KIER DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

KYOTO INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH

Discussion Paper No. 1118

"Social Capital in Russia in the Period of Turbulence"

Satoshi Mizobata, Kazuho Yokogawa, Victor Gorshkov, Hiroaki Hayashi and Vasiliy Anikin

June 2025



KYOTO UNIVERSITY

KYOTO, JAPAN

Social Capital in Russia in the Period of Turbulence*

Satoshi Mizobata¹ • Kazuho Yokogawa² • Victor Gorshkov³ • Hiroaki Hayashi⁴ • Vasiliy Anikin⁵

^{*} This research was supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 20H04404 "Social Structure of Russia from ¹ Kyoto Institute of Economic Research, Kyoto University; Ristumeikan University
² Kanagawa University
³ University of Niigata Prefecture
⁴ Ristumeikan University

⁵ HSE University

Social Capital in Russia in the Period of Turbulence

Abstract

This paper presents the results of a survey on social capital in Russia, conducted from December 2023 to January 2024. It represents the second round of research, following an initial survey conducted in early 2022. The survey's methodology for this round mirrors that of the first, with 1,600 individuals from across Russia surveyed on their perceptions of social networks, levels of trust, civic engagement, and evaluations of government policies. Conducted nearly two years after the start of the military conflict with Ukraine and the imposition of economic sanctions by Western countries, this paper aims to assess how social capital has evolved during this turbulent period. The findings indicate that Russian social capital has remained relatively stable. Key characteristics include low generalized trust, high particularized trust, strong networks among family, relatives, and close friends, as well as mutual support within these networks. There is also notable trust in the President and the military. However, slight shifts are observable, such as efforts of some respondents to form new social ties and networks and emerging social division, particularly pronounced in generational differences in attitudes toward Russia's government policies on Ukraine.

JEL classification: A13, A14, P52

Keywords: social capital, Russia, social network, social trust, civic engagement

要旨

この調査研究は、ロシアで 2023 年 12 月から 2024 年 1 月にかけて実施したソーシャル・キャ ピタルに関するアンケート調査に基づくもので、我々が 2022 年初頭に行った調査の第 2 弾に相 当する。調査の方法は前回と同じで、ロシア全土の 1600 人を対象に、ネットワーク、信頼、市 民参加、またロシア政府の政策に対する評価などを尋ねている。今回の調査は、ウクライナと の軍事紛争や本格的な経済制裁の開始から約 2 年が経過した時点で行われており、激動する環境 の中でソーシャル・キャピタルがどのように変化した、あるいはしていないのかが注目される。 全体として、ロシアにおける一般的信頼の低さと特定化信頼の強さ、家族や親族、友人など近 しい人々の間の強いネットワークや助け合い、大統領や軍への信頼の高さなどの特徴は、前回 調査時と変わっていない。ただし、一部の人々による新たなネットワークの模索、対ウクライ ナ政策の評価における世代間のギャップなど、環境の変化に伴う新たな関係の構築、潜在的な 認識の対立も一部で観察される。

JEL classification: A13, A14, P52 Keywords: ソーシャル・キャピタル、ロシア、社会的ネットワーク、信頼、市民参加

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

2. Challenges of Social Capital in Russia

3. Survey Methodology and Respondent Demographics

- 2.1. Survey methodology
- 2.2. Attributes of respondents

4. Survey Results and Discussion

- A. Social Contacts and Membership in Organizations
- B. Social Trust
- C. Opportunities and Influence
- D. Social Cohesion and Social Inclusiveness
- E. Collective Actions and Cooperation
- G. Socio-Political Values
- H. Respondent's Profile
- 5. Conclusion

References

- **Appendix 1. Survey Results**
- **Appendix 2. Survey Questions**

1. Introduction

In examining economic policy, its effectiveness, and the functions of a market economy, the concept of social capital has attracted increasing attention (Inaba, 2024; Yodo, 2018; Sekine, 2023). Regardless of the degree of market freedom, all economic systems are fundamentally rooted in human behaviour and values. This perspective is essential for analysing the Russian economy and society, where people have experienced the socialist economic system that differs significantly from a market economy.

Social capital, as defined by Inaba (2007 p.4) refers to the 'trust, norms and networks in society,' and it functions through relationships between individuals and groups. When analysing Russia, social capital can be considered a 'heuristic devise' (Staveren, 2014). Russia has experienced a dramatic market transition, recovered from an economic crisis, and reestablished itself as a world power. Although it functions as a capitalist economy, it has not evolved into a typical liberal and coordinated-market type.

In Russia, state-business relations are unusually close. The dependence of the Russian society on the state⁶ and its distinct economic system remains stark and does not seem to move forward towards normalisation. Russia's economic system is not that of the Soviet Union⁷, but is still heavily influenced by state intervention⁸. While Russia operates within a market economy, the state plays a dominant role (Galbraith, 2023). The relative importance of the market and the state in the formation of social capital remains an open question.

People have accepted various socio-economic systems, and consequently, social capital– comprising of micro-, intra- and inter-organisational relations, networks, trust and norms– serves not only as an analytical tool for understanding economic systems shaped by people's behaviour, but it also provides people with 'heuristic devise' for guiding individual decisions. Since the beginning of the 21st century, Russia has experienced growth, a global economic crisis, a pandemic, and economic sanctions over its military conflict with Ukraine. The 'normalization' of such crises inevitably affects people's values and behaviours. Therefore, Russia represents a compelling case for the examination of social capital in times of a crisis.

⁶ See Gorshkov and Tihkonova eds. (2024).

⁷ Russia is disconnected from the Soviet authoritarianism (Todd, 2024).

⁸ The legacy is represented by the following three trends: (1) centralization, (2) belonging to a hierarchical religion, and (3) the systematic deterioration of social capital during the communist regime (Paldam and Svendsen, 2002).

This paper explores the contemporary trends of social capital in Russia. This research is an outcome of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) *Social structure from the angle of social capital* (20H04404; Principal investigator: Satoshi Mizobata), with Hiroaki Hayashi, Kazuho Yokogawa, and Victor Gorshkov serving as co-investigators. In addition, Vasiliy Anikin (HSE University, Russia), who is a specialist in Russia's social capital, is involved as a research collaborator.

This study approached the research question by conducting a survey on social capital in Russia and constructing the database based on it. The first round of the survey was conducted in February-March 2022 (hereafter referred to as the first round). The results of the first round were compiled and published in June 2024 as a Discussion Paper No.2401 *'Social Capital in Russia during the COVID-19 Pandemic'*, in the KIER Discussion Paper Series, (Mizobata et al., 2024).

This paper summarises the results of the second survey conducted from December 2023 to January 2024 (hereafter referred as the second round) and includes the analysis of changes in the social situation in Russia since 2022. The survey questions are presented in the Appendix.

The division of roles for the analysis conducted in this paper is presented in Table 1-1:

| Satoshi Mizobata | 1. Introduction; 2. Survey methodology and respondent demographics: 4. Conclusion: overall supervision of the paper |
|------------------|--|
| Kazuho Yokogawa | 3. Survey results and discussion (Part C. Opportunities and influence, Part D. Social cohesion and social inclusiveness, Part E. Collective actions and cooperation. Part G. Socio-political orientations. Part H. Respondent's profile), 4. Conclusion; Appendix proofreading and translation |
| Hiroaki Hayashi | 3. Survey results and discussion (Part A. Social contracts and membership in organisations) |
| Victor Gorshkov | 3. Survey results and discussion (Part B. Social trust); Appendix proofreading and translation; proofreading of the whole paper |
| Vasily Anikin | Questionnaire survey coordination and implementation; adjustments of the survey questions for comparability with the existing studies on social capital both worldwide and in Russia |

Table 1-1. The division of roles for this project

Preliminary results of this research have been presented at several scientific conferences, including: The Annual Conference of the Japanese Society for Comparative Economic Studies (28 August 2024, Japan); The 18th EACES Biannual Conference (12 September 2024, Serbia),

Asia Economic Community Forum (7 November 2024, South Korea); International Conference on *Conflicts in the Global Economy and The Resilience of State-Led Capitalist Economic Systems*, (16 February 2025, Kyoto Institute of Economic Research, Kyoto University, Japan), International Research Workshop on *Global Conflicts and Resilience of Economic Systems* (11 March 2025, Kyoto Institute of Economic Research, Kyoto University, Japan), and Research Project Seminar 2025 (8 March 2025, Institute for the Future of Human Society, Kyoto University).

2. Challenges of Social Capital in Russia

Social capital is defined as the connections between individuals, social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trust that emerge from them (Putnam, 2000)⁹, and can be viewed as a form of social infrastructure. Russia has developed its social infrastructure in a unique way. Informal institutions and state dependency has played a dominant role, which has made civil society particularly fragile when compared to Western societies (Ishikawa et al, eds., 2017). In Russia, particularized trust is strong, and while politicians are generally not trusted the president is viewed as trustworthy (Mizobata et al., 2024). However, an individual's excessive trust in the president can lead to negative externalities (Inaba, 2024). Therefore, the analysis of social capital in different forms is crucial for understanding the Russian society.

Indeed, global evaluations of Russian social capital are full of contradictions. On the one hand, Social Capital Index by SolAbility¹⁰ ranked Russia negatively at 102nd of 191 countries in 2024. The World Bank also assessed Russia' social capital as low, ranking it at 113th in 2019¹¹. Informal institutions further suggest weakness of social capital (Schrader, 2004). Kennedy and Kawachi (1998) found a correlation between inadequate social capital and increased mortality.

Nevertheless, Russia's social capital may not necessarily be low; it could be at a moderate level. The UK Legatum Institute's Prosperity Index, a tool designed to identify pathways from poverty to prosperity, consists of 12 pillars across three domains: inclusive society, open economy, and people of ability – with social capital being one of the pillars. In the 2023 survey, Japan ranked 16th out of 167 countries overall, but its social capital score was exceptionally low, placing it at 141st. In contrast, Russia, which ranked 77th overall, achieved a much higher 54th place in social capital, a ranking that can hardly be considered low. Russia has high social and civic participation, even though political engagement of its population remains limited.

⁹ Inaba (2024, p.8) defines social capital as 'networks, trust, norms, etc., with externalities of the mind', and focuses both on positive and negative externalities. Based on the definition, we utilize six dimensions in this paper. We use the definition of social capital from Grootaert and Van Bastelar (2002), which encompasses social contacts and associations, trust, social cohesion and inclusion, collective action and cooperation, and social attitudes.

¹⁰ It is a Swiss-Korean joint venture that publishes the Global Sustainable Competitiveness Index, which consists of five pillars: natural capital, resource efficiency, social capital, intellectual capital and economic sustainability, using 190 indicators from international organisations such as World Bank, IMF, UN. See https://solability.com/the-global-sustainable-competitiveness-index/social-capital. Japan ranked the1st in 2024.

¹¹ See the World bank group, WEF Global Competitiveness Index 4.0

⁽https://prosperitydata360.worldbank.org/en/dataset/WEF+GCI). Japan ranked at low level, 98th in 2019.

Furthermore, the data indicates that Russia's social capital has improved in 2013-2023. Although Maltseva (2012) evaluates the level of general trust in Russia as low, Russia is considered to have a medium level of general trust in comparison to OECD countries (Algan, 2018).

Given that social capital is shaped by historical and cultural backgrounds, Russian social capital shows very unique characteristics, which will be further explored in this paper. At the very least, social capital has evolved over time, with significant changes, particularly in the aftermath of the 1992 system transformation and the crisis that accompanied it, which caused dynamic fluctuations in social capital. As Inaba (2024, p. 20) states, 'If social capital is viewed as the stock of society as a whole, it is certain that social capital in a country with a significantly declining population has been severely depleted' (Inaba, 2024, p.20).

Figure 2-1 shows demographic changes in Russia. It is evident that after the transformation the young population has sharply declined. Even though in 2010 the demographic situation slightly recovered, it seems stagnant. In addition, drastic changes have occurred: a sharp increase in the elderly population (aging trend) and a decline in the working age population. At the very least we can observe two basic changes: deteriorating social capital and generation gaps.



Figure 2-1. Demographic changes in Russia (population, million people)

Note: For female 15-54 and 55-, and for male 15-59 and 60-, based on the pension age before 2018. *Source:* Federal State Statistics Service. *The Demographic Yearbook of Russia*. Data for 1995-2023.

In addition, dependence on the state has not fostered strong mutual reliance between the government and the people. Through the crises and changes, Russian society has come to be seen as the 'wily man' society—the one that appears to need state protection but does not necessarily wish to serve the state. People in this society adapt to new realities with such mentality (Yaffa, 2020). In practice, while people seek money for success, connection is more focused than their capacity and education (VTSIOM, 26 June 2020).

The vast majority of the population is apathetic, passively and automatically 'mostly supports' what the regime is doing while waiting for 'all this' to end. This part of the population has chosen apathy, a condition that can be described as learned indifference. For these individuals, the president is a legitimate leader, so his 'special military operation' must legitimate as well (Volkov and Koleshnikov, 2022; 2023).

Figure 2.2 shows levels of trust and evaluations of the government across the two rounds of our research. Overall, trust in government remains relatively low, compared to that of President Putin; citizens have no strong intention to participate in social and political activities. Moreover, positive evaluations of the government (good, right, satisfied) are not harmonized, and people generally evaluate the policy towards Ukraine positively. However, they react negatively to perceived personal threats, such as the September 2022 mobilization policy. This reflects a distinctive mentality within the Russian society, which helps to clarify the nature and structure of social capital in Russia.



Figure 2.2 Russian's trust and assessment of the state (%) *Note*: Respondents are 1600, and % of respondents. *Source*: VTSIOM data, 20 March 2024 and April 2025.

3. Survey Methodology and Respondent Demographics

3.1. Survey methodology

This research was launched under the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) in FY2020. After conducting the literature review, in 2021, the research team arranged a questionnaire survey to examine the scope and features of social capital in Japan and Russia as well as people's perceptions, awareness, and behavioral patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic. In designing the survey, the research team relied on similar surveys conducted by the World Values Survey, Grootaert and Van Bastelaer (2002) and that of Iwai and Shishido (2021). The first round of the survey was implemented in February-March 2022. The second round of the survey was conducted in December 2023 - January 2024. The survey questionnaire is attached in the form of an appendix at the end of this paper.

The most important point of discussion and concern when combining the survey questions was the elaboration of income categories. In Russia, income inequality varies significantly between regions, thus the income thresholds are divided into five categories which are different from region to region, reflecting the disparities between regions (federal districts).

We categorised incomes into five groups based on deviations from the region-specific median income. The income boundaries were determined by the Median groups (Me): (1) less than 0.5 Me, (2) 0.5-0.75 Me, (3) 0.75-1.25 Me, (4) 1.25-2 Me, and (5) more than 2 Me. These groups were calculated in rubles for the year 2022. In other words, respondents in 2024 were asked about their individual income in terms of actual 2022 values, which were done for comparison purposes. The cumulative income growth between 2022 and 2024 was higher than the inflation rate (cumulative income growth from 2022 to 2024 was 45.9%, while the cumulative inflation rate was 31.7%). However, this growth was unevenly distributed among income groups, with low and high-income groups benefiting the most. This explains the shift in the relative income structure, as illustrated in Figure 3-5. We can interpret these dynamics as suggesting that Russian society has become more affluent due to a significant decrease in the number of people with low incomes and an increase in those with high incomes.

For instance, we observe a significant shift in the 2022 income distribution. There's a substantial decrease of 51.4% in the income of individuals earning less than 0.5 of the 2022 median income (which is less than 16,000 rubles per month). On the other hand, there's a remarkable 70.5% increase in the income of individuals earning more than double of the 2022

median incomes (which is more than 65,000 rubles per month). Moreover, income in the third (middle) quintile, the disparity is more than double of the lowest level in the North Caucasian (15,000-24,000 rubles) to the highest level in the Central Federal District (31,000-50,000 rubles), which includes Moscow.

