudrillard). For each of those features there is worth a thorough analysis of contradictory tendencies in the mind and behavior. However, these definitions are answering, in our opinion, only the question on selected aspects of the specifics and peculiarities of human activity.

In the national scientific literature the attempts were made to describe the man and his fortune in post-Soviet Russia. In a number of works the human essence was linked only to the processes taking place in the economy or politics, but also in terms of social well-being. In short, referring to these definitions, we can say that the mass man called shovel crafty person lost, catastrophic. But each of these definitions, in our opinion, affect only one of the essential aspects of a person, and cannot be accepted as its full characterization.

In search of an answer to this question, the author applied to the study of mind and behavior during radical social change that allows for the most complete, precise description of a set of traits, all the contradictions of consciousness and behavior.

1. Research and methodology

As the base of this study is the comparison of 1990 and 2012, the researchers took statistic data of these years, describing the level of economy (*Table 1*).

Table 1. Economic indicators in USSR (1990) and Russia (2012)

Indicators	USSR, 1990	Russia, 2012
Gross Domestic Product	2nd place in world	6th place in world
Proceeding industries	1- 2nd place in world	17 th place in world
Output of machine-tools (thousands)	70	3
Trade share in GDP (%)	7	27 (1st place in world)
Output of shoes (millions of pairs)	520	107 (11th place in world)
Human development index	No data	56th place in world

Source: own complication based on www.worldbank.org.

These data display obviously a very contradictory picture. On the one hand is Russia after collapse of the USSR and emergence on its former territory of 15 independent states has

naturally decreased its share in the soviet-times GDP having however retained comparably high overall indices – 6th place after USA, China, Japan, India and Germany. On the other hand these indices are the sum of rather contradictory components: the 1st place of trade share in GDP and a practically high loss in industrial development – Russia is the 17th in processing industries production in the world. These data are closely tied to Human development index figures where Russia, globally, is the 56th.

To my mind, this contradictory situation finds its reflection in public and especially economic consciousness. People might not know some specific figures, but they understand essence and contents of ongoing political and economic changes.

The researchers proposed a fundamentally new thesis, which stems from the fact, that genuine picture of situation in society and its characteristics can be achieved only through sociological analysis of economic, political, moral and other forms of social consciousness and behavior. This approach includes not only the study of society consciousness in general, but the expert opinions in comparison to objective (statistical) data, as well as information published in periodical press and materials in academic periodicals. In accordance with this attitude such aspects of social consciousness as knowledge, appraisals, motives, needs, value systems, interests were revealed. During the research of the behavior really performed actions were being captured. In accordance to this purpose, goals and hypothesis of the research were formed.

Comparison of 1986-1990 and 2012 surveys led to certain corrections in research instruments due to the changing political and economic situation in the world. Some of the indicators fell out of date, others were corrected, but significant number of questions remained valid. In the 1986 study 1360 people from 6 regions of the country were interviewed, in 1988 – 1485 people from 9 regions, in 1990 – 1525 – factory workers and national economy specialists from 17 regions, in 2012 – 1201 people in 12 constituent regions.

Economic consciousness during these years was analyzed on various levels of social organization – all-Russian, regional, organizational units level, as well as individual perceptions, which allowed to elicit general, specific and peculiar traits of the trust on these levels.

This methodological requirement led to in the necessity to consider peculiarities of trust in such aspects of a person's life, when one is represented as a citizen (country level), resident (specific territory – region, city, rural area), employee-worker, member of a social group or community (labor organization, place of residence or resting-place) and finally as the subject of interpersonal level.

This study design was also chosen based on the fact of paradoxes, regarding that people unknowingly represent an astonishing phenomenon – the same person includes at the same time opposite, and sometimes mutually exclusive assessments, guidelines and intentions. Person is like running from himself and from society in opposite directions at the same time. Our coeval, often disoriented, without knowing it, professes opposing truth, and what is striking, refers to mutually exclusive opinions and judgments with confidence, focusing on them quite frankly, often unaware of this incredible inconsistency.

Thus, the paradoxes – in most cases are divergent, contradictory and even conflicting opinions, judgments, attitudes, orientations, actions that exist simultaneously, combine and operate in the minds and behavior of the same people.

As the paradoxes related to all areas of social life and their diversity, this study will focus on only one of their manifestation – the economic sphere.