The survey was conducted via computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) method. The first round of the survey was conducted in February-March 2022 with the survey questions organised into eight main sections (Table 3-1). The number of questions was approximately 100, including sub-questions, which helped provide a more holistic picture of social capital. The second round was conducted in December 2023 to January 2024 and the survey consisted of seven main sections, excluding COVID-19 pandemic related questions (Table 3-2).

| Basic characteristics | Consent, gender, age and area of residence | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| A. Social contacts and | Participating organisations (Q5), degree of participation (Q6- | |
| membership in | 7), relationships (Q8), communication (Q9-10), neighbourhood | |
| organizations | (Q11-12), friends (Q13-15), socialising (Q16-28) | |
| B. Social trust | Generalised trust (Q29-32) | |
| C. Opportunities and | Decisions (Q33), happiness (34-35), affect (Q36), | |
| influence | psychological state (Q137) | |
| D. Social cohesion and | Cohesion (Q37-41) | |
| inclusiveness | | |
| E. Collective actions and | Collective action (Q42), volunteering (Q43), socialising (Q44), | |
| cooperation | lobbying (Q45) | |
| F. Influence of the | Responsibility (Q46), Information (Q47), Change (Q48-51), | |
| COVID-19 pandemic | Vaccines (Q52), Policy and support (Q53-54) | |
| G. Socio-political | Disparities (Q55), Policy evaluation (Q56) | |
| orientation | | |
| H. Respondent's profile | Education (Q57-62), family (Q63-64), income/work (Q65-82) | |

Table 3-1 The structure of the survey during the first round

| Basic characteristics | Consent, gender, age and area of residence | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| A. Social contacts and | Participating organisations (Q5), communication (Q9-10), | |
| membership in | neighbourhood (Q11-12), friends (Q13-15), socialising (Q16, | |
| organizations | 22, 25- 28, 83-85) | |
| B. Social trust | Generalised trust (Q29,30, 32) | |
| C. Opportunities and | Decisions (Q33), happiness (Q35), affect (Q36), psychological | |
| influence | state (Q137) | |
| D. Social cohesion and | Cohesion (Q37, 41) | |
| inclusiveness | | |
| E. Collective actions and | Volunteering (Q43), socialising (Q44), lobbying (Q45) | |
| cooperation | | |
| G. Socio-political | Disparities (Q55), Policy evaluation (Q56) | |
| orientation | | |
| H. Respondent's profile | Education (Q57-62), family (Q59, 63-64), income/work (Q65- | |
| | 78) | |

Table 3-2. The structure of the survey during the second round

2.2. Attributes of respondents

Interviews were conducted using the CATI Stratified RDD-Sample method. The sample represented respondents aged 18 and above covering all Russian regions (85 federal regions). The sample size in the second round was 1,600 people¹².

Women respondents prevailed in the gender composition of the sample (Figure 3-1). The share of Moscow, St Petersburg, and large cities in terms of region of residence has increased in the second round (Figure 3-2). Respondents residing in urban areas prevailed over those residing in rural areas. Figure 3-3 shows the composition of respondents by age.

Figure 3-4 presents data on the occupational structure. Approximately 48% of respondents are full-time employees, 5.9% work part-time, 11.3% are self-employed, 22.6% are pensioners, 3% are temporarily unemployed, 1.6% are who currently left work due to health reasons, 2.5% are on a maternity leave, 1.9% are engaged in housework, 1.1% are students, and 0.3% are volunteers. Regular workers and pensioners are the largest groups in the sample.

The composition by income is shown in Figure 3-5. The size of the income categories differs

¹² The sample size in the first round was 1,700 people.

from region to region. Central Federal District and Volga Federal District show a high level of income compared to the other six federal districts. The income composition in the second round was higher than in the first round, with a significantly higher weighting of the highest income group (quintile 5) and, conversely, a lower weighting of the lowest quintile 1. Income levels have not been affected by the imposition of economic sanctions as real incomes have continued to grow.



Figure 3-1. The composition of respondents by gender (in percentage)



Figure 3-2. Composition of respondents by region of residence (in percentage)



Figure 3-3. Composition of respondents by age (in percentage)



Figure 3-4. Composition of respondents by occupational status (in percentage)



Figure 3-5. Composition of respondents by income level (in percentage)

4. Survey Results and Discussion¹³

A. Social Contacts and Membership in Organizations

Section A examines the participation of Russian citizens in organisations and their interactions with those around them, based on 17 questions. The findings from the individual questionnaires are summarised at the end of the section.

A1(Q5) asks whether respondents participate in any organisations. The percentage of respondents who do participate is 18.25%, nearly double the 9.4% recorded in the 2022 survey (Mizobata et al. 2024). However, the percentage of those who do not participate in any organisations was still significantly higher, at 80.75%. Furthermore, over 60% of those who reported participating in an organisation answered that they participated only one organisation, a result similar to that of the 2022 survey. Notable differences from the previous survey include a higher participation rate of women compared to men, no significant difference across age groups, a higher participation rate in rural areas in addition to large cities, and an unclear correlation with income.

A5(Q9)-A6(Q10) ask about communication with family and relatives. The number of family members or relatives, other than those living together with the respondents, with whom they daily contact (A5) was the highest at 1-2 people (28.4%), followed by 3-4 people and 5-9 people, each accounting for about a quarter of the total. Over 10% of the respondents reported daily contact with more than 10 persons, while another 10% reported no contact at all. Overall, contacts among family members and relatives are widespread, similar to the findings of the first round of the survey. By gender, women have more contact than men. By age, the number of contacts increases with age. The number of contacts rises with the size of the city. In terms of income, the highest and the lowest income groups reported fewer contacts.

As for the frequency of contact with family and relatives who do not live with the respondents (A6), the largest share (24.3%) reported no contact at all (or no relatives), while another 24.0% said they have contact everyday or several times a week. As in the first round of the survey, there is a certain number of people with strong and weak family and kinship ties. By gender, about a quarter of both men and women reported no contact

¹³ The comprehensive overview of the survey results is presented in Appendix 1.

at all, but women tend to have closer contact with their relatives than men. The proportion of respondents who 'never' have contact increases with age, though those aged 55 and older are also more likely to contact their family or parents 'everyday or several times a week'. This suggests that among the elderly, there is a polarization between those with strong family networks and those without. By region, more than a quarter of respondents in all regions have no contact at all, while the proportion of those who have frequent contact increases with the size of the city. By income, those in the lowest income group are more likely to report both no communication and frequent communication.

A7(Q11) asked about the number of neighbours with whom respondents usually say hello. 6% of the respondents reported having no neighbours at all, while about 20% of respondents each reported having 1-4, 5-9, 10-19, and 20 or more neighbours. This indicates that most respondents have more or less friendly relations with their neighbours. By gender, women are more likely than men to have close neighbourhood relations. By age, the 18-24 age group was the most likely to report having no neighbours, accounting for just under 20% of all respondents, while the older age groups were more likely to have close neighbourhood ties. No significant regional trends were observed. By income, the proportion of respondents who have no neighbourhood relations at all is higher among both the lowest and highest income groups.

In A8(Q12), which asked about deeper neighbourhood relationships, the largest number of respondents (30.7%) indicated that they have no neighbours with whom they could ask for an advice or help. This was followed by 1-2 neighbours (28.3%) and 3-4 neighbours (16.7%). By age, the number of neighbours with whom one can have a close relationship tends to increase with age. By region, deeper relationships with neighbours are more common in rural areas than in metropolitan areas. By income, the proportion of respondents with no close neighbourhood relationships is higher among both the lowest and highest income groups.

A9(Q13)-A11(Q15) ask about their relationships with friends and acquaintances. As for the number of close friends (A9), the largest proportion (37.7%) had 1-2 friends, followed by 3-4 friends (22.4%), no friends (20.0%), and 5-9 friends (13.3%). By attribute, the proportion of respondents with no friends was higher among males rather than female respondents, with 22.4% of males reporting having no friends. By age, the number of respondents who have no or many friends tends to increase with age. By region of residence, the larger the city, the greater the number of close friends. By income, the

number of close friends tends to increase with higher income. These results are consistent with the findings of the 2022 survey.

Regarding the frequency of asking friends and acquaintances for advice or help (A10(Q14)), over 80% of respondents reported doing so once a month or once every few months, never, or once a year to once every few years. By age, the proportion of 'not at all' ask for advice or help increases with age, indicating that younger respondents are more likely to engage with friends and acquaintances. There were no significant differences by region. By income, the 'never' category is higher in both the lowest and highest income groups. This suggests that the elderly and those with lower incomes are less likely to have a network of friends and acquaintances they can rely on. There is little difference by gender.

In terms of methods of communication with friends and acquaintances (A11), the most commonly used method was the telephone, at 47.0%. This was followed by in-person communication at 30.3%, and SNS at 19.3%. The high percentage of phone calls is a notable difference compared to Japan. In particular, many women and elderly chose the telephone as their preferred method of communication. SNS was most commonly used among younger age groups, with usage decreasing as age increases. More than a quarter of all age groups, from teens to those in their 50s, reported using in-person communication. By region, the telephone was the most popular method in all regions, followed by SNS usage, which was more common in large cities and less so in rural areas, In contrast, in-person communication was more prevalent in rural areas and decreased as city size increased. By income, in- person communication was more frequently used in the highest income groups, while SNS was more frequently used in the highest income group.

A12(Q16) asks about the status of non-family members with whom they socialise on a daily basis. Eighty percent of respondents reported socialising with people of approximately the same status as themselves, indicating that they primarily socialise in a homogeneous manner. By gender, women are slightly more likely than men to associate with others of the same status. By age, the 18-24 age group has about 15% of respondents who socialise with people of higher status, but as age increases, individuals tend to associate more with people of the same status. There are no significant regional differences observed. While there is no marked difference by income, in the highest age group, social contacts with people of lower status exceeded those with higher status. These results are consistent with the findings of the first round of the survey. A16(Q27) asked about the most important people in respondents' personal interactions. A significant 52.2% of the respondents listed family and relatives, far ahead of other categories. This was followed by friends or acquaintances (20%) and work colleagues (17%). Women were more likely than men to name family and relatives, while men were more likely to mention work colleagues. By age, the proportion of respondents who chose family and relatives tends to increase with age. Among younger respondents aged 18-24, the proportion of friends and acquaintances was the highest, exceeding that of family and relatives, but the proportion of friends and acquaintances decreased with age. Workplace colleagues were more commonly mentioned by those in their 30s and 40s, who are in the prime of their working lives. By region, the proportion of those who selected family and relatives was higher in rural and farming areas compared to large cities, while work colleagues were more prominent in large cities. By income, more respondents in the lower income groups cited family and relatives, while those with higher incomes were more likely to cite co-workers. These trends are unchanged from the results of the 2022 survey.

A14.5(Q22) asked who respondents would turn to help in an emergency. A total of 38.6% cited family members living with them, and 30.9% cited other relatives, together accounting for nearly 70% of the total responses. By attribute, there was a marked difference between men and women, with women being more likely than men to rely on family members living with them and other relatives. By age, those aged 18-24 were more likely to rely on friends, while those aged 55 and older tended to rely more on family members living with them. There were no significant differences by region or income.

A15.1(Q25)-A15.2(Q26) asked whether or not there is someone who can help them when they are in financial trouble, comparing rural and urban areas. The total number of positive responses, 'definitely yes' and 'most likely yes,' reached approximately 64%, which is significantly higher than the 20.8% who answered negatively. There is little difference between men and women. By age group, more than two-thirds of those in the 18-24 age group answered 'definitely yes,' a notably high percentage. By income, the lowest income group had a much lower percentage of positive responses than other income groups, but otherwise the results were generally consistent across other groups.

In A15.2, which asked the same question of urban residents, 42.9% responded 'definitely yes' and 23.4% answered 'most likely yes', for a combined total of 66.3%. The sense of trust that someone will help them financially in times of need is as strong as or even stronger than in rural areas. Negative responses, at 20.7%, were also similar to those

in rural areas. By attribute, men are slightly more optimistic than women. By age, the percentage of positive responses is higher among younger respondents and declines with increasing age. By region, there are no significant differences (this question does not include residents of Moscow and St. Petersburg). By income, the higher the income group, the more positive the response.

Q14(Q83) asks whether the respondents received or provided various types of assistance from people close to them in the past 12 months. The items were: money lent or borrowed, job referrals, admission to a good university, promotion, admission to a good school, solution to housing problems, referral to a good doctor or hospital, opportunity to earn extra income, referral to people in authority who could solve their problems, and moving to other regions of Russia or abroad. The most frequent responses were; loaned money (less than 100,000 rubles) (38.0%), referred to a good doctor or hospital (22.3%), offered the opportunity to earn extra income (17.3%), borrowed money (less than 100,000 rubles) (17.3%), referred to a good job (14.8%), etc. and there is a fairly close interrelationship with those close to them. By attribute, men were more likely than women to report receiving assistance in the following areas; enrolling in a good college or school, solving housing problems, referring to a good doctor or hospital, and moving out of the country. By age, those in their 30s and older were more likely to receive or provide assistance, but younger respondents were more likely to receive a good job referral or assistance in getting into a good university, and to move to another country (both receiving and providing assistance). By region, republics and the central cities of regions had the highest values for all items. Moscow and St. Petersburg showed nearly the highest values for providing assistance with moving abroad, approaching the values seen in the central cities of the republics and regions. By income, the highest values were observed in the upper income groups for all items except for the provision of assistance for enrolling in a good university.

Q15(Q84) asks how the frequency of communication between respondents and the people they interact with had changed over the past 12 months. Respondents were asked about communication with relatives who do not live with them, friends, acquaintances, colleagues, and neighbours. The largest percentage of respondents (more than 60%) reported 'no change' in communication for all items, while the percentages for 'increased' and 'decreased' were similar, ranging between 10% and 20%. No significant differences were observed between men and women. By age, the 18-24 age group had the highest percentage of respondents who selected 'increased' for all items, and the percentage

decreased as age increased. There were no significant differences by place of residence. By income, the proportion of respondents who reported an 'increased' frequency of communication rose as income increased, particularly in the area of communication with colleagues.

Q16(Q85) asked whether respondents experienced the necessity for any of the following matters in the past 12 months: the need to communicate on the Internet (social networks, dating sites, etc.), the need to find new friends or close acquaintances, the need to find partners in new business or start-ups, the need to find new partners for fulfilling professional activity, the need to restore trust in their relationships with close relatives, the need to restore relations with relatives living in other parts of Russia, and the need to restore relations with people who have left Russia. In all categories, the largest proportion of the responses was 'cannot answer,' at over 70%. However, 21.0% of respondents felt the need to communicate via the Internet, 16.5% felt the need to find a new partner to carry out professional activities, 13.4% felt the need to restore trust in their relationships with their closest relatives. No significant differences were observed by gender. Younger respondents felt more strongly about the need to communicate on the Internet and find new friends and close acquaintances, while older respondents felt more strongly about the need to find a partner in new business or start-ups and to find a new partner for fulfilling professional activity. The percentage of those who feel the need for these services increases with age. By place of residence, the need to find a partner in a new business or start-up is felt more strongly in large cities such as Moscow and St. Petersburg and declined as the city size decreased. By income, the need to find a new business or start-up partner and the need to find a new partner to carry out professional activities increased with income.

A17(Q28) asked about the importance of relationships with influential people in achieving social success, and responses showed that both 'absolutely unimportant' and 'absolutely important' categories were around 30%. By gender, men were more likely to respond 'absolutely important,' while women were more likely to respond 'absolutely unimportant'. By age, the extremes of 'absolutely unimportant' and 'absolutely important' tended to increase with age. However, in the four age groups from 18 to 54, the percentage of those who considered relationships with influential people important (the sum of responses 4 and 5) was large, around 50%. However, in the 55 and older age group, the percentage of those who consider it unimportant (the sum of responses 1 and 2) was large, just under 50%. By area of residence, respondents in large cities were more likely to

consider relationships with influential people important, while the proportion of those who considered it unimportant was lower. Notably, the percentages of 'absolutely important' and 'absolutely unimportant' were larger in rural areas compared to other regions. By income, respondents in the high-income group (Category 5) were more likely to consider relationships with influential persons as important.

B. Social Trust

B.1. Previous research on social trust in Russia

Social trust remains one of the most important components of social capital. In a market economy, having at least a minimum level of trust is essential to conduct all economic activities. Previous research highlighted the importance of open trust, or trust to unknown, as a necessary condition for the sound development of the market (Yamagishi, 1999).

Three types of social trust are conventionally distinguished in literature on social capital: namely, particularized trust, generalized trust, and institutional trust.

Particularized trust, also known as personalized trust, is trust between people who already know each other, which is measured by confidence (level of trust) in family, relatives, friends, co-workers, and neighbours. Closed networks in the community create particularised trust of a closed or bonding type based on the closed reciprocity.