2. Economic consciousness of an individual as citizen

On this level trust to the economic and political system, social and political institutes is evaluated. Analysis of the information gathered on all Russian level shows that the level of trust to general transformations conducted in the country varies significantly.

Comparison of the 1990 and 2012 data shows that some positive changes in evaluation of political system in the country took place, especially acknowledging the fact, that the economic situation in the country is normal (good). But factor of economic situation improvement in the country, in our opinion, can be referred to people engaged in private enterprise, commerce and service industry, which developed significantly and mustered successful economic situation. At the same time estimates of unsatisfying condition decreased slightly – to almost 54% in 2012, compared to 61% in 1990.

Table 1a. How do you value current economic situation in Russia? (% to the number of respondents)

1990 Appreciation	%	2012 Appreciation	%
Normal	1	Good	16,6
Complicated	38	There are some difficulties, but not bad	29,5
-		Rather bad than good	35,5
Bad	61	Very bad	10,7
-		Cannot say	7,7

Note: mark (-) means that this question was lacking.

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Analysis of these data allows to try to understand the reasons for such evaluation of economic situation in the country and figure out why trust to one or another institute falls down or varies significantly (*Table 2*).

Table 2. Which of these circumstances in to your opinion hinders the economic development in our country?

Factors	2012	1990
Corruption	48,4	46
Impunity of lawbreakers	36,8	-
Flaws in economic policy	34,9	62
Mismanagement	30,4	-
Administrative arbitrariness of authorities in economic management	24,6	30
Lack of qualified managers	18,7	-
Absence of the conditions for free entrepreneurship	14,2	23
Monopoly of producers of goods and services	10,4	34
Wage-leveling out of employees	7,8	44
Influence of criminal groups on economy	7,4	-
Dependence of economy on political and ideological dogmas	7,3	28
Transformation of production and services into almshouse for idlers	4,8	34
Other	0,7	
Cannot say	3,2	

Note: Mark (-) means that this question was not asked in 1990.

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Analysis of the data presented in this table indicates that in 1990 mistrust for economic policy of the state took first place, which means that the authorities were made guilty, while in 2012 first place took the evaluation of economic functioning mechanism – corruption, criminal groups in management and trade. It should be mentioned that on the first hand such vice as corruption vary very little from the data of 1990. However, considering that impunity of lawbreakers in the 2012 research is evaluated highly – claimed by almost 35% of respondents, this is nothing else but the same corruption. Such conclusion allows to assert that corruption in its various forms increased twofold according to the public opinion. Administrative arbitrariness, which slightly vary in last 25 years – 30% in 1990 and 24,6% in 2012, continues to annoy people in modern Russia.

Public consciousness cannot digest and come to terms with such ideas on the shape of the new masters, that does not decorate Russian society and our ideas of honor and dignity. People are exasperated by ostentatious presentation, arrogance of wealth, and a surfeit of cheeky new rich, shameless behavior, accompanied by the absence of any taste and ethical concepts.

In other words, the paradox lies in the fact that the social consciousness, supporting market reforms, categorically opposes to the subjects of the transformations, against those who really and actually represents a change in economic life in Russia.

The paradoxical nature of consciousness and behavior is also seen in connection with the official focus on "capitalizing" people's mind – to make the private interest principal, leading.

Data of another research centers also indicate that there is no high trust to economic changes in the country (*Table 3*).

Table 3. How do you think, does the country go in the right or the wrong direction starting from August 1991? (% to the number of respondents)

	2003	2005	2007	2012, October
In the right direction	30	25	28	42
In the wrong direction	47	50	37	39
Cannot say	23	25	35	19

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

These data witness that opinions obtained divide the society into approximately equal groups. It is evident, that respondents, who support official course, are inclined to trust those subjects of changes, who are in control of this course. They can bring convincing arguments in defense of their position judging from their satisfying economic and social position. Thus it is completely understandable why they in any event advocate current course of the political system. This number correlates to some extent with the data of all Russian election, which although shows the approval of 50-60% for United Russia party and its leaders, related to overall electorate (and not only to the number of those appearing at election process) indicates that this approval amounts to 40%.