Generalised trust is defined as trust between people who meet for the first time and is sometimes referred as horizontal trust. Generalised trust is measured by asking a question such as 'Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be careful in dealing with people?' and it is an important indicator of measuring the general level of trust existing in the society as it serves as a 'glue' that ensures social cohesiveness. Generalised trust, affected by the external factors such as economic gaps and education, is related to open network and reciprocity within the society (Inaba 2011). Generalized trust is essential for economic development and prosperity (La Porta et al. 1997; Avdeeva 2019) and serves as a prerequisite for the sound functioning of democratic societies (Beilmann et al. 2021). Generalised trust helps building open-type networks that promote reciprocity within the societies and stimulate the formation of an open (bridging) type of social capital.

Institutional trust (or trust in public infrastructure), also sometimes referred as vertical trust, is defined as trust in institutions such as the church, the police, parliament,

government, the justice system, the president, political parties, the army, and others or towards representatives of these institutions. The higher the institutional trust, the higher the resilience of the socio-political system of the society. Institutional trust incorporates the belief in security and accountability of institutions as well as trust in those who enforce these institutions.

The evaluation of social trust and social capital in Russia at the macro level presents mixed results, but it is generally considered to be at a low level. According to the Edelman Trust Barometer, the *Trust Index* in 2022 was 32, placing Russia among countries with low trust, such as Japan (40), South Korea (42), the United States (43), the United Kingdom (44), and Germany (46). In Russia, the government is the most trusted institution (37), followed by business (34), media (29), and NGOs (28). The *Solability Social Capital Index* ranks Russia 85th, while the *Legatum Prosperity Index 2023* places it 54th. Previous research on the quality of social capital and social trust in Russian society has yielded mixed results (Anikin 2022, Mizobata et al. 2024), likely due to the lack of a standardized method for measuring these concepts.

Particularized trust, rooted in close connections with family, relatives, and friends, remains the most important form of trust for many Russians (Ishikawa et al. 2017; Almakaeva and Volchenko 2018). This is largely due to the shared experience among Russian citizens in coping with socio-economic and political challenges, as well as a chronic lack of generalized trust. In fact, particularized trust has persisted throughout the marketization process, especially among those with greater access to social and economic resources (such as income, education, and living in a large city) (Kuchenkova 2016).

Numerous studies indicate that generalized trust in Russia is extremely low (Maltseva 2012; Veselov and Skvortsov 2023), leading to the view that Russia is a society characterized by low trust, or even distrust (Anikin 2022). This lack of generalized trust is often attributed to the legacy of communism and the social and economic challenges faced by society during the market transition (Almakaeva and Wilkies 2021). The Soviet legacy continues to influence the country through phenomena like the 'economy of favours' (Ledeneva 1998), and overall, this path dependency has a significant impact on the level of social capital and trust in Russia.

International comparisons show that generalized trust in Russia is significantly lower than in Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon countries, but it is higher than in other emerging economies (except for China), as well as in Latin American countries. In fact, it is comparable to that of France and Italy (Table 4-B-1).

| Country | Most people can be trusted (%) |
|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Finland | 68.4 |
| China | 63.5 |
| Sweden | 62.8 |
| United Kingdom | 43.3 |
| Germany | 39.5 |
| United States | 37.0 |
| Japan | 33.7 |
| South Korea | 32.9 |
| Italy | 26.6 |
| France | 26.3 |
| Russia | 22.9 |
| India | 16.9 |
| Brazil | 6.5 |
| Indonesia | 4.6 |

Table 4-B-1. Generalised trust in selective economies

Source: Haerpfer et al. (2022) World Value Survey. 7th Wave

Institutional trust in Russia overall is generally considered low to medium, though it is notably higher when it comes to specific institutions such as the president, the army, and the church (Sasaki et al. 2009; Ishikawa et al. 2017; Avdeeva 2019; Malkina et al. 2020; Latov 2021; Anikin 2022; Latov 2024). Trust in the president, the army, and the government has been rising in recent years (Krivopuskov 2023). However, the majority of social and state institutions in Russia are not trusted. Citizens seeking social change have few opportunities to rely on effective institutions, as political parties, mass media, labour unions, and social organizations are either distrusted or only slightly trusted. The institutions that maintain stability—such as the president, the army, and the security services—are the most trusted, but this trust tends to come from citizens who are generally resistant to significant structural reforms (Latov 2021). Trust in private businesses (the corporate sector) remains notably low in Russia, despite trust being crucial for its successful development (Kozyreva and Smirnov 2010; Avdeeva 2019).

Institutional trust towards institutions with 'vertical power' such as the president, the army, the government, the police has been increasing since 2021 followed by the turning point in fight against the COVID-19 pandemic and by the 'unity around the flag' since 2022. High institutional trust provides intangible benefits such as enhanced subjective well-being: Russians with higher trust toward the president are likely to be more engaged

in social actions that contributed to the stability of the country and view the development path of the country more optimistically (Latov 2024).

Overall, the previous research highlights the fact that particularized trust has not effectively transformed into higher level of generalized trust during the marketization process. Consequently, the state has strengthened social institutions to compensate for the lack of trust in society (Reutov and Reutova 2014). The chronically low level of generalized trust has led Russian citizens to favor a strong state in the political system, with paternalistic values often prevailing. Ultimately, the Russian government has assumed a dominant role in economic development, often replacing or diminishing the social capacity for self-discipline and self-organization among citizens (Maltseva 2012), and many citizens prefer to benefit from this system. The extremely high level of trust in institutions with vertical power (the president, the army, the government, the church) compensates for the very low trust in non-executive (non-administrative) representative institutions (such as the State Duma, political parties, local and municipal authorities, and the mass media) (Trofimova 2017). However, the very low trust in representative (elective) institutions has not yet reached a critical level that could lead to the collapse of Russian society (Latov 2024).

B.2. Survey results on social trust

B1(Q29) measures the level of generalized trust. According to Figure B1-0, generalized trust remains at a low level. The cumulative percentage of respondents who replied that 'in most cases people can be trusted' and those who replied that 'in some cases people can be trusted' amounted to 29.4%, which is significantly lower than the cumulative percentage of those who answered that 'sometimes you have to be careful in dealing with people' (30.3%) and 'in most cases, you have to be careful when dealing with people' (39.6%). While there are no significant differences between male and female respondents who provided a positive answer, male respondents appear to be more cautious in dealing with people. Approximately 44% of them reported that, in most cases, it is extremely important to be careful when dealing with people, which is higher than the 36.5% of female participants who gave the same response. Generalized trust tends to be higher among respondents from older age cohorts, those living in larger cities, and those with higher incomes.

B2(Q30) measures particularized trust and institutional trust. Particularized trust remains the strongest, with 91.7% of respondents absolutely or somewhat trusting their

family, 80.4% trusting their relatives, and 72% trusting their friends (Figure B2-0). There is no significant difference in trust in family members by sex, age, and region, while it tends to be only slightly higher for respondents with higher income. Trust in relatives is higher for respondents from older age cohorts and those with higher income. Trust in friends is higher for respondents of younger age cohorts, those living in large cities, and with higher income. Only 33% of respondents trust their neighbors (Figure B2.5), with trust in neighbors being higher for female respondents, those from older age cohorts, respondents residing in small and rural areas.

B2(Q30-6) provides additional insights into the level of generalized trust by measuring trust in people whom respondents meet for the first time. Approximately 82% of respondents indicated that they' absolutely do not trust' or 'somewhat do not trust' people they meet for the first time (Figure B2.6-0), confirming the notion that Russia is a society of distrust. Respondents residing in small towns and rural areas, as well as those with lower incomes, tend to have lower levels of trust in people they meet for the first time. Differences among age cohorts were not pronounced.

Institutional trust towards institutions with vertical power, such as the army (76.6%), the president (69.2%), and the government (47.7%) as well as the trust in church (48.6%) is high (Figures B2.19, B2.14, B2.23, B2.20, respectively). Trust in these institutions is higher among female respondents, those in older age cohorts, respondents residing in smaller towns and rural areas, and those with lower incomes. Trust in scientists (63.1%) and teachers (56.1%) is also high (Figures B2.11 and B2.10, respectively). Conversely, trust in elective (representative) institutions, such as elections (42.8%), State Duma (37.0%), political parties (21.2%) and other social institutions, namely courts (32.8%), police (34.6%), directors or managers of companies (26.5%), civil servants, (23.3 %), NGO and NPO leaders (19.5%), and municipal employees (19.4%), traditional media (16.2 %), and new media (8.2%), remains low. Trust in elections, State Duma, and old media (TV, radio, newspapers) is higher for female respondents, those from older age cohorts, respondents residing in small and rural areas, and those with lower income.

B4(Q32) measures respondents' attitude towards human nature based on the Likert scale from 1-7. The cumulative percentage of respondents who consider that there is better in human nature (the sum of 5-7 on the Liker scale) is approximately 62% (Figure B4-0).

To sum up, the results of our analysis are generally consistent with previous research studies and they clearly demonstrate that Russia remains a country with a significant level of particularized trust, a low level of generalized trust, and a low-to-medium level of institutional trust. However, institutional trust in Russia has several distinctive features, such as a strong inclination toward higher trust in institutions with vertical power and its recent enhancements due to the instability of geopolitical environment.

C. Opportunities and Influence

This section explores various aspects of subjective well-being, including the sense of selfefficacy, life satisfaction, emotional well-being, and the perception of significant life influences.

C1(Q33) inquired about the extent to which individuals feel capable of making pivotal life decisions. Overall, the data suggest that the Russian population generally exhibits high levels of self-efficacy. The survey revealed that over 80% of respondents expressed positive sentiments regarding their ability to shape their own lives, with only about 15% reporting a lack of confidence in this capacity. Notably, males and younger demographics exhibited a more optimistic outlook, while the elderly exhibited a less positive perspective. The correlation between income level and positive attitude is significant, with the proportion of positive attitudes reaching 65% among the lowest income group and peaking at 95% among the highest income group.

The subsequent question, C3(Q35), addressed life satisfaction. The data indicates that more than 50% of individuals expressed satisfaction with their lives, while 38% provided neutral responses. Notably, only 5% of respondents reported feelings of dissatisfaction. The analysis revealed that factors such as gender, age, and geographical location did not exert a significant influence on the outcomes. However, income emerged as a salient factor, with higher income groups exhibiting a marked tendency to report higher levels of satisfaction compared to their lower-income counterparts.

The next question, C5(Q137), addressed the respondents' daily emotional and psychological well-being. The predominant response, indicated by 44% of respondents, was reported to be feelings of calm and well-being. A significant proportion, constituting 37% of the sample, indicated that their emotional state is contingent on the prevailing circumstances. A total of 8% of respondents reported experiencing anxiety. Further analysis revealed that females exhibit heightened anxiety compared to males. No substantial disparities across diverse age demographics, geographical locations. However, a marginal increase in anxiety was observed among individuals from the lowest income

bracket, while those in the higher income categories reported higher levels of calmness and well-being.

Question C4(Q36) inquired about the most significant individual in the respondent's life, such as an authority figure, primary advisor, or facilitator in problem-solving or goal achievement. The results indicate that nearly half of the respondents reported not having such an individual, while 42% selected 'other' as their response. The majority of these 'other' responses indicated family members, including parents, partners, children, and relatives. This finding suggests that networks within family and relatives play an important role in the lives and work of Russians. However, younger demographics tend to place greater reliance on teachers than other generations, and 5-10% of working-age adults cite their immediate superiors at work as their most significant source of support. A similar pattern is observed among higher income groups, where the influence of one's immediate supervisor is more pronounced compared to lower income categories. Individuals in distant social positions, such as government officials and politicians, exert minimal influence over the general populace.

D. Social Cohesion and Social Inclusiveness

Section D of the survey inquired about the perception of differences among residents within their respective neighbourhoods in terms of safety.

D1(Q37) inquired about the disparities among individuals residing in respondents' localities with respect to social status, financial welfare, nationality, mother tongue, political inclinations, religious beliefs, age, gender, and other demographic characteristics. The results indicate that approximately 45% of respondents do not perceive a significant difference between residents, while 26% report experiencing some degree of difference. The perception of these differences is observed based on gender, generation, and income. Specifically, males, younger generations, and higher income classes exhibit a heightened sensitivity to these variations, while females, older generations, and lower income classes demonstrate a lesser sensitivity.

D5(Q41) addressed residents' perceptions of neighbourhood security. A significant majority of respondents, exceeding 75%, reported that the neighbourhood is safe enough to walk alone at night. Specifically, females reported higher levels of anxiety compared to males. Also, lower income groups reported feelings of insecurity to a greater extent

than higher income groups, a discrepancy that may be attributed to variations in their residential areas and housing conditions.

E. Collective Actions and Cooperation

Section E of the survey inquiries about the respondents' political consciousness and engagement in civic activities.

E2 (Q43) inquired about respondents' engagement in voluntary activities within the past 12 months, encompassing online engagement. Among the respondents, 19% reported engagement in volunteering activities aimed at enhancing their local environment, including activities such as street landscaping, security enhancement, and event organization. A total of 9% of respondents indicated engagement in volunteering activities related to sports, cultural events, and popular scientific events. Furthermore, 20% of respondents indicated that they were engaged in volunteering activities related to the provision of social assistance to individuals with disabilities, children, elderly people, and other vulnerable groups. Furthermore, 6% of respondents engaged in volunteering activities related to political engagement, including activities such as collecting signatures and participating in rallies. It is noteworthy that females exhibit a higher level of engagement in volunteering activities compared to males, except for sports, cultural, and scientific events. Furthermore, approximately one out of four females engaged in volunteering activities related to improving living conditions and providing social assistance to socially disadvantaged people. Among the various age demographics, young generations demonstrated the highest level of engagement in sports, cultural, and scientific events, while those aged 35-54 exhibited the strongest involvement in social assistance. Correlation between income level and volunteering is not observed.

E3 (Q44) inquired about the degree of political and societal awareness. The respondents are tasked with evaluating their level of consciousness on a five-point scale. In response to the assertion that 'ordinary people like myself have no influence on what happens in the country or its government,' 44% of respondents expressed agreement, while 32% expressed disagreement. A negative correlation was observed between age and perceived political competence, with older individuals tending to exhibit lower levels of confidence in their political acumen. Furthermore, when confronted with the assertion that 'I don't really understand what the government and politicians do, because it's a difficult

area for me,' approximately 40% of respondents expressed disagreement, while slightly less percentage expressed agreement. Regarding interest in politics, approximately half of the respondents indicated a lack of interest. Findings suggest a gender disparity in perception, with males expressing a higher level of confidence in their understanding of politics compared to females, while they are less interested in political matters. A comparison of younger and older generations reveals that younger generations are more confident with their political understanding, though the elder generation is demonstrating greater interests in politics. The statement 'I want to be useful to society' garnered a resounding approval from 70% of the respondents, with a particularly notable response from the 25-54 age group. Furthermore, the results of Q44_5 and Q44_6 indicate that nearly half of the respondents expressed confidence in their neighbours' willingness to assist in times of need, while 30% expressed scepticism. Females, older generations, and individuals residing in rural areas with lower incomes exhibited higher levels of confidence in their relationships with neighbours compared to males, younger individuals, and those residing in urban areas.

E4 (Q45) inquired about the frequency with which respondents requested assistance from authorities to address issues within their living environment over the past three years. The results indicated that 60% of respondents had never done so, while one third of them had applied to the authorities at least once. A notable disparity emerges in the propensity of such actions, with rural areas exhibiting a higher frequency compared to urban centres.

G. Socio-Political Values

Section G inquiries about the evaluation of government policy, including policy toward Ukraine.

G1 (Q55) inquired into the extent to which respondents believe the state should mitigate income disparities among citizens. The results indicate that approximately two-thirds of the respondents advocate for the government implementing such policies, with 50% of respondents expressing an 'absolutely agree' sentiment. Notably, older individuals, particularly those residing in rural areas, exhibited a greater propensity to advocate for redistribution, while those in younger age groups and affluent urban dwellers demonstrated a more pronounced reluctance to do so.

The second question G2 (Q56) pertains to the evaluation of government policies over the past five years. The question encompasses eight areas of government policy: 1) the creation of new jobs, 2) the reduction of economic inequality, 3) the stimulation of economic growth, 4) infrastructure development, 5) ensuring security, 6) the development of education and science, 7) the development of the healthcare system, and 8) environmental protection. Respondents were asked to evaluate these policies on a fivepoint scale.