No less convincing arguments can be brought by those, who reckon that the country goes in the wrong direction. Their real economic and social status demonstrates that they are experiencing significant difficulties and losses while some people have doubts about the perspectives for achieving own welfare. As well as the first group they can bring convincing arguments why the country continues to go in the wrong direction, comparing it with the situation, which directly concerns their everyday life. Apparently they do not trust Russian national institutions and their promises. The number of people voting for oppositional parties

is formed exactly by the group mentioned together with those who abstain from the evaluation of the country's path. This also correlates with the data on participation (non-participation) in election campaigns.

What is clear that Russian society has not chosen a market orientation as the main means of transforming the economy and way of life, it has not yet become a leading theme in the public and private life. People are comparing not only bumps and failures of the Russian experience, but also the experience of countries that consistently and successfully operate in a market environment. The split in the understanding of market opportunities continue to exist, despite some increase in positive assessments of its forms and methods.

In public opinion of the people the political economy category, whether monetarist, fiscal or social-oriented do not dominate. In everyday life, people are asking the question to themselves and to others – who is guilty and responsible for their plight, for the lack of social and legal protection and support.

It is therefore not surprising that discontent begin to focus on those individuals who actually represent market relations, namely: businessmen, bankers, entrepreneurs and all the new actors of the economic theater, who are often called the "new Russians". If we proceed from the fact of the matter, they pave the way for new economic relations, represent the triumph of the new realities.

Economic changes in the country correlates with the appraisal of trust to main political institutes.

These forms of trust can be judged to a certain extent on the basis of the questions aimed at evaluating activities of various authority bodies (*Tables 4 and 5*).

Table 4. How do you evaluate the activity of forthcoming regulatory bodies? (% to the number of respondents)

Regulatory bodies	Positively	Negatively	Cannot say
President	47,0	26,5	26,5
Federal Government	26,3	38,5	35,2
The State Duma (parliament)	20,3	44,5	35,2
Head (Governor) of your region	38,2	29,9	31,9
Authorities of your city	30,4	39,6	30,0

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Table 5. How do you evaluate efforts to economy improvement on the part of (% to the number of respondents)

Regulatory bodies	Positively	Negatively	Cannot say
The CPSU Central Committee	8	38	54
Republican governments	18	27	55
Local bodies	9	36	55
Enterprises administration	19	29	52
Local party bodies	8	40	52

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Despite some peculiarities of question formulations, the very core of the subject remains the same. In general, the evaluation of regulatory bodies in modern Russia is higher than in Soviet Russia. But some factors should be taken into account. The country's economy in Soviet Russia as well as in the whole USSR collapsed due to the deeply wrong economic

policy in Perestroika period. Thoughtless reorganizations, resistance towards market relations introduction, hasty decisions, which had damaging influence on enterprises functioning, crude lawmaking such as the Law “About cooperation” led to the sharp downfall in trust to government bodies. Such situation had significant negative effect. But the other fact impresses in this comparison which has an almost 25-year break – there is practically no difference in negative characteristics describing the trust to authorities. On the first hand this phenomenon is hard to explain. The fact remains – despite the so-called democratic reforms and other attempts to give a new image to Russia, the number of people who negatively evaluate not only results of Gorbachev Perestroika, but also the activity of authority bodies in post-Soviet Russia remains virtually the same.

3. Economic consciousness of a person as a resident

A huge, in some cases crucial meaning gains interrelation with the environment where a person lives, works, rests, where he/she has everyday life. In other words a socially spatial location of a person plays significant role. This emerges primarily in evaluation of urban (rural) condition concerning those changes and processes on this level of social organization, and then in the evaluation of government efforts towards normal functioning establishment for the habitants. Data in this respect are fairly controversial, but can be compared with some degree of authenticity. Comparison of the data from *Table 5* and *6* (evaluation of local authorities in 2012 and local party bodies which had symbolized regional power in 1990) shows a positive shift. It can be explained by specific situations at the end of 1980s and in the early 2010s. In 1980s the country had went towards its collapse, the situation of critical needs fulfillment had dramatically escalated (lack of goods, unemployment growth, drastic decrease of social support, government disorganization, absence of clear development strategy), which led to refusal of trust. In 2010 people were troubled by certain vital and urgent problems such as situation in housing maintenance and utilities, transport problems, pension schemes.

In the meantime it is astonishing and in some specified sense paradoxical that negative evaluation of local authorities activity in the sphere of welfare securing, attitude towards environmental resources, regulation of economic affairs in the world of work, consumption and exchange did not change. Evaluation of consequences of transition to market relations can be referred exactly to these regional and local structures (*Table 6*).

Table 6. Which consequences caused the transition to market relations? (% to the number of respondents)

Factors	1990	2012
Standard of population prosperity was low	33	47,9
Injustice in labor compensation increased	12	45,5
Plunder of natural resources increased	13	54,5
Inflation increased	17	52,9
The number of economic crimes increased	18	56,4
Only wealthy people succeed	27	47,9

Source: own research based on Levada-Center’ data.

Analysis of this data shows that the strengthening of negative evaluation of social consequences of market reforms took place. It fits into the general evaluation of social sphere according to other researches indicating that a decline in social health and well-being occurred. The feeling of social justice violations strengthened. Such evaluation was given not

only by the people who are infringed by current changes, but also by people who are well arranged in their lives. Also it should be stated that this feeling of injustice is formed exactly in the sphere, with which he/she has a direct contact and about which he/she can judge by obvious and concrete indicators such as labor compensation, gap in the living standards etc. This is accompanied by characteristics of deviations existing in the city (district) according to people opinion (*Table 7*).

Table 7. To which extent are you bothered by following negative events in your city (district)? (% to the number of respondents)

Deviation	2012 Very and partly bother	1990 Very dangerous
Prostitution	44,9	35
Speculation	46,5	62
Discreditable practices in trade	70,3	55
Bribery	77,8	61
Racket, robbery	68,8	56
Fraud	77,8	40

Note. In 1990 survey the question was asked in a different way s.s. "Which events do you consider dangerous?"
Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

The data indicate that the number of various legal and moral deviations grew by half or even twice with the exception of speculation which became not so much a deviation from rules as a characteristic of competing activities. In these conditions it can be hardly spoken about trust in social life, because any of mentioned (and not mentioned) negative occurrences have their negative impact on mutual relations between people in this community. These tendencies are rather demonstrational, as the destruction of trust in initial social stage causes, as a consequence, deviations in all other forms of mutual relations of people and official institutions, as well as between people themselves, as they become not only regulators of people moral life, but more the object of commerce and the change of gaining income, profit, legal and illegal behavior.

4. Economic consciousness of a person as an employee

On this level of social organization economic consciousness is formed in the process of interaction with environment, in other words with the help of those conditions and factors which specify the behavior in certain conditions (*Table 8*). At this level, the main paradox is a paradox, which is associated with the opposition in the minds and behavior of people's social features as consumers and workers.

At the moment they are just in the opposite direction, although it is well known that only when they act consistently, we can talk about the rational functioning of not only the economy but also economic behavior, way of life. Though the real life goes in the way that the vector of efforts in these two roles is mutually exclusive. As a consumer, the persons strive to meet effectively and efficiently their material and spiritual needs, to have a perspective on their fuller enrichment and renewal. However, as an employee a person faces a different situation. He is not always paid for his work, and if paid, but not in adequately changing socio-economic environment. Products in the production of which he is involved, by different reasons are often not in demand. Results of work are often unnecessary, impaired. The current economic situation is such that more and more people – the workers and peasants, and professionals – realize that now neither mind nor talent or skilled hands are the key to success. Moreover, the prestige of the labor involved in the creation of wealth and spiritual values is promoted and supported by the state.

Table 8. If your work with great commitment, will your salary grow? (% to the number of respondents)

	1990	2012
Yes, significantly	6	17,4
A little	26	24,1
No / cannot say	68	58,5

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Analysis of this position allows to indicate that we observe a clear shift in evaluation of the person's position as a worker, though this shift cannot be called determinative. It can be supposed with a higher possibility that the growth of people number positively evaluating the prospect or receiving higher pay for their work took place because of those who were able to work individually or in privately owned organizations.

This indicator is something like the statistical number of employees engaged outside public ownership. At the same time it is evident that shift from public to other forms of ownership didn't bring significant changes – three of five respondents (i.e. approximately 60%) couldn't find their position. This allows to conclude that despite all promises about possibility to link one's your work with income from it, there is no real shift in trust to the situation formed in production and other organizations (*Table 9*).

Table 9. Question "How do you evaluate...?"