The policies that received the highest ratings were those pertaining to infrastructure development and security. More than 50% of respondents expressed a favourable opinion of these policies, while 20% expressed a negative opinion. The policy aimed at generating new employment opportunities garnered slightly less than 50% support among respondents. Conversely, policies that received more negative than positive evaluations included those related to reducing economic inequality, developing the healthcare system, and protecting the environment.

A notable tendency is observed, wherein older generations exhibit a propensity to offer more favourable appraisals of policies in general. However, the youngest cohort, ranging from 18 to 24 years of age, demonstrates a comparatively more tolerant stance than upper age cohorts. A notable observation is the propensity of individuals from higher income brackets to exhibit more critical assessments of policies, in contrast to those from lower income categories. However, this tendency was not observed in the context of policies aimed at infrastructure development, which exhibited no discernible correlation with income level.

Q55 (Q138) inquired about the public's stance on the Russian government's policy toward Ukraine. The results indicate that two-thirds of respondents expressed support for the policy, albeit to varying extents, while 20% of the respondents expressed their disapproval. Notably, older individuals, those residing in rural areas, and male respondents demonstrated a stronger inclination to support the policy compared to their female, younger, and urban counterparts. The findings of our survey are consistent with the data provided by VCIOM (Russian Public Opinion Research Center). As demonstrated in Figure 4-G-1, survey data from VCIOM reveals that approximately two-thirds of Russian citizens expressed support for the country's 'special military operation'. VCIOM also revealed data on how Russian people evaluated the results of the 'special military operation'. As demonstrated in Figure 4-G-2, two thirds of the respondents regarded it as 'rather successful'. This suggests that the same demographic of the population supports

the government's policy towards Ukraine and provides a positive evaluation of the operation.



Figure 4-G-1. Support of special military operation (percentage of respondents)

Note: All-Russian telephone survey VTsIOM-Sputnik, 1600 respondents.

Source: VCIOM, Special military operation in Ukraine: Monitoring, <u>https://wciom.ru/analytical-reviews/analiticheskii-obzor/specialnaja-voennaja-operacija-na-ukraine-monitoring</u>



Figure 4-G-2. Support of special military operation (percentage of respondents)

Note: All-Russian telephone survey 'VTsIOM-Sputnik', 1600 respondents.

Source: VCIOM, Special military operation in Ukraine: Monitoring, <u>https://wciom.ru/analytical-reviews/analiticheskii-obzor/specialnaja-voennaja-operacija-na-ukraine-monitoring</u>

Q56 (Q139) inquired about the perception of responsibility for Russia's special military operation in Ukraine. The predominant response, accounting for 26.8% of the sample, was attributed to the 'government of foreign countries,' a category that primarily encompasses NATO member countries and the United States. The second most prevalent response, with 21.7%, cited 'politicians and deputies of Russia and Ukraine,' while the third most common response, at 17.1%, identified the Russian government as the primary responsible entity. A mere 10% of the respondents indicated that they believed the Ukrainian government was responsible. 11% of the respondents indicated that they found the question difficult to answer, and 2% refused to respond.

A discernible discrepancy emerges when examining age-related differences. A survey revealed that the predominant proportion of the 18-34 age group attributes responsibility to politicians from both Russian and Ukrainian governments, while a comparatively smaller proportion attributes responsibility to foreign governments. Conversely, older generations tend to attribute a greater share of responsibility to foreign governments compared to their Russian or Ukrainian counterparts. It is noteworthy that no discernible correlation exists between the respondents' answers and their income level or geographical location.

H. Respondent Information

This section contains information regarding the respondents' profiles. Question H1 (Q57-Q62) provides data on the educational attainment of the respondents themselves, their spouses, their parents, and their closest friends. The data reveal that approximately 45% of respondents have attained a university education or higher, while 35% have completed secondary special education. A similar educational attainment is observed among spouses. Conversely, the parents of the respondents tend to have a lower educational attainment, with 30% having completed only general secondary education or less.

A slight tendency towards higher educational attainment is observed among females. The place of residence exerts a significant influence on these outcomes. In Moscow and St. Petersburg, over 70% of respondents have attained a university degree or are currently enrolled in a university program, compared with approximately 25% in rural areas. Income level has been found to have a positive correlation with educational attainment.

H2 (Q63) addressed the number of family members. The data reveals that 83.2% of individuals reside with family members, while 16.3% live alone. The composition of family units residing in the same dwelling is typically characterized by a range of two to four individuals. Among the 1,325 respondents with family members residing in the same dwelling, 596 reported having children under the age of 18.

H3(Q65) solicits information regarding the sources of income, including that of family members. The results indicate that 67% of respondents derive their income from wages, while 47% receive a pension or other social benefits. Furthermore, 10% of the population owns their own business, while an equal proportion derives income from property. A significant proportion of the population, approximately one-quarter, derives income from part-time or occasional employment. Furthermore, 21% of the population possesses their own dacha.

The average income per month for the sample is presented in H4(Q66-Q73). The criteria for delineating five-level income strata vary according to the federal districts in which the respondents reside.

To the question regarding the presence of sources of income for family members other than the respondent (H5. Q74), 73% reported that they do.

H6(Q75) delves into the respondents' current financial status. 36.7% of respondents indicated that they have some financial resources available for a limited period. Furthermore, 35.6% of the respondents reported having outstanding loans from banking institutions or other financial entities, which are likely related to housing and automobile financing. Furthermore, 15% of the respondents reported possessing sufficient savings to sustain themselves for more than one year.

Question H7 (Q76) inquires about the current employment status of respondents. The results indicate that almost half of the respondents are employed full-time, a category that includes working pensioners and working students. Furthermore, 22.6% of the respondents reported being retired and inactive in the labor force. Part-time workers and self-employed individuals account for 5.8% and 5.9%, respectively.

H8 (Q77) Among individuals employed by companies and organizations, 27% are specialists who require higher education, while 17.5% are specialists with lower qualifications, such as office workers and secretaries. Notably, approximately 20% of the
employed population belongs to the managerial class. Furthermore, 9.5% of the workforce is employed by commercial and service companies. 20% of the workforce is categorized as 1-5th category.

H9(Q78) solicits feedback regarding the extent to which individuals perceive their influence on organizational decision-making processes. 18.7% of the respondents indicated that they have the capacity to influence enterprise-wide decision-making processes, while 40% reported being able to influence decision-making across units or departments. Conversely, 40% of the respondents expressed a lack of perceived influence within their professional contexts.

5. Conclusion

Our first-round survey conducted in February-March 2022, coincided with the start of the Russia-Ukraine military conflict. This second round was carried out from December 2023 to January 2024, approximately two years after the start of the conflict and economic sanctions imposed on Russia. During this period, the international landscape surrounding Russia and its socio-economic conditions underwent significant changes. Ties with Western nations were severed, while nations in the Global South emerged as new partners. A substantial number of citizens have left Russia, and although some have returned, the human capital loss remains considerable. Inflation persists, and the pressure on opponents has intensified. Nevertheless, Russian economy has demonstrated resilience, with national incomes even rising. The key contribution of this study lies in its analysis of how social capital in Russia has evolved in this period of turbulence.

Our first-round survey, in line with previous research, have revealed that Russian people have low levels of generalized trust and strong suspicion towards strangers. In contrast, they demonstrate high levels of particularized trust and maintain bonding social networks with family, relatives, and close friends. These characteristics have remained consistent in the second-round survey. Family and relatives are identified as the primary source of support for Russians, followed by friends, acquaintances, and work colleagues. Politics does not directly step into their human interaction. Mutual support between family members, relatives, and close friends and neighbours is observed in various forms including financial support. Currently, there are 10-20% of respondents who have renewed their relationships, such as establishing new business partners or reviving communication with relatives and friends, likely due to changes in their environment.

Regarding trust, the Russian population showed high level of confidence in vertical power institutions, such as the president and the army. This propensity has remained consistent since the first round of the survey. The Russian population, inhabiting a society characterised by distrust, tends to expect a strong state and implementation of paternalistic, redistributive policies. Additionally, the public's evaluation of the security policies enacted by the Russian government is generally positive, with two-thirds of respondents expressing support for policies concerning Ukraine. Overall, the nature of social capital in Russia has remained relatively stable since February 2022. Individuals are adapting to their environment by relying

on their close networks and are largely satisfied with their personal lives, while feeling powerless to influence the political change in the country.

However, it is important to recognize that social changes have affected segments of the Russian population unevenly. Differences in age and income level lead to disparities in the social capital endowment and the level of trust. For example, generalised trust, is higher among higher-income groups, while lower-income groups are extremely cautious toward others and rely on particularised trust within their immediate networks. Trust in colleagues and neighbours is also low for younger age groups. This division by personal attributes is also found in their support for the policy on Ukraine, with most young people responding negatively to the question of whether they would be willing to participate in the 'special military operation'. If taken at face value, these responses suggest a sense of disengagement, alienation and apathy towards politics.

As a result, strong particularised trust in social capital is not secure and contains considerable tensions. The reality of social capital in Russia cannot be captured by averages alone. It is therefore essential to analyse the difference in attitudes across various social clusters, which could potentially cause dissonance in Russian society.

References

- Algan, Y. (2018) Trust and social capital, Joseph E. Stiglitz, Jean-Paul Fitoussi and Martine Durand eds., For Good Measure: Advancing Research on Well-being Metrics Beyond GDP, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307278-en
- Almakaeva, A., Wilkes, R. (2021) Introduction: Social Capital and Subjective Well-Being: Towards a Conceptual Framework. In: Almakaeva A, Moreno A, Wilkes R (eds) Social Capital and Subjective Well-Being. Societies and Political Orders in Transition. Springer https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75813-4_1
- Almakaeva, A.M., Volchenko, O.V. (2018) Dynamika cotsial'nogo kapitala v Rossii (Dynamics of social capital in Russia). Monitoring obshestvennogo menniya: Ekonomicheskie i socialnye problem (Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes) 4(146): 273–292
- Anikin, V.A. (2022) Obzornoy issledovanie social'nogo kapitala v kontekste uluchsheniya cheloveka (Comprehensive study on social capital in the context of human improvement). The 7th volume of the report on 'Global research landscape and development perspectives in the field of human enhancement'. Electronic Publisher Egitas. 93p (In Russian)
- Avdeeva, D.A. (2019) Doverie v Rossii i ego svyaz s urovnem eknomicheskogo razvitiya (Trust in Russia and its relationship with Russia's economic development). Obshestvennye nauki i sovremennost (Social Sciences and the Contemporary World) 3:79–93 https://doi.org/10.31857/S086904990005087-7
- Beilmann, M., Lilleoja, L., Realo, A. (2021) Learning to Trust: Trends in Generalized Social Trust in the Three Baltic Countries from 1990 to 2018. In: Almakaeva A, Moreno A, Wilkes
 R. (eds) Social Capital and Subjective Well-Being. Societies and Political Orders in Transition. Springer. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75813-4_2</u>
- Galbraith, J.K. (2023) The Gift of Sanctions: An Analysis of Assessments of the Russian Economy, 2022 – 2023, Institute for New Economic Thinking, *Working Paper* N.204, 10 April 2023.
- Gorshkov, M.K. and Tikhonova, N.E. eds. (2024) *Russian Society and Challenges of the Times*, Ves' mir, Moscow, 352 pages. (in Russian)
- Grootaert and Van Bastelar (2002) Understanding and Measuring Social Capital A Multidisciplinary Tool for Practitioners, The World Bank, Washington.
- Haerpfer, C., Inglehart, R., Moreno, A., Welzel, C., Kizilova, K., Diez-Medrano J., M. Lagos, P. Norris, E. Ponarin & B. Puranen (eds.) (2022) World Values Survey: Round Seven –

Country-Pooled Datafile Version 6.0. Madrid, Spain & Vienna, Austria: JD Systems Institute & WVSA Secretariat. doi:10.14281/18241.24

- Inaba, Y. (2007) Social Capital: Contemporary Economic and Social Issues Solved through 'Bonds of Trust''', Seisansei publisher, Tokyo, Japan. (In Japanese)
- Inaba, Y. (2011) *Introduction to Social Capital: from Isolation to Bondage*. Chuoukoronsha (In Japanese)
- Inaba, Y. (2024) A New Theory of Social Capital: Analysing the 'Unreasonableness' of Japanese Society, Tokyo University Press. (In Japanese)
- Ishikawa, A., Sasaki M., and Dryakhlov, N. eds. (2017) *Trust of Russian Society*, Harvest-sha, Tokyo. (In Japanese)
- Iwai, N. and Shishido, K. eds. (2021) Social Network and Social Capital in East Asia: A Comparison among Japan, South Korea, China and Taiwan on East Asian Social Survey 2012, Nakanishiya.
- Kennedy, B., and Kawachi, I. (1998) The role of social capital in the Russian mortality crisis, *World Development*, Vol.26, Issue 11, 2029-2043.
- Kozyreva, P.M. and Smirnov, A.I. (2010) Doverie i ego rol' v konsolidatsii rossijskogo obshestva (Trust and its role in consolidation of the Russian society). In M.K. Gorshkov (ed.) *Social'nye factory konsolidatsii rossijskogo obshetva: sociologicheskoe izmerenie* (Social factors of consolidation of the Russian society: sociological measurement). Novy Khronograph: Moscow 160–199.
- Krivopuskov, V.V. (2023) Public trust to institutions as a resource of interethnic consolidation in the regional community. *Digital sociology*, 6(4): 20–28. doi: 10.26425/2658-347X-2023-6-4-20-28
- Kuchenkova, A.V. (2016) Interpersonal trust in the Russian society. *Social Studies* 1: 26–36 (In Russian)
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., Vishny, R.W. (1997) Trust in large organizations. *The American Econ Rev* 87(2): 333–338
- Latov, Y.V. (2021) Institutsionalnoe doverie kak socialny kapital v sovremennoj Rossii (Institutional trust as social capital in contemporary Russia). Polis. Political research 5:161– 175 https://doi. org/10.17976/jpps/2021.05.11
- Latov, Y.V. (2024) Trends in chaning institutional trust as social capital of Russian society.Sociologicheskieissledovanija.doi:https://doi.org/10.31857/S0132162524110056

- Ledeneva, A. (1998) Russia's Economy of Favours. Blat, Networking and Informal Exchange. Cambridge University Press
- Malkina, M.Yu., Ovchinnikov, V.N., Kholodilin, K.A. (2020) Institutional factors influencing political trust in modern Russia. *Journal of Institutional Studies* 12(4):77–93. doi: 10.17835/2076-6297.2020.12.4.077-093 (In Russian.)
- Maltseva, A.P. (2012) Social trust in modern Russia: Diagnosis, reasons of crisis, "treatment" conditions, *Vlast*, No.11, 49-52. (In Russian)
- Mizobata, S., Yokogawa, K., Gorshkov, V., Hayashi, H., and Anikin, V. (2024) Research on social capital under COVID-19 in Russia, Kyoto University Institute of Economic Research *Discussion Paper*, No.2401, June 2024. (In Japanese)
- Paldam, M. and Svendsen, G. T. (2002) Missing social capital and the transition in Eastern Europe, *Journal of Institutional Innovation, Development and Transition*, 5, pp.21–34.
- Putnam, R. (2000) Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community, Simon & Schuster.
- Reutov, E.V., Reutova, M.N. (2014) Socialnoe doverie v rossijskom obschestve: tendencii i protivorechija (Social trust in Russian society: trends and contradictions). Rossia i sovremennyj mir (Russia and Contemporary World) 1(82):173–181 (In Russian)
- Sasaki, M., Davydenko, V.A., Latov, Y.V., Romashkin, G.S., Latova, N.V. (2009) Problemy i paradoksy analiza institutsionalnogo doveriya kak elementa socialnogo kapital sovremennoj Rossii (Problems and paradoxes of analysis of institutiona trust as an element of social capital in contemporary Russia). *Journal of Institutional Studies* 1(1):20–35
- Schrader, H. (2004) Social capital and social transformation in Russia, *Journal of East European Management Studies*, Vol.9, No.4, 391-410.
- Sekine, Y. (2023) Does neighbourhood social support reduce the stress of the COVID-19 pandemic?: The Nagahama study, *Japan Journal of Social Relations*, vol.2, no.5, 55-65, DOI: 10.57336/jjsr.2023.020555. (in Japanese)
- Staveren, I. (2014) Preface, Christoforou A. and Davis, J.B. eds., Social Capital and Economics: Social Values, Power, and Social Identity, Routledge.
- Todd, E. (2024) The Defeat of the West, translated by Ohno, M., Bungeishunjyu. (In Japanese)
- Trofimova, I.N. (2017) Struktura i dinamika institutsional'nogo doveriya v sovremennom rossijskom obshestve [Sturcture and dynamics of institutional trust in contemporary Russian society] *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*. 10: 68-75 (In Russian)