Indicators	Improves	Declines	Cannot say
Labor organization	53,5/20	24,4/22	22,1/ 58
Sanitary-hygienic conditions	51,0/13	20,2/23	28,8/63
Discipline at work	53,3/16	23,4/36	23,3/40
Labor compensation	46,5/25	33,9/25	19,6/50
Social-psychological climate	41,8/-66	29,6/-15	28,6/19

Note. 1. In numerator the data of 2012 are given, in denominator – data of 1990. 2. In the poll of 1990 the answer "cannot say" sounds as "doesn't change" 3. In 1990 question "Social-psychological climate" was formulated as "moral support".

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Analysis of this table shows that improvement of main indicators, characterizing inner centeredness of organization, took place. That is to say, steadying of worker position differs in a positive way from this characteristic as a citizen and a resident. It can be possibly explained by the fact that in 1990 the destruction of economic bases became critical: the parameters of working process organization could not be characterized as stability and certainty.

These conclusions are obliquely confirmed by the *Table 10*. The data in this table testifies that independence and responsibility of a worker have grown. From our point of view this is connected to a large extent with the fact, that many respondents who took part in survey are the owners of businesses or are employed in private or joint-stock companies.

Table 10. Do you feel yourself as leader on your working place, in the department and in the organization in general? We mean the will to take care of equipment, to work effectively, care for performance of your organization (% to the number of respondents)

Level of working situation	Yes	In a certain degree	No	No answer
On the individual working place	60,1/38	30,5(-)	9,2/62	0,2(-)
In the department (division, shop floor etc)	41,9/16	36,7(-)	21,0//84	0,4(-)
In the organization	32,6/10	36,9(-)	30,1/90	0,4 (-)

Note. 1. In numerator the data of 2012 are given, in denominator – data of 1990 2. Mark (-) means that this question was not asked in 1990.

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

5. Economic consciousness on personal level

Trust as a social phenomenon can develop to the fullest extent when it is asserted on a micro level, in a workplace, while on rest, in everyday life in small groups, in the groups of personal, direct contact. But these are not only the relations which depend on personal perception of another people, or liking/disliking those who surround a person and with whom one contacts in everyday life. Social parameters also influence on an interpersonal level, which is confirmed by the 2012 data (*Table 11*).

Table 11. What defines social well-being and profile of a person? (% to the number of respondents)

Features	2012	1990
Possession of capital, money	52,8	42,1
Possession of power or access to it	35,1	40,3
Social standing	34,6	-
Personal achievements, training	33,3	
Personal traits (intellect, attraction)	19,3	
Other	3,1	

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

It should be mentioned that during this time period a significant fall in trust to social institutes took place while trust to immediate environment grew significantly (*Table 12*).

Table 12. If you happen to be in a difficult situation, to whom will you look for help? (% to the number of respondents)

To family members	74,2	42,2
To friends	49,1	40,1
To organization executives	18,1	45,3
To local authorities	8,6	34,0
To labor unions	8,2	21,4
To political parties	2,1	46,6
To colleagues	21,1	-
Other	1,6	6,0

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

This data dramatically contrast with the data of the late 1990s, when people trusted significantly more organizations executives and looked for help to political parties and labor unions. At that period trust to higher authorities was rather high. The so called “encapsulation” took place, which means trust closure only on personal (kindred) level. It was aided also by the official course towards property individualization, which has its positive and negative consequences.

A comparison of the data of all Russian surveys indicates that there is a contradictory process of economic consciousness and behavior functioning which significantly influences the level of trust to current economic and political system (*Table 13*).

Table 13. Does the transition to market relations conduce positive changes of following economic indicators? (% to the number of respondents)

Indicators	Yes	No	Cannot say
Prestige of honest employment strengthened	30,6 /26	47,0	22,4
Wage-leveling is overcome	32,6/28	44,7	22,7
Natural resources are better used	22,2/14	54,2	23,6
Goods and services became more accessible	65,0/40	25,6	9,4
The ruble strengthened, inflation decreased	26,6/19	53,2	20,2
Tariff rates and prices lowered	13,7/13	75,0	11,3
Speculation and theft are overcome	14,5/19	69,6	15,9
Income control is improved	24,7/9	52,6	22,7
Population welfare is heightened	29,4/19	48,0	22,6

Source: own research based on Levada-Center’ data.

Or otherwise the transition to market relations stipulates following negative consequences? (% to the number of respondents)

Consequences	Yes	No	Cannot say
Injustice in labor compensation strengthened	45,5/12	31,7	22,8
Plunder of natural resources strengthened	54,5/13	21,1	24,4
Many goods became inaccessible for common people	40,6/43	44,8	14,6
Inflation strengthened	52,9/17	23,1	24,0
Tariff rates and prices grew higher	78,1/52	12,1	9,8
Mass unemployment rose	40,7/40	27,8	31,5
The number of economic crises increased	56,4/18	17,6	26,0
Only the wealthy benefited	54,3/27	20,4	25,3
Population welfare lowered	47,9/53	27,7	24,4

Note. 1. In numerator the 2012 data are given, in denominator – data of 1990s. 2. In the 1990 survey only the answer “yes” was available. 3. All the answers in 1990 sounded in a different way hypothetically “What do you expect from market relations development?”

Source: own research based on Levada-Center’ data.

Analysis of these data indicates that there is a counterintuitive situation influencing peoples’ trust. On one hand, trust to main indicators of economic development grew. On the other hand, the evaluation of how these indicators impact the life of people worsened. Especially astonishing is the fact that according to some indicators such as unemployment and welfare level the evaluation practically did not change during the last quarter of the century. And these are leading indicators of living.

In conclusion resumptive data about how people treat political authority can be brought. This is the core of all political trust in Russian society (*Table 13*). Exactly this evaluation deforms the process of trust formation, as the people are confirmed that current political authority does not reflect the position of the majority of population and is guided only by interests of two groups – state bureaucracy and wealthy population strata (*Table 14*).

Table 14. Distribution of the answers to question “Whose interests according to your opinion expresses and defends Russian state”? (% to the number of respondents)

	Impoverished layers	Middle class	Wealthy layer	All Russian citizens	State bureaucracy	Cannot say
2000	1	8	46	9	44	9
2005	1	8	54	8	52	15
2007	2	10	52	8	51	14
2011	2	11	49	12	42	14

Source: own research based on Levada-Center' data.

Conclusions

Proclaimed advantage of market relations cannot by itself break the road. If the market relations are not socially oriented, people will get into (a significant part of the population) poverty and deprivation, and despair. And this in turn is associated with possible social upheavals, despite the will of anybody. So, Russian society has almost no choice - either to take the way of the original (bloody, nasty and very long) accumulation of capital in the hope of a brighter future through the unknown time or the regulation of market relations, the revision of the forms and methods of economic policy. And if the first way does not need to work hard (let's say the story itself will lead us on the path of a prosperous life), then the second way demands a lot of effort to steer the path, worthy men of the XXI century.

Thus, at the heart of economic paradoxes there are huge changes that have occurred in society in general, and in the life of every person. Under the modern conditions of Russian society the situation has radically changed, based on the relationship of the property and its derivative with respect to ownership, use and disposal. We have witnessed a change in the essential features of economic consciousness and behavior, which in the Soviet period were not only regulatory requirements, but also became a tradition, patterns of thought and activity of many millions of people.

This gap between the imaginary and real, between official policy and socio-economic realities, between the orientations and the results of the changes is the basis of the paradoxical nature that we see in today's life.

It should be noted that a significant contribution to this paradoxical confusion of what is happening was done by contradictory concepts of scientists from different dogmatic, populist or blindly copying someone else's experience ideas. Experience of managing in Russia in the 1990s convincingly showed that, firstly, it is impossible, even guided by the best intentions, to accelerate changes, ignore the lessons of international experience, and be away from real life. Second, scientific and political extremism, being based on the absolute monetarist methods and not taking into account the entire spectrum of modern views, cannot lead to success.

Hence, the paradox of the current and tomorrow's social and economic situation, and consequently economic consciousness and behavior of people is that the objective and subjective forces of the historical process are different, and sometimes go in opposite

directions, and that does not give stability and confidence in solving urgent problems of Russian society in the nearest future.