- Veselov, Y.V., Skvortsov, N.G. (2023) Transformation of the culture of trust in Russia. Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes 1: 157–179. https:// doi.org/10.14515/monitoring.2023.1.2212 (In Russian)
- Volkov, D. and Kolesnikov, A. (2022) My country, right or wrong: Russian public opinion on Ukraine, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Working Paper*, September 2022, 1-23.
- Volkov, D. and Kolesnikov, A. (2023) Alternate reality: How Russian society learned to stop worrying about the war, Carnegie Russia Eurasia Center *Working Paper* November 2023.
- Yaffa, J. (2020) Between Two Fires. Truth, Ambition, and Compromise in Putin's Russia, Granta, London
- Yamagishi, T. (1999) From Security Society to Trust Society. Chuoukoronsha (In Japanese)
- Yodo, M. (2018) Economic Analysis of Social Capital: Can Human Relationships Revive Economy?, Keio University Publishing, Tokyo. (in Japanese)

Appendix 1

Survey Results

A. Social Contacts and Membership in Organizations

A1(Q5). People often participate in different groups, organisations, networks, or associations. These can be formally established groups such as voluntary organisations, political parties, interest clubs, voluntary organisations, or simply groups of people who meet regularly to work together or discuss different topics. How many of these groups do you or your family member belong to?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Have membership in such | 292 | 18.25% |
| associations | | |
| Do not have membership in | 1,292 | 80.75% |
| such associations | | |
| Cannot answer | 16 | 1.00% |
| TOTAL | 1,600 | 100.00% |

| Table A1 0 Mombers | hin in | associations | N = 1600 | • |
|---------------------|--------|--------------|-----------|---|
| Table AT-0. Members | mp m | associations | (10-1000) | , |

Figure A1-0. Membership in associations (N=1584)



Figure A1-1. By sex (N=1584)





Figure A1-3. By region (N=1577)



Figure A1-4. By income (N=1461)



Figure A1-2. By age (N=1584)



Figure A1-5. Number of associations to which the respondent belongs to (N=292)

A5 (Q9). With how many family members or relatives do usually have contact with in one day? You can contact them in person, by telephone or via the internet. Do not include family members and relatives residing with you.

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 0 people | 173 | 10.8% |
| 1-2 people | 455 | 28.4% |
| 3-4 people | 426 | 26.6% |
| 5-9 people | 384 | 24.0% |
| 10-19 people | 119 | 7.4% |
| more than 20 people | 26 | 1.6% |
| Cannot answer | 17 | 1.1% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A5-0. Number of social contacts (family members and relatives) (N=1583)







Figure A5-3. By region (N=1576)





Figure A5-4. By income (N=1464)

A6(Q10). How often do you communicate, ask for advice or help from your family members or close relatives? (excluding those residing with you)

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Never | 388 | 24.3% |
| Once a year or once every few years | 219 | 13.7% |
| Once a month or more than once a month | 338 | 21.1% |
| Once a week or more than once a month | 242 | 15.1% |
| Everyday or several times a week | 384 | 24.0% |
| Cannot answer | 29 | 1.8% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |















A7(Q11). Among your neighbours, how many people do you usually say hello to?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 0 people | 96 | 6.0% |
| 1-4 people | 388 | 24.3% |
| 5-9 people | 345 | 21.6% |
| 10-19 people | 413 | 25.8% |
| 20 or more people | 311 | 19.4% |
| Cannot answer | 47 | 2.9% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A7-0. Number of neighbours whom the respondent usually says hello to (N=1553)







Figure A7-3. By region (N=1546)



51



A8(Q12). How many neighbours can you ask for an advice or help in case of a need?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 0 people | 491 | 30.7% |
| 1-2 people | 453 | 28.3% |
| 3-4 people | 267 | 16.7% |
| 5-9 people | 187 | 11.7% |
| 10 or more people | 152 | 9.5% |
| Cannot answer | 50 | 3.1% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A8-0. Number of neighbours whom the respondent can ask for help (N=1550)











Figure A8-1. By sex (N=1550)



A9(Q13). How many close friends with whom you share details about your personal life or ask for help in difficult situations do you have?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 0 people | 320 | 20.0% |
| 1-2 people | 603 | 37.7% |
| 3-4 people | 359 | 22.4% |
| 5-9 people | 213 | 13.3% |
| 10-19 people | 61 | 3.8% |
| 20-49 people | 9 | 0.6% |
| 50-99 people | 9 | 0.6% |
| 100 or more people | 6 | 0.4% |
| Cannot answer | 20 | 1.3% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A9-0. Number of people with whom you share details of your personal life or ask for help in difficult situations (N=1580)











Figure A9-3. By region (N=1573)





Figure A9-4. By income (N=1462)

A10(Q14). How often do you ask for advice or help from your friends and acquaintances, excluding co-workers?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Never | 440 | 27.5% |
| Once a year or once every few years | 380 | 23.8% |
| Once a month or once every few years | 488 | 30.5% |
| Once a week or more than once a month | 172 | 10.8% |
| Every day or several times a week | 84 | 5.3% |
| Cannot answer | 36 | 2.3% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A10-0. Frequency of asking advice or help from friends and acquaintances, excluding

colleagues (N=1564)





Figure A10-2. By age (N=1564)









Figure A10-4. By income (N=1443)



| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| in person | 484 | 30.3% |
| by phone | 752 | 47.0% |
| by e-mail | 5 | 0.3% |
| by social networks | 308 | 19.3% |
| other | 33 | 2.1% |
| Cannot answer | 18 | 1.1% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A11-0. Total respondents (N=1582)















Figure A11-4. By income (N=1461)



| | Number of respondents | Percentage | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|--|
| There are more people with higher social | 100 | 6.8% | |
| status around me | 109 | 0.070 | |
| There are more people of the same social | 1280 | 80.0% | |
| status around me | 1200 | 00.070 | |
| There are more people with lower social | 76 | 1 80/ | |
| status around me | 70 | 4.070 | |
| Cannot answer | 135 | 8.4% | |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% | |





Figure A12-1. By sex (N=1465)



Figure A12-2. By age (N=1465)









Figure A12-4. By income (N=1361)

A16(Q27). Who of the following people constitute your largest communication circle?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| family and relatives | 835 | 52.2% |
| neighbours | 40 | 2.5% |
| classmates | 64 | 4.0% |
| friends and acquaintances (excluding classmates) | 318 | 19.9% |
| co-workers | 270 | 16.9% |
| employees of non-profit or voluntary organisations | 12 | 0.8% |
| church representatives | 15 | 0.9% |
| members of political parties | 3 | 0.2% |
| other | 20 | 1.3% |
| Cannot answer | 23 | 1.4% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |



Figure A16-0. Total number of respondents (N=1577)







Figure A16-2. By age (N=1577)







Figure A16-4. By income (N=1454)

A14.5(Q22). To whom do you usually apply for help in extreme situations?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| family members living with you | 617 | 38.6% |
| relatives | 495 | 30.9% |
| work colleagues | 29 | 1.8% |
| neighbours | 30 | 1.9% |
| friends | 196 | 12.3% |
| a professional | 69 | 4.3% |
| social organisations | 12 | 0.8% |
| no one | 60 | 3.8% |
| don't have such problems | 33 | 2.1% |
| other | 32 | 2.0% |
| Cannot answer | 27 | 1.7% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |



Figure A14.5-0. Total number of respondents (N=1573)

Figure A14.5-1. By sex (N=1573)









Figure A14.5-3. By region (N=1567)





A15.1(Q25). (For respondents residing in rural areas). If you need a small amount of money sufficient to cover for weekly expenses of your family, do you have anyone, apart from your family members and close relatives, to whom you could apply for and borrow this money?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Definitely yes | 94 | 40.7% |
| Most likely yes | 53 | 22.9% |
| Not sure | 20 | 8.7% |
| Most likely no | 21 | 9.1% |
| Definitely no | 27 | 11.7% |
| Cannot answer | 16 | 6.9% |
| Total | 231 | 100.0% |

Figure A15.1-0. Total number of respondents (N=215)



Figure A15.1-1. By sex (N=215)













Figure A15.1-4. By income (N=200)

A15.2(Q26). (For respondents residing in urban areas). If you need a small amount of money equivalent to your weekly salary, do you have anyone, apart from your family members and close relatives, to whom you could apply for and borrow this money?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Definitely yes | 498 | 42.9% |
| Most likely yes | 271 | 23.4% |
| Not sure | 59 | 5.1% |
| Most likely no | 98 | 8.4% |
| Definitely no | 143 | 12.3% |
| Cannot answer | 91 | 7.8% |
| Total | 1,160 | 100.0% |

Figure A15.2-0. Total number of respondents (N=1069)



Figure A15.2-1. By sex (N=1069)













Figure A15.2-4. By income (N=994)
Q14(Q83). In the past 12 months, have you received or provided help listed below from your close surroundings?

| | Type of assistance | I received such help | I provided such help | Neither received nor provided such help | Cannot answer | Total |
|------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------|-------|
| Q83_1 | Borrowing up to 100,000 rubles | 276 | 608 | 878 | 9 | 1600 |
| Q83_2 | Borrowing more than 100,000 rubles | 112 | 205 | 1315 | 14 | 1600 |
| Q83_3 | Getting a good job | 181 | 236 | 1207 | 22 | 1600 |
| Q83_4 | Entering a good university | 59 | 70 | 1453 | 20 | 1600 |
| Q83_5 | Career promotion | 134 | 104 | 1376 | 16 | 1600 |
| Q83_6 | Ensuring entrance to a good school for children | 66 | 84 | 1428 | 25 | 1600 |
| Q83_7 | Solving a housing issue | 172 | 187 | 1259 | 17 | 1600 |
| Q83_8 | Introducing a good doctor or getting access to a good hospital | 357 | 159 | 1122 | 14 | 1600 |
| Q83_9 | Searching opportunities for earning extra income (e.g. via one-time jobs) | 278 | 208 | 1174 | 16 | 1600 |
| Q83_1 0 | Getting access to people with authority who can help solving your problems | 170 | 126 | 1331 | 17 | 1600 |
| Q83_1 1 | Help in moving to other region of Russia | 93 | 118 | 1398 | 11 | 1600 |
| Q83_1 2 | Help in moving abroad | 25 | 27 | 1536 | 15 | 1600 |

| Table 14-0. Number of | of respondents and | percentage who receive | ed or provided help |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|

In percentage

| Q83_1 | Borrowing up to 100,000 rubles | 17.3% | 38.0% | 54.9% | 0.6% | 100.0% |
|-------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|
| Q83_2 | Borrowing more than 100,000 rubles | 7.0% | 12.8% | 82.2% | 0.9% | 100.0% |
| Q83_3 | Getting a good job | 11.3% | 14.8% | 75.4% | 1.4% | 100.0% |
| Q83_4 | Entering a good university | 3.7% | 4.4% | 90.8% | 1.3% | 100.0% |
| Q83_5 | Career promotion | 8.4% | 6.5% | 86.0% | 1.0% | 100.0% |

| Q83_6 | Ensuring entrance to a good school for children | 4.1% | 5.3% | 89.3% | 1.6% | 100.0% |
|-------|---|-------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| Q83_7 | Solving a housing issue | 10.8% | 11.7% | 78.7% | 1.1% | 100.0% |
| Q83_8 | Introducing a good doctor or | | | | | |
| | getting access to a good | 22.3% | 9.9% | 70.1% | 0.9% | 100.0% |
| | hospital | | | | | |
| Q83_9 | Searching opportunities for | | | | | |
| | earning extra income (e.g. | 17.4% | 13.0% | 73.4% | 1.0% | 100.0% |
| | via one-time jobs) | | | | | |
| Q83_1 | Getting access to people | | | | | |
| 0 | with authority who can help | 10.6% | 7.9% | 83.2% | 1.1% | 100.0% |
| | solving your problems | | | | | |
| Q83_1 | Help in moving to other | 5 80/ | 7 40% | 87 10/2 | 0.7% | 100.0% |
| 1 | region of Russia | 5.870 | /.470 | 07.470 | 0.770 | 100.070 |
| Q83_1 | Help in moving abroad | 1 60/ | 1 70/ | 06.0% | 0.0% | 100 00/ |
| 2 | | 1.070 | 1./70 | 90.070 | 0.970 | 100.070 |







Figure 14-1(Q83_1) Borrowing up to 100,000 rubles



Figure 14-2 (Q83_2) Borrowing more than 100,000 rubles













Figure 14-4 (Q83_4) Entering a good university



Figure 14-5 (Q83_5) Career promotion





Figure 14-6 (Q83_6) Ensuring entrance to a good school for children







Figure 14-7 (Q83_7) Solving a housing issue









Figure 14-9 (Q83_9) Searching opportunities for earning extra income (e.g. via one-time jobs)





Figure 14-10 (Q83_10) Getting access to people with authority who can help solving your problems



Figure 14-11 (Q83 11) Help in moving to other region of Russia

St.Petersburg

Republican or

Moscow and

District centre,

regional centre,.

Urban type

small or...

By region

settlemnet

Rural area

(village,...

Female

By sex

Male

25-34

18-24

35-44

45-54

By age

55 and over

1- low

 \sim

 \sim

By income

4

5 - high









Figure 14-12 (Q83_12) Help in moving abroad

Q15 (Q84). How has the frequency of your communication with the following people changed in the past 12 months?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Increased | 249 | 15.6% |
| Did not change | 1107 | 69.2% |
| Decreased | 233 | 14.6% |
| Cannot answer | 11 | 0.7% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |





Figure 15-1. By sex





Figure 15-2. By age



Figure 15-3. By region



Figure 15-4. By income

Q16 (Q85). In the past 12 months, have you experienced the necessity in the following matters?

| | Yes, and I fullfull ed this necessit y | No, but I plan to fulfill such a necessit y | | Cannot answer | no data | Total |
|---|---|---|------|------------------|---------|--------|
| Communication in Internet | 336 | 25 | 45 | 1,178 | 16 | 1,600 |
| etc.) | 21.0% | 1.6% | 2.8% | 73.6% | 1.0% | 100.0% |
| Finding new friends and close | 138 | 57 | 38 | 1,352 | 15 | 1,600 |
| acquaintances | 8.6% | 3.6% | 2.4% | 84.5% | 0.9% | 100.0% |
| Finding partners for new | 86 | 73 | 31 | 1,406 | 4 | 1,600 |
| business or start-ups | 5.4% | 4.6% | 1.9% | 87.9% | 0.3% | 100.0% |
| Finding new partners for | 264 | 102 | 27 | 1,197 | 10 | 1,600 |
| activity | 16.5% | 6.4% | 1.7% | 74.8% | 0.6% | 100.0% |
| Restoring trust in relations | 215 | 68 | 28 | 1,276 | 13 | 1,600 |
| with close relatives | 13.4% | 4.3% | 1.8% | 79.8% | 0.8% | 100.0% |
| Restoring communication (connections) with relatives | 156 | 54 | 27 | 1,357 | 6 | 1,600 |
| in other regions of Russia | 9.8% | 3.4% | 1.7% | 84.8% | 0.4% | 100.0% |
| Restoring communication (connections) with those who | 87 | 22 | 19 | 1,465 | 7 | 1,600 |
| left Russia | 5.4% | 1.4% | 1.2% | 91.6% | 0.4% | 100.0% |



Figure 16-0. Total number of respondents









| | 0. | 00% 10.00 | % 20.00% | 6 30.00% | 40.00% 50 | .00% 60.0 | 00% 70.0 | 0% 80.00 | % 90.00 | % 100. |
|--|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|--------|
| in tes, | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| tion ocial ing si 103) | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| unica net (s (N=4 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| omm Interi vorks etc.) | Village | | | | | | | | - | |
| Connetv | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
| s and s | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| iends tance () | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| ew fr iquin [=23(| Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| ing n lose a | Village | | | | | | | | | |
| Findi cl | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
| new Ips | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| rs for tart-u)) | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| artne: s or s (=19(| Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| ng pa siness (N | Village | | | | | | | | | |
| Findi bus | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
| s for ity | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| urtner your activ | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| w pa ling y onal a =390 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| ng ne fulfil fessi | Village | | | | | | | | | |
| Findi pro | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
|) se | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| h clo =309 | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| ing ti s wit es (N | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| estor ation lativ | Village | | | | | | | | | |
| R rel | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
| h gions 7) | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| ng ation s) wit er reg V=23 | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| storu nunic cions n oth sia (D | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| Ke conne ves i Rus | Village | | | | | | | | | |
| (c relati | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
| hose 128) | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | | | | |
| ng ation vith t (N= | Republican or regional centre, large city | | | | | | | | | |
| storii nunic nus) v (ussia | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | | | | |
| Re Somn Lectio | Village | | | | | | | | | |
| , (conr who l | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Yes, and I fullfulled this necessity | | No, bu | ıt I pla | n to ful | fill su | ich a i | iecess | ity | |
| 1 | I did not have such a necessity | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 16-3. By region



Figure 16-4. By income

A17(Q28). On a scale from 1 to 5, how important is having connections with people with power (such as politicians, public servants, company managers, etc.) in order to be successful in the society?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 - Absolutely unimportant | 460 | 28.8% |
| 2 | 101 | 6.3% |
| 3 | 284 | 17.8% |
| 4 | 193 | 12.1% |
| 5 - Absolutely important | 522 | 32.6% |
| Cannot answer/ Refuse | 40 | 2.5% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure A17-0. Total number of respondents (N=1560)



Figure A17-1. By sex





Figure A17-2. By age (N=1560)







Figure A17-4. By income (N=1439)

B. Social Trust

B1(Q29). Generally speaking, do you think that most people can be trusted, or one has to be careful in dealing with people?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| In most cases people can be trusted | 172 | 10.8% |
| In some cases people can be trusted | 297 | 18.6% |
| Sometimes you have to be careful in dealing with people | 485 | 30.3% |
| In most cases, you have to be extremely careful when dealing with people | 634 | 39.6% |
| Cannot answer | 12 | 0.8% |
| Total | 1600 | 100.0% |

Figure B1-0. Total number of respondents (N=1588)





Figure B1-2. By age (N=1588)



Figure B1-3. By region (N=1582)





Figure B1-4. By income

B2(Q30). How much do you trust your immediate environment? Rate on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not trusted at all, 5 is fully trusted.

| | Absol | Some | Neith | Some | Absol | Cann | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | utely | what | er | what | utely | ot | |
| | do not | do not | trust | trust | trust | answ | |
| | trust | trust | nor | | | er | |
| | | | distru | | | | |
| | | | st | | | | |
| Q30_1_family | 35 | 20 | 75 | 163 | 1,285 | 22 | 1,600 |
| Q30_2_relatives | 64 | 63 | 181 | 344 | 921 | 27 | 1,600 |
| Q30_3_friends | 97 | 79 | 263 | 446 | 683 | 32 | 1,600 |
| Q30_4_work colleagues | 212 | 185 | 468 | 323 | 209 | 203 | 1,600 |
| Q30_5_neighbours | 337 | 244 | 453 | 300 | 210 | 56 | 1,600 |
| Q30_6_people I see for the | 1,006 | 275 | 218 | 47 | 23 | 31 | 1,600 |
| first time | | | | | | | |
| Q30_7_doctors | 246 | 207 | 514 | 375 | 224 | 34 | 1,600 |
| Q30_8_directors/Managers of | 324 | 246 | 501 | 253 | 134 | 142 | 1,600 |
| companies | | | | | | | |
| Q30_9_directors of NGOs or | 458 | 240 | 439 | 200 | 75 | 188 | 1,600 |
| NPOs | | | | | | | |
| Q30_10_teachers | 143 | 127 | 365 | 487 | 325 | 153 | 1,600 |
| Q30_11_scientists | 124 | 91 | 325 | 486 | 438 | 136 | 1,600 |
| Q30_12_municipal | 478 | 312 | 457 | 202 | 97 | 54 | 1,600 |
| employees | | | | | | | |
| Q30_13_civil servants | 461 | 260 | 443 | 243 | 111 | 82 | 1,600 |
| Q30_14_president of Russia | 244 | 77 | 153 | 275 | 792 | 59 | 1,600 |

| Q30_15_political parties | 496 | 247 | 419 | 220 | 93 | 125 | 1,600 |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Q30_16_elections | 476 | 131 | 273 | 268 | 389 | 63 | 1,600 |
| Q30_17_courts | 355 | 205 | 434 | 296 | 189 | 121 | 1,600 |
| Q30_18_police | 313 | 237 | 456 | 334 | 199 | 61 | 1,600 |
| Q30_19_Russian army | 109 | 65 | 183 | 346 | 823 | 74 | 1,600 |
| Q30_20_church | 380 | 140 | 249 | 255 | 473 | 103 | 1,600 |
| Q30_21_traditional media | 543 | 319 | 450 | 175 | 78 | 35 | 1,600 |
| (TV, radio, newspapers) | | | | | | | |
| Q30_22_social media, | 521 | 409 | 449 | 89 | 34 | 98 | 1,600 |
| information on the internet | | | | | | | |
| Q30_23_Russian government | 302 | 149 | 351 | 379 | 352 | 67 | 1,600 |
| Q30_24_State Duma | 404 | 179 | 373 | 319 | 242 | 83 | 1,600 |

| | Absol | Some | Neith | Some | Absol | Canno | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | utely | what | er | what | utely | t | |
| | do not | do not | trust | trust | trust | answe | |
| | trust | trust | nor | | | r | |
| | | | distru | | | | |
| | | | st | | | | |
| Q30_1_family | 2.2% | 1.3% | 4.7% | 10.2% | 80.3% | 1.4% | 100% |
| Q30_2_relatives | 4.0% | 3.9% | 11.3% | 21.5% | 57.6% | 1.7% | 100% |
| Q30_3_friends | 6.1% | 4.9% | 16.4% | 27.9% | 42.7% | 2.0% | 100% |
| Q30_4_work colleagues | 13.3% | 11.6% | 29.3% | 20.2% | 13.1% | 12.7% | 100% |
| Q30_5_neighbours | 21.1% | 15.3% | 28.3% | 18.8% | 13.1% | 3.5% | 100% |
| Q30_6_people I see for the | 62.9% | 17.2% | 13.6% | 2.9% | 1.4% | 1.9% | 100% |
| first time | | | | | | | |
| Q30_7_doctors | 15.4% | 12.9% | 32.1% | 23.4% | 14.0% | 2.1% | 100% |
| Q30_8_directors/Managers of | 20.3% | 15.4% | 31.3% | 15.8% | 8.4% | 8.9% | 100% |
| companies | | | | | | | |
| Q30_9_directors of NGOs or | 28.6% | 15.0% | 27.4% | 12.5% | 4.7% | 11.8% | 100% |
| NPOs | | | | | | | |
| Q30_10_teachers | 8.9% | 7.9% | 22.8% | 30.4% | 20.3% | 9.6% | 100% |
| Q30_11_scientists | 7.8% | 5.7% | 20.3% | 30.4% | 27.4% | 8.5% | 100% |
| Q30_12_municipal | 29.9% | 19.5% | 28.6% | 12.6% | 6.1% | 3.4% | 100% |
| employees | | | | | | | |
| Q30_13_civil servants | 28.8% | 16.3% | 27.7% | 15.2% | 6.9% | 5.1% | 100% |
| Q30_14_president of Russia | 15.3% | 4.8% | 9.6% | 17.2% | 49.5% | 3.7% | 100% |
| Q30_15_political parties | 31.0% | 15.4% | 26.2% | 13.8% | 5.8% | 7.8% | 100% |
| Q30_16_elections | 29.8% | 8.2% | 17.1% | 16.8% | 24.3% | 3.9% | 100% |
| Q30_17_courts | 22.2% | 12.8% | 27.1% | 18.5% | 11.8% | 7.6% | 100% |
| Q30_18_police | 19.6% | 14.8% | 28.5% | 20.9% | 12.4% | 3.8% | 100% |
| Q30_19_Russian army | 6.8% | 4.1% | 11.4% | 21.6% | 51.4% | 4.6% | 100% |

| Q30_20_church | 23.8% | 8.8% | 15.6% | 15.9% | 29.6% | 6.4% | 100% |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| Q30_21_traditional media | 33.9% | 19.9% | 28.1% | 10.9% | 4.9% | 2.2% | 100% |
| (TV, radio, newspapers) | | | | | | | |
| Q30_22_social media, | 32.6% | 25.6% | 28.1% | 5.6% | 2.1% | 6.1% | 100% |
| information on the internet | | | | | | | |
| Q30_23_Russian government | 18.9% | 9.3% | 21.9% | 23.7% | 22.0% | 4.2% | 100% |
| Q30_24_State Duma | 25.3% | 11.2% | 23.3% | 19.9% | 15.1% | 5.2% | 100% |

| | 0% | 10% | 20% | 30% | 40% | 50% | 60% | 70% | 80% | 90% | 100% |
|--|-------|----------------|----------|-------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|-----|-----|------|
| Q30_1_family | y 📕 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_2_relative | s 🗖 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_3_friend | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_4_work colleague | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_5_neighbour | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_6_people I see for the first time | e | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_7_doctor | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_8_directors/Managers of companie | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_9_directors of NGOs or NPOs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_10_teacher | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_11_scientist | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_12_municipal employee | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_13_civil servant | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_14_president of Russi | a | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_15_political partie | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_16_election | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_17_court | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_18_polic | e | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_19_Russian arm | y 📃 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_20_churcl | h | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_21_traditional media (TV, radio, newspapers |) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_22_social media, information on the internet | t | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_23_Russian governmen | t | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q30_24_State Duma | a | | | | | | | | | | |
| Absolutely do not trust | Somev | what do | o not ti | ust I | Neith | er trus | st nor d | istrust | | | |
| Somewhat trust | Absol | solutely trust | | | Cannot answer | | | | | | |

Figure B2-0. Total number of respondents (N=1600)

B2(Q30_1). Trust in family members



Figure B2.1-0. Total number of respondents (N=1578)

Figure B2.1-1. By sex (N=1578)



Figure B2.1-2. By age (N=1578)





Figure B2.1-3. By region (N=1571)

Figure B2.1-4. By income



B2(Q30_2). Trust in relatives



Figure B2.2-0. Total number of respondents (N=1573)



Figure B2.2-1. By sex (N=1573)











B2(Q30_3). Trust in friends





Figure B2.3-1. By sex (N=1568)





Figure B2.3-2. By age (N=1568)







Figure B2.3-4. By income (N=1446)

B2(Q30_4). Trust in colleagues (co-workers)



Figure B2.4-0. Total number of respondents (N=1397)

















B2(Q30_5). Trust in neighbours



Figure B2.5-0. Total number of respondents (N=1544)









Figure B2.5-3. By region (N=1539)





Figure B2.5-4. By income (N=1425)

B2(Q30_6). Trust in people whom you see for the first time



Figure B2.6-0. Total number of respondents (N=1569)















Figure B2.6-4. By income (N=1446)
B2 (Q30_7). Trust in doctors



Figure B2.7-0. Total number of respondents (N=1566)

Figure B2.7-1. By sex (N=1566)













Figure B2.7-4. By income (N=1445)

B2 (Q30_8). Trust in company managers



Figure B2.8-0. Total number of respondents (N=1458)















Figure B2.8-4. By income (N=1346)

B2 (Q30_9). Trust in leaders of NPOs



Figure B2.9-0. Total number of respondents (N=1412)

Figure B2.9-1. By sex (N=1412)





Figure B2.9-2. By age (N=1412)







Figure B2.9-4. By income (N=1304)

B2 (Q30_10). Trust in teachers



Figure B2.10-0. Total number of respondents (N=1447)

Figure B2.10-1. By sex (N=1447)















B2 (Q30_11). Trust in scientists









Figure B2.11-1. By sex (N=1464)







Figure B2.11-4. By income (N=1355)

B2 (Q30_12). Trust in local and municipal authorities



Figure B2.12-0. Total number of respondents (N=1546)

Figure B2.12-1. By sex (N=1546)





Figure B2.12-2. By age (N=1546)







Figure B2.12-4. By income (N=1434)

B2 (Q30_13). Trust in public servants



Figure B2.13-0. Total number of respondents (N=1518)

Figure B2.13-1. By sex (N=1518)















B2 (Q30_14). Trust in President









Figure B2.14-3. By region (N=1534)



Figure B2.14-1. By sex (N=1541)



Figure B2.14-4. By income (N=1428)

B2 (Q30_15). Trust in political parties



Figure B2.15-0. Total number of respondents (N=1475)

Figure B2.15-1. By sex (N=1475)













Figure B2.15-4. By income (N=1367)

B2 (Q30_16). Trust in elections



Figure B2.16-0. Total number of respondents (N=1537)

Figure B2.16-1. By sex (N=1537)

















Figure B2.17-0. Total number of respondents (N=1479)





Figure B2.17-1. By sex (N=1479)







B2(Q30_18). Trust in the police





Figure B2.18-1. By sex (N=1539)













Figure B2.18-4. By income (N=1423)

B2 (Q30_19). Trust in the army





Figure B2.19-1. By sex (N=1526)

















Figure B2.20-0. Total number of respondents (N=1497)









Figure B2.20-3. By region (N=1492)





Figure B2.20-4. By income (N=1367)

B2 (Q30_21). Trust in old media (TV, radio, newspapers)



Figure B2.21-0. Total number of respondents (N=1565)







Figure B2.21-2. By age (N=1558)







Figure B2.21-4. By income (N=1444)

B2 (Q30_22). Trust in new media (social networks, information in the Internet)



Figure B2.22-0. Total number of respondents (N=1502)

Figure B2.22-1. By sex (N=1502)









Figure B2.22-3. By region (N=1502)





B2 (Q30_23). Trust in Russia's Government



Figure B2.23-0. Total number of respondents (N=1533)



Figure B2.23-1. By sex (N=1533)

Figure B2.23-2. By age (N=1533)









Figure B2.23-4. By income (N=1421)

B2 (Q30_24). Trust in State Duma

Figure B2.24-0. Total number of respondents (N=1517)



Figure B2.24-1. By sex (N=1517)





Figure B2.24-2. By age (N=1517)







Figure B2.24-4. By income (N=1409)

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 - Absolute predominance of evil | 67 | 4.2% |
| 2 | 34 | 2.1% |
| 3 | 147 | 9.2% |
| 4 | 364 | 22.8% |
| 5 | 580 | 36.3% |
| 6 | 146 | 9.1% |
| 7 - Absolute predominance of good | 247 | 15.4% |
| Cannot answer/Refuse | 15 | 0.9% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

B4(Q32). In your opinion, is there more good or evil in human nature?





Figure B4-1. By sex (N=1585)





Figure B4-2. By age (N=1585)







Figure B4-4. By income (N=1462)

C. Opportunities and Influence

| | Number of | Percentage |
|--|-------------|------------|
| | respondents | |
| Absolutely cannot to make decisions that could change my | 61 | 3.8% |
| life | | |
| Somewhat cannot make decisions that could change my | 188 | 11.8% |
| life | | |
| Somewhat can make decisions that could change my life | 690 | 43.1% |
| Absolutely can make decisions that could change my life | 613 | 38.3% |
| Cannot answer | 48 | 3.0% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

C1(Q33). Do you feel that you can change your life on your own?

Figure C1-0. Total number of respondents (N=1552)



Figure C1-1. By sex (N=1552)





Figure C1-2. By age (N=1552)







Figure C1-4. By income (N=1431)

C3 (Q35). To what extent are you satisfied with your life?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Absolutely not satisfied | 33 | 2.1% |
| Somewhat not satisfied | 48 | 3.0% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 601 | 37.6% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 572 | 35.8% |
| Absolutely satisfied | 333 | 20.8% |
| Cannot answer | 13 | 0.8% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |





Figure C3-1. By sex (N=1587)





Figure C3-2. By age (N=1587)







Figure C3-4. By income (N=1465)
| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| I feel emotionally uplifted | 56 | 3.5% |
| I feel calm and well-balanced | 704 | 44.0% |
| I feel apathetic | 51 | 3.2% |
| I feel anxious | 127 | 7.9% |
| I feel irritated | 27 | 1.7% |
| I feel angry | 9 | 0.6% |
| I feel aggressive | 9 | 0.6% |
| It depends, my emotional condition | 599 | 37.4% |
| varies | | |
| Other | 10 | 0.6% |
| Cannot answer | 8 | 0.5% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

C5 (Q137). How would you describe your daily emotional and psychological condition?

Figure C5-0. Total number of respondents (N=1592)

















Figure C5-4. By income (N=1471)

C4 (Q36). Who in your environment is the most important person: an authority, a main adviser or person providing assistance in solving your problems or achieving your goals?

| | Number of | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| | respondents | |
| My boss at work | 88 | 5.5% |
| A state or local government official | 3 | 0.2% |
| A politician | 12 | 0.8% |
| A teacher at school or university | 31 | 1.9% |
| A member of a local community | 15 | 0.9% |
| organization | | |
| Other | 677 | 42.3% |
| No one | 757 | 47.3% |
| Cannot answer | 17 | 1.1% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |



Figure C4-0. Total number of respondents (N=1583)









Figure C4-3. By region (N=1576)





D. Social Cohesion and Social Inclusiveness

D1 (Q37). It is often the case that there are significant differences between people living in the same area in terms of social status, income, nationality, mother tongue, political preferences, religion, age, gender, etc. How pronounced are such differences in your area of residence?

| | Number of | Percentage |
|---|-------------|------------|
| | respondents | |
| 1 - Such differences are not pronounced | 482 | 30.1% |
| 2 | 240 | 15.0% |
| 3 | 405 | 25.3% |
| 4 | 177 | 11.1% |
| 5 - Such differences are quite | 241 | 15.1% |
| pronounced | | |
| Cannot answer | 55 | 3.4% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure D1-0. Total number of respondents (N=1545)











Figure D1-3. By region (N=1538)





Figure D1-4. By income (N=1426)

D5 (Q41). In your experience, how safe is it to walk around in your residing area at night?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Quite safe | 600 | 37.5% |
| Somewhat safe | 630 | 39.4% |
| Somewhat unsafe | 244 | 15.3% |
| Quite unsafe | 96 | 6.0% |
| Cannot answer | 30 | 1.9% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure D5-0. Total number of respondents (N=1570)







Figure D5-3. By region (N=1563)



Figure D5-1. By sex (N=1570)



Figure D5-4. By income (N=1449)

E. Collective Actions and Cooperation

E2(Q43). Have you participated in any volunteer activities in the past 12 months, including online participation?

| | Numbe | Number of respondents | | | Percentage | |
|---|-------|-----------------------|-------|---------------|------------|-------|
| | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| Volunteering to improve the place | | | | | | |
| (area) where you live (landscaping | 1 200 | 310 | 1 600 | 80.6% | 10 /0/2 | 100% |
| streets, improving security, organizing | 1,290 | 510 | 1,000 | 1,000 00.0% | 19.470 | 10070 |
| events, etc.) | | | | | | |
| Volunteering for sports, cultural, | 1 454 | 146 | 1 600 | 00.0% | 0.1% | 100% |
| scientific and popular science events | 1,434 | 140 | 1,000 | J0.J70 | J.170 | 10070 |
| Volunteer activities related to the | | | | | | |
| provision of social assistance to | 1 265 | 335 | 1 600 | 70 1% | 20.0% | 100% |
| persons with disabilities, children, | 1,205 | 555 | 1,000 | / 9.1 /0 | 20.970 | 10070 |
| elderly people, etc. | | | | | | |
| Voluntary participation in political | | | | | | |
| activities (collection of signatures, | 1,502 | 98 | 1,600 | 93.9% | 6.1% | 100% |
| participation in rallies, etc.) | | | | | | |

Figure E2-0. Total number of respondents





Figure E2-1. By sex

Figure E2-2. By age





Figure E2-3. By region



Figure E2-4. By income

E3 (Q44). On a scale from 1 to 5, evaluate to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

| | 1 - | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 - | Cann | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------|----------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|
| | Absol | | | | Absol | ot | |
| | utely | | | | utely | answ | |
| | disag | | | | agree | er | |
| | ree | | | | | | |
| | Number | of respo | ndents | | | | |
| Ordinary people like me have no | 325 | 192 | 346 | 153 | 554 | 30 | 1,600 |
| influence on whatever happens | | | | | | | |
| in the country or its government | | | | | | | |
| I do not really understand what | 444 | 192 | 343 | 219 | 349 | 53 | 1,600 |
| the government and politicians | | | | | | | |
| do, because it's a difficult area | | | | | | | |
| for me | | | | | | | |
| I am interested in politics | 375 | 115 | 306 | 250 | 534 | 20 | 1,600 |
| I want to be useful to society | 128 | 61 | 274 | 324 | 781 | 32 | 1,600 |
| I and my neighbours care about | 333 | 161 | 338 | 248 | 493 | 27 | 1,600 |
| each other | | | | | | | |
| I can count on my neighbours in | 282 | 174 | 325 | 286 | 504 | 29 | 1,600 |
| case of need | | | | | | | |
| | Pe | rcentage | : | | | | |
| Ordinary people like me have no | 20.3 | 12.0 | 21.6 | 9.6% | 34.6 | 1.9% | 100% |
| influence on whatever happens | % | % | % | | % | | |
| in the country or its government | | | | | | | |
| I do not really understand what | 27.8 | 12.0 | 21.4 | 13.7 | 21.8 | 3.3% | 100% |
| the government and politicians | % | % | % | % | % | | |
| do, because it's a difficult area | | | | | | | |
| for me | | | | | | | |
| I am interested in politics | 23.4 | 7.2% | 19.1 | 15.6 | 33.4 | 1.3% | 100% |
| | % | | % | % | % | | |
| I want to be useful to society | 8.0% | 3.8% | 17.1 | 20.3 | 48.8 | 2.0% | 100% |
| | | | % | % | % | | |
| I and my neighbours care about | 20.8 | 10.1 | 21.1 | 15.5 | 30.8 | 1.7% | 100% |
| each other | % | % | % | % | % | | |
| I can count on my neighbours in | 17.6 | 10.9 | 20.3 | 17.9 | 31.5 | 1.8% | 100% |
| case of need | % | % | % | % | % | | |



Figure E3-0. Total number of respondents

Figure E3-1. By sex





Figure E3-2. By age

| | | 0% | 20% | 40% | 60% | 80% | 100% |
|--|---|----|---------|----------|------|-----|------|
| ike er on he (63) | Moscow and St. Petersburg | ; | | | | | |
| ple li ve no soeve soeve s in t r its V=15 | Republican or regional centre, big city | | | | | | |
| y peo If hav what ppen ttry o ent (1 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | |
| linary nysel ar ha coun | Village | | | | | | |
| Ord Influe wh gove | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | |
| he use for | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | |
| cally hat t t and beca area 340) | Republican or regional centre, big city | , | | | | | |
| not ro und w numen s do, icult N=15 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | |
| [do r lersta overn ician a diff me (| Village | | | | | | |
| und g politi jt's ä | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | |
| г (| Moscow and St. Petersburg | ; | | | | | |
| ted ii 1573 | Republican or regional centre, big city | , | | | | | |
| (Interes) (Interes) | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | |
| am in olitics | Village | | | | | | |
| I a | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | |
| to | Moscow and St. Petersburg | | | | | | |
| seful 1561 | Republican or regional centre, big city | | | | | | |
| be u | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | |
| ant tc ociety | Village | | | | | | |
| I wa sc | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | |
| lırs 1er | Moscow and St. Petersburg | ; | | | | | |
| ghbou ch otl 6) | Republican or regional centre, big city | , | | | | | |
| / neig ut ead =156 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | |
| nd my abor (N) | Village | | | | | | |
| I ar care | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | |
| y of | Moscow and St. Petersburg | ; | | | | | |
| on m case 564) | Republican or regional centre, big city | , | | | | | |
| ount o lars in (N=1 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | | | | | | |
| ian co ghbou reed (| Village | | | | | | |
| I c neig | Rural area (village, countryside) | | | | | | |
| | ■1 - Absolutely disagree ■2 ■3 ■4 | 5 | - Absol | utely ag | gree | ſ | I |

Figure E3-3. By region



Figure E3-4. By income

E4(Q45). In the last three years, how often did you jointly apply with other residents to local authorities to solve a problem in your residing area?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Never | 966 | 60.4% |
| Once | 220 | 13.8% |
| Several times (2 to 5) | 309 | 19.3% |
| More than 5 times | 92 | 5.8% |
| Cannot answer | 13 | 0.8% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure E4-0. Total number of respondents (N=1587)



Figure E4-1. By sex (N=1587)





Figure E4-2. By age (N=1587)









G. Socio-Political Values

G1 (Q55). To what extent do you agree with the statement that the government should reduce income gap between citizens?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 - Absolutely do not agree | 193 | 12.1% |
| 2 | 81 | 5.1% |
| 3 | 279 | 17.4% |
| 4 | 209 | 13.1% |
| 5 - Absolutely agree | 793 | 49.6% |
| Cannot answer | 45 | 2.8% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure G1-0. Total number of respondents (N=1555)



Figure G1-1. By sex (N=1555)





Figure G1-2. By age (N=1555)









1 -2 3 4 5 -Cannot Total Extrem Extrem answer ely ely ineffici efficien ent t Creation of new 249 137 375 309 443 87 1,600 jobs Reduction of economic 432 263 417 151 180 157 1,600 inequality Stimulation of 298 186 376 305 288 147 1,600 economic growth Infrastructure 181 159 325 398 463 74 1,600 development Security 180 134 350 431 431 74 1,600 Development of education and 198 99 251 370 329 353 1,600 science Development of 365 276 403 278 229 49 1,600 health care system Protection of the 320 271 418 263 231 97 1,600 environment Percent Creation of new 15.6% 8.6% 23.4% 19.3% 27.7% 5.4% 100.0% jobs Reduction of 27.0% 9.8% 100.0% economic 16.4% 26.1% 9.4% 11.3% inequality Stimulation of 18.6% 11.6% 23.5% 19.1% 18.0% 9.2% 100.0% economic growth Infrastructure 11.3% 9.9% 20.3% 24.9% 28.9% 4.6% 100.0% development 11.3% 8.4% 4.6% 100.0% Security 21.9% 26.9% 26.9% Development of education and 6.2% 100.0% 15.7% 12.4% 23.1% 20.6% 22.1% science Development of 22.8% 17.3% 25.2% 17.4% 14.3% 3.1% 100.0% health care system Protection of the 16.9% 20.0% 26.1% 16.4% 14.4% 6.1% 100.0% environment

G2(Q56). How would you evaluate the government policy for the last 5 years?



Figure G2-0. Total number of respondents

Figure G2-1. By sex





Figure G2-2. By age

| | | 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90%100 |
|--|--|---|
| ÷ | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| o n o obs 08) | Republican or regional centre, large city | |
| atio <i>N</i> jc =15 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | |
|)re: nev (N= | Village | |
| 0 0 | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| o de | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| on mic 138 | Republican or regional centre, large city | |
| ucti ano qua =14 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | |
| ine ecc | Village | |
| 22 | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| c c | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| tion vth 447 | Republican or regional centre, large city | |
| ula onc rov =1, | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | |
| Sec fin | Village | |
| Ω Ω | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| ture ent | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| pm 52 | Republican of regional centre, large city | |
| asti elo V=1 | Kegional centre, small of medium-sized town | |
| dev D | Village Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| H - | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| (0) | Republican or regional centre large city | |
| urit 152 | Regional centre small or medium-sized town | |
| | Village | |
| | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| o n nt | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| mei ittioi ince 96) | Republican or regional centre, large city | |
| lopi uca scie | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | |
| eve ed nd N= | Village | |
| Of of Of | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| ire | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| ame n ca m 45) | Republican or regional centre, large city | |
| alth alth ste =15 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | |
| The sy | Village | |
| of | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| of int | Moscow and St. Petersburg | |
| ion e t97 | Republican or regional centre, large city | |
| the the ron =14 | Regional centre, small or medium-sized town | |
| nvi N | Village | |
| с o | Rural area (village, countryside) | |
| | ■ 1 - Extremely inefficient ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ | 4 5 - Extremely efficient |

Figure G2-3. By region



Figure G2-4. By income

Q55 (Q138). What is your attitude on the policy of Russian government towards Ukraine?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Absolutely do not support | 173 | 10.8% |
| Somewhat do not support | 149 | 9.3% |
| Somewhat support | 335 | 20.9% |
| Absolutely support | 751 | 46.9% |
| Difficult to answer | 160 | 10.0% |
| Cannot answer/Refuse | 32 | 2.0% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure 55-0. Total number of respondents (N=1600)









Figure 55-2. By age (N=1408)









Q56 (Q139). In your view, who is mostly responsible for the special military operation of Russia in Ukraine?

| | Number of | Percentage |
|--|-------------|------------|
| | respondents | |
| Russian government | 273 | 17.1% |
| Ukrainian government | 161 | 10.1% |
| Politicians and deputy members of both | 347 | 21.7% |
| countries | | |
| Russian citizens | 31 | 1.9% |
| Ukrainian citizens | 13 | 0.8% |
| Foreign country governments | 428 | 26.8% |
| Foreign businessmen | 81 | 5.1% |
| Other | 52 | 3.3% |
| Difficult to answer | 180 | 11.3% |
| Refuse | 34 | 2.1% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |

Figure 56-0. Total number of respondents (N=1600)





Figure 56-1. By sex (N=1386)

Figure 56-2. By age (N=1386)





Figure 56-3. By region (N=1380)





H. Respondent Information

| | Responde nt | Spouse | Responde nt's father | Responde nt's mother | Responde nt's friend |
|--|----------------|--------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Primary education | 4 | 8 | 121 | 126 | 6 |
| Incomplete secondary education | 63 | 29 | 109 | 126 | 25 |
| General secondary education | 142 | 106 | 135 | 173 | 103 |
| Secondary special education (technical colledge) | 573 | 462 | 500 | 590 | 387 |
| Unfinished higher education | 98 | 32 | 16 | 28 | 39 |
| Higher education in humanities or social sciences | 318 | 266 | 112 | 236 | 404 |
| Higher education in science | 271 | 220 | 253 | 149 | 393 |
| Two higher educations, master degree or Ph.D. degree | 131 | 60 | 31 | 42 | 71 |
| Total | 1,600 | 1,183 | 1,277 | 1,470 | 1,428 |
| Percentage | | | | | |
| Primary education | 0.3% | 0.7% | 9.5% | 8.6% | 0.4% |
| Incomplete secondary education | 3.9% | 2.5% | 8.5% | 8.6% | 1.8% |
| General secondary education | 8.9% | 9.0% | 10.6% | 11.8% | 7.2% |
| Secondary special education (technical colledge) | 35.8% | 39.1% | 39.2% | 40.1% | 27.1% |
| Unfinished higher education | 6.1% | 2.7% | 1.3% | 1.9% | 2.7% |
| Higher education in humanities or social sciences | 19.9% | 22.5% | 8.8% | 16.1% | 28.3% |
| Higher education in science | 16.9% | 18.6% | 19.8% | 10.1% | 27.5% |
| Two higher educations, master degree or Ph.D. degree | 8.2% | 5.1% | 2.4% | 2.9% | 5.0% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

H1 (Q57-Q62). What is your highest level of education?



Figure H1-0. Total number of respondents



Figure H1-1. By sex (N=1600)



Figure H1-2. By age (N=1600)

Figure H1-3. By region (N=1593)




Figure H1-4. By income (N=1475)

H2 (Q63). How many family members constantly live with you in the same apartment?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 Live with family members | 1,331 | 83.2% |
| 2 Live alone | 261 | 16.3% |
| 3 Cannot answer | 8 | 0.5% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |





| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 person | 97 | 7.3% |
| 2 people | 473 | 35.7% |
| 3 people | 337 | 25.4% |
| 4 people | 278 | 21.0% |
| 5 people | 80 | 6.0% |
| 6 people | 30 | 2.3% |
| 7 people | 13 | 1.0% |
| 8 people | 7 | 0.5% |
| 9 people | 4 | 0.3% |
| 10 people | 2 | 0.2% |
| 11 people | 1 | 0.1% |
| 12 people | 2 | 0.2% |
| 32 people | 1 | 0.1% |
| Total | 1325 | 100.0% |

Figure H2-1. How many family members do you live with? (N=1325)



| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|-------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 | 300 | 50.3% |
| 2 | 217 | 36.4% |
| 3 | 48 | 8.1% |
| 4 | 25 | 4.2% |
| 5 | 4 | 0.7% |
| 7 | 1 | 0.2% |
| 10 | 1 | 0.2% |
| Total | 596 | 100% |

Q60 (Q64). How many children, grandchildren, and close people under 18 years old live with you?

Figure 60-0. Total number of respondents (N=1331)



H3 (Q65). Which of the following constitutes your sources of income? (Mark all that are relevant to your family).

| | Yes | | N | | |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------|
| | Number of respondent s | Percentag e | Number of respondent s | Percentag e | Total |
| Wage | 1066 | 66.6% | 534 | 33.4% | 1600 |
| Pension and other social benefits | 757 | 47.3% | 843 | 52.7% | 1600 |
| Own business | 162 | 10.1% | 1438 | 89.9% | 1600 |
| Part-time job | 106 | 6.6% | 1494 | 93.4% | 1600 |
| One-time income from occasional jobs | 314 | 19.6% | 1286 | 80.4% | 1600 |
| Income from property (rents), interest rates on deposits | 160 | 10.0% | 1440 | 90.0% | 1600 |
| Aid from relatives, friends, and neighbours | 138 | 8.6% | 1462 | 91.4% | 1600 |
| Dacha, garden | 340 | 21.3% | 1260 | 78.8% | 1600 |
| Other | 16 | 1.0% | 1584 | 99.0% | 1600 |

Figure H3-0. Percentage of respondents who chose Yes (N=1600)



H4 (Q66-Q73). What is your monthly average income?

| | 1 - low | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 - high | No answer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|----------|--------------|--------|
| Central | 67 | 99 | 94 | 64 | 103 | 44 | 471 |
| Federal District | 14.2% | 21.0% | 20.0% | 13.6% | 21.9% | 9.3% | 100.0% |
| North-Western | 7 | 33 | 26 | 33 | 48 | 13 | 160 |
| Federal District | 4.4% | 20.6% | 16.3% | 20.6% | 30.0% | 8.1% | 100.0% |
| Southern | 6 | 22 | 31 | 25 | 76 | 15 | 175 |
| Federal District | 3.4% | 12.6% | 17.7% | 14.3% | 43.4% | 8.6% | 100.0% |
| North | 4 | 11 | 33 | 15 | 26 | 6 | 95 |
| Caucasian Federal District | 4.2% | 11.6% | 34.7% | 15.8% | 27.4% | 6.3% | 100.0% |
| Volga Federal | 15 | 42 | 67 | 70 | 103 | 21 | 318 |
| District | 4.7% | 13.2% | 21.1% | 22.0% | 32.4% | 6.6% | 1 |
| Ural Federal | 14 | 28 | 23 | 24 | 30 | 6 | 125 |
| District | 11.2% | 22.4% | 18.4% | 19.2% | 24.0% | 4.8% | 100.0% |
| Siberian | 14 | 24 | 43 | 36 | 45 | 13 | 175 |
| Federal District | 8.0% | 13.7% | 24.6% | 20.6% | 25.7% | 7.4% | 100.0% |
| Far East | 10 | 13 | 24 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 81 |
| Federal District | 12.3% | 16.0% | 29.6% | 16.0% | 17.3% | 8.6% | 100.0% |

Table H4-0. Total number of respondents







H5 (Q74). Does your family have other sources of income?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Yes | 1,171 | 73.2% |
| No | 380 | 23.8% |
| Cannot answer | 49 | 3.1% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |



Figure H5-0. Total number of respondents (N=1551)

H6 (Q75). Which of the following best describes your present financial situation? Select all that apply.

| | Number of respondent s | Total | Percentag e |
|--|------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| I have savings to live on for more than one year | 240 | 1600 | 15.0% |
| I have some savings to live on for a short time | 587 | 1600 | 36.7% |
| I have outstanding loans from a bank or other financial institutions | 570 | 1600 | 35.6% |
| I have loans from my company | 19 | 1600 | 1.2% |
| I have large loans with private individuals | 30 | 1600 | 1.9% |
| I have small accumulated debts | 107 | 1600 | 6.7% |
| I have more than 2 month-rent arrears | 35 | 1600 | 2.2% |
| None of the above | 397 | 1600 | 24.8% |
| Cannot answer | 18 | 1600 | 1.1% |



Figure H6-0. Total number of respondents

H7 (Q76). What is your current employment situation?

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Full-time employment (incl. working students and pensioners) | 767 | 47.9% |
| Part-time employment | 94 | 5.9% |
| Own company with employees as subordinates | 34 | 2.1% |
| Individual entrepreneur or a farmer | 55 | 3.4% |
| Self-employed | 92 | 5.8% |
| Volunteer activity or internship (no pay) | 4 | 0.3% |
| Non-working student | 18 | 1.1% |
| Unemployed for health reasons (disability, etc.) | 26 | 1.6% |
| Temporarily unemployed but looking for a job | 48 | 3.0% |
| On maternity leave | 40 | 2.5% |
| Housework | 30 | 1.9% |
| Pensioner (not engaged in any work) | 361 | 22.6% |
| Other | 21 | 1.3% |
| Cannot answer | 10 | 0.6% |
| Total | 1,600 | 100.0% |



Figure H7-0. Total number of respondents (N=1590)

H8 (Q77). What is your current job? (If you chose one of the first three answers for Q76.)

| | Number of | Percentag |
|--|-------------|-----------|
| | respondents | e |
| Director or vice-director (senior manager) | 43 | 5.0% |
| Middle or low-rank manager | 125 | 14.5% |
| Specialist (positions that require higher education) | 236 | 27.4% |
| Specialist (positions that do not require higher education): | 151 | 17 50/ |
| office worker, secretary, administrator | 131 17 | |
| Employee in a commerce or service company | 82 | 9.5% |
| Employee of the 5th category | 64 | 7.4% |
| Employee of the 3-4 category | 47 | 5.5% |
| Employee of the 1-2 category | 66 | 7.7% |
| Other | 37 | 4.3% |
| Cannot answer | 10 | 1.2% |
| Total | 861 | 100.0% |



Figure H8-0. Total number of respondents (N=851)

H9 (Q78). Which of the following best describes your situation at your current place of work? (If you chose one of the first three answers for Q76.)

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--|--|------------|
| | respondents | |
| I am able to influence the decision-making process at my | ence the decision-making process at my | |
| enterprise | 101 10.7 | |
| I am able to influence decision making in my | making in my | |
| unit/department | 545 40.1 | |
| Virtually nothing at work depends on my opinion | 343 | 39.8% |
| Cannot answer | 12 | 1.4% |
| Total | 861 | 100.0% |



Figure H9-0. Total number of respondents (N=849)

Appendix 2 Survey Questions

191

| Русский | English |
|--|--|
| 0. БАЗОВЫЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ | 0. Basic Characteristics |
| | 01 Concept to participate in the interview |
| V_1 . Consider принять участие в опросе $F_{CTU} \cap 1000 > 1$ mo pagentium, illumentatio e network memory "2 agentique" | If 01000>1, complete the interpieu with "Completed" result |
| <i>Если Q1000~1, то завершить интервью с результитом</i> завершено | If Q1000>1, complete the interview with Completed Tesuti |
| 1 Согласие | 1 Agree |
| 2 Отказ | 2 Disagree |
| 3 Категорический отказ | 3 Absolutely disagree |
| 4 Респондент сказал, что в роуминге | 4 Respondent said that he/she was in roaming |
| 5 Респондент очень быстро повесил трубку | 5 Respondent hung up very quickly |
| 6 Плохая связь, плохо слышно респондента или оператора | 6 Poor connection, respondent or operator has trouble to hear |
| 7 Трубку взял ребенок (детский голос) | 7 Child answered the phone (child's voice) |
| 8 Автоответчик | 8 Voicemail |
| 9 Факс | 9 Fax |
| 10 Организация/рабочий/служебный номер | 10 Company/work/office number |
| 11 Тишина в трубке | 11 Silence on the line |
| 12 Респондент не говорит на русском языке, плохо понимает | 12 Respondent does not speak Russian language or has poor Russian |
| 13 Физическая или ментальная нереспондентопригодность | language ability |
| | 13 Physical or mental disability of the respondent to participate in the |
| | survey |
| 02. Пол респодента | 02. Sex |
| | |
| 1 Мужской | 1 Male |
| 2 Женский | 2 Female |
| 03. Возраст. Сколько лет вам исполнилось? | 03. Age. |
| | |
| Если Q1003 < 18, то завершить интервью с результатом | If $Q1003 < 18$, complete the interview with the result "Completed". |
| "Завершено" | |
| | 04. Age. Age cohorts |
| 04. Возраст. Возрастные когорты | |
| | 1 18-24 |
| 1 18-24 | 2 25-34 |
| 2 25-34 | 3 35-44 |
| 3 35-44 | 4 45-54 |
| 4 45-54 | 5 55 and over |
| 5 55 лет и старше | |

| 05. Скажите пожалуйста, в каком регионе(крае, области, | 05. Please tell me in which region (kray, oblast, republic) you reside at |
|--|---|
| республике) Вы проживаете на данный момент? | the moment? |
| 1 Белгородская область | 1 Belgorod oblast |
| 2 Брянская область | 2 Bryansk oblast |
| 3 Владимирская область | 3 Vladimir oblast |
| 4 Воронежская область | 4 Voronezh oblast |
| 5 Ивановская область | 5 Ivanovo oblast |
| 6 Калужская область | 6 Kaluga oblast |
| 7 Костромская область | 7 Kostroma oblast |
| 8 Курская область | 8 Kursk oblast |
| 9 Липецкая область | 9 Lipetsk obalst |
| 10 Орловская область | 10 Oryol oblast |
| 11 Рязанская область | 11 Ryazan oblast |
| 12 Смоленская область | 12 Smolensk oblast |
| 13 Тамбовская область | 13 Tambov oblast |
| 14 Тверская область | 14 Tver oblast |
| 15 Тульская область | 15 Tula oblast |
| 16 Ярославская область | 16 Yaroslavl oblast |
| 17 Йосква | 17 Moscow |
| 18 Московская область | 18 Moscow oblast |
| 19 Респ. Карелия | 19 Republic of Karelia |
| 20 Респ. Коми | 20 Republic of Komi |
| 21 Ненецкий автономный округ | 21 Nenets Autonomous okrug |
| 22 Архангельская область | 22 Arkhangelsk oblast |
| 23 Вологодская область | 23 Vologda oblast |
| 24 Калининградская область | 24 Kaliningrad oblast |
| 25 Ленинградская область | 25 Leningrad oblast |
| 26 Санкт-Петербург | 26 Saint-Petersburg |
| 27 Мурманская область | 27 Murmansk oblast |
| 28 Новгородская область | 28 Novgorod oblast |
| 29 Псковская область | 29 Pskov oblast |
| 30 Респ. Адыгея | 30 Adygeya Republic |
| 31 Республика Калмыкия | 31 Republic of Kalmykia |
| 32 Крым | 32 Crimea |
| 33 Севастополь | 33 Sevastopol |

| 34 Краснодарский край | 34 Krasnodar krai |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 35 Астраханская область | 35 Astrakhan oblast |
| 36 Волгоградская область | 36 Volgograd oblast |
| 37 Ростовская область | 37 Rostov oblast |
| 38 Республика Дагестан | 38 Republic of Dagestan |
| 39 Республика Ингушетия | 39 Republic of Ingushetia |
| 40 Кабардино-Балкарская республика | 40 Kabardino-Balkarian republic |
| 41 Карачаево-Черкесская республика | 41 Karachayevo-Circassian republic |
| 42 Республика Северная Осетия - Алания | 42 Republic of North Ossetia-Alania |
| 43 Чеченская республика | 43 Chechen Republic |
| 44 Ставропольский край | 44 Stavropol krai |
| 45 Республика Башкортостан | 45 Republic of Bashkortostan |
| 46 Республика Марий Эл | 46 Republic of Mariy-El |
| 47 Республика Мордовия | 47 Republic of Mordovia |
| 48 Республика Татарстан | 48 Republic of Tatarstan |
| 49 Удмуртская республика | 49 Udmurt republic |
| 50 Чувашская республика | 50 Chuvash republic |
| 51 Пермский край | 51 Perm krai |
| 52 Кировская область | 52 Kirov oblast |
| 53 Нижегородская область | 53 Nizhny Novgorod oblast |
| 54 Оренбургская область | 54 Orenburg oblast |
| 55 Пензенская область | 55 Penza oblast |
| 56 Самарская область | 56 Samara oblast |
| 57 Саратовская область | 57 Saratov oblast |
| 58 Ульяновская область | 58 Ulyanovsk oblast |
| 59 Курганская область | 59 Kurgan oblast |
| 60 Свердловская область | 60 Sverdlovsk oblast |
| 61 Ханты-Мансийский автономный округ | 61 Khanty-Mansi autonomous okrug |
| 62 Ямало-Ненецкий автономный округ | 62 Yamalo-Nenets autonomous okrug |
| 63 Тюменская область | 63 Tyumen oblast |
| 64 Челябинская область | 64 Chelyabinsk oblast |
| 65 Республика Алтай | 65 Republic of Altai |
| 66 Республика Тыва | 66 Republic of Tuva |
| 67 Республика Хакасия | 67 Republic of Khakassia |
| 68 Алтайский край | 68 Altai krai |
| 69 Красноярский край | 69 Krasnoyarsk krai |
| 70 Иркутская область | 70 Irkutsk oblast |

| 71 Кемеровская область | 71 Kemerovo oblast |
|---|--|
| 72 Новосибирская область | 72 Novosibirsk oblast |
| 73 Омская область | 73 Omsk oblast |
| 74 Томская область | 74 Tomsk oblast |
| 75 Республика Бурятия | 75 Republic of Buryatia |
| 76 Республика Саха (Якутия) | 76 Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) |
| 77 Забайкальский край | 77 Zabaykalsky krai |
| 78 Камчатский край | 78 Kamchatka krai |
| 79 Приморский край | 79 Primorsky krai |
| 80 Хабаровский край | 80 Khabarovsk krai |
| 81 Амурская область | 81 Amur oblast |
| 82 Магаданская область | 82 Magadan oblast |
| 83 Сахалинская область | 83 Sakhalin oblast |
| 84 Еврейская автономная область | 84 Jewish Autonomous oblast |
| 85 Чукотский автономный округ | 85 Chukotka Autonomous oblast |
| 98 Затрудняюсь ответить (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 Отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 Disclaimer (DO NOT READ |
| | |
| 06. В каком Федеральном округе Вы проживаете? | 06. Which Federal District do you live in? |
| 1 II | 1 Control Fordered District |
| 1 центральный федеральный округ | 1 Central Federal District |
| 2 Северо-западный федеральный округ | 2 North West Federal District |
| 3 Южный федеральный округ 4 Сарага Кариаланий факторы и и и актир | 5 Southern Federal District |
| 4 Северо-Кавказский федеральный округ | / North / Carson area lighted and / Arctment |
| 5 Davis a manager in the second sec | 4 North Caucasian Federal District |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибировий федеральный округ | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberion Federal District |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 For Footom Foderal District |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Different te ensure (DO NOT READ) |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 90 2/0 стиса (НЕ 24 ШИТ ПАТЬ) | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 90 no asymptotic to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 07. В населенном пункте какого типа Вы проживаете сейчас? | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) 07. What type of settlement do you currently live in? |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 07. В населенном пункте какого типа Вы проживаете сейчас? | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) 07. What type of settlement do you currently live in? |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 07. В населенном пункте какого типа Вы проживаете сейчас? 1 Москва и Санкт-Петербург | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) 07. What type of settlement do you currently live in? 1 Moscow and St. Petersburg |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 07. В населенном пункте какого типа Вы проживаете сейчас? 1 Москва и Санкт-Петербург 2 Республиканский или областной центр, крупный город | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) 07. What type of settlement do you currently live in? 1 Moscow and St. Petersburg 2 Republican or regional centre, big city |
| 5 Приволжский федеральный округ 6 Уральский федеральный округ 7 Сибирский федеральный округ 8 Дальневосточный федеральный округ 98 Затрудняюсь ответить 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 07. В населенном пункте какого типа Вы проживаете сейчас? 1 Москва и Санкт-Петербург 2 Республиканский или областной центр, крупный город 3 Районный центр, малый или средний город | 4 North Caucasian Federal District 5 Volga Federal District 6 Ural Federal District 7 Siberian Federal District 8 Far Eastern Federal