References

- Bolshakov, A. M. (1929), *Derevn'ya 1917-1927 (Village 1917-1927)*.
- Boykov, V. E., Ivanov, V. N., Toshchenko, Zh. T. (1990), *Obshchestvennoe soznanie i perestroika (Social Consciousness and Perestroika)*, Moscow.
- Desyat' let transformatsionnykh protsessov v stranakh TZVE i Rossii: rezultaty i uroki (Ten Years of Transformational Processes in the Countries CEE and Russia: Results and Lessons) (2010), *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*, No 5.
- Dratshev, V. K. (1977), *Ekonomicheskoe soznanie kak faktor razvitiya obshchestvennogo proizvodstva pri socializme (Economic Consciousness as Factor for Developing Social Production in Socialism)*. Minsk.
- Dushatskiy, L. E. (2009), Tsennostno-motivatsionnye dominanty Rossiyskikh predprinimateley (Dominant Values and Motivations of Russian Business People), *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, No 7.
- Fadeeva, O. P. (2007), Khozyaistvennye ukhlyadi v sovremennom rossiyskom sele (Economic Production in Contemporary Russian Countryside), *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, No 11.
- Fofanov, V.P. (1979), *Ekonomitsheskiye otnosheniya i ekonomicheskoe soznanie (Economic Relations and Consciousness)*, Novosibirsk.
- Gordeyev, A. (2012), Kursom stabilizatsii i razvitiya (Following the Course of Stabilization and Developments), *APK: ekonomika i upravlenie*, No 3-4.
- APK: ekonomika i upravlenie*, 1998, No 4.
- Kalugina, Z. I. (2011), *Paradoxy agrarnoy reformy v Rossii: sotsiologicheskiy analiz transformatsionnykh processov (Paradoxes of Agrarian Reforms in Russia: Sociological Analysis of Transformation Processes)*, Novosibirsk.
- Kolesov, N. D. (1986), *Ekonomitsheskoe myshlenie trudyashchikh i razvitie narodnogo khozyaystva (Economic Thinking of Workers and Development of National Economy)*, Moscow.
- Konsul'tant direktora (Director's Consultant)*, 2012, No 12.
- Kuz'min, S. A. (2007), O transformatsii derevenskogo ukhlyada I sud'bakh sel'skokhozyaystvennogo proizvodstva v Rossii (Transformation of Economy and Future of Production in the Countryside in Russia), *Mir Rossii*, No 1.
- Popov, V. D. (1981), *Ekonomitsheskoe soznanie: suzhnost, formirovanie i rol' v sotsialisticheskoy obshchestve (Economic Consciousness: Essence, Formation and Role in Socialist Society)*.
- Rossiyskiy statisticheskiy ezhegodnik (Russia's Statistical Year-book)* (2012), Goskomstat of Russia. Moscow.
- Russian Public Opinion Monitor (Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya. Ekonomitsheskiye i sotsialniye peremeny)* (1999), No 3. p. 17; (2010), No 4.
- Rutkevich, M. N. (2007), Transformatsiya sotsial'noy struktury rossiyskogo obshchestva (Transformation of Social Structure in Russian Society), *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, No 7.
- Sociologhia vlasti (Sociology of Political Power)*, 2009, No 2-3.
- Sokolova, G. N. (2005), *Ekonomitsheskaya sotsiologhia (Economic Sociology)*, Minsk.
- Steilmann, K. (1998), *Novaya filozofiya biznesa (New Philosophy of Business)*. 3 vols. Berlin, Vol. 1.
- Tumanov, S. V. (2010), *Sovremennaya Rossiya: massovoe soznanie i massovoe povedenie (Contemporary Russia: Mass Consciousness and Mass Behavior)*.

- Velikiy, P. P., Eliutina, M. E., Shteynberg, I. E., Bakhturina, L. V. (2011), *Stariki rossiyskoy derevni (Elders of Russian Village)*. Saratov.
- Verkhovin, V. I. (1998), *Ekonomitsheskaya sotsiologhia (Economic Sociology)*.
- Vinogradskiy, V. G. (2006), *Krestyanskie soobshchestva segodn'ya (yuzhnorossiyskiy variant) (Peasants' Communities Today. South-Russian Version)*, *Sotsiologhicheskiye issledovaniya*, No 6.
- Zabelin, A. (1993), *Razdum'e vslukh (Thinking aloud)*, *Rossia*, No 15.
- Zaslavskaya, T. I., Ryvkina, R. V. (1999), *Sotsiologhia ekonomicheskoy zhizni. Otsherki teorii (Sociology of Economic Life. Sketches of Theory)*. Novosibirsk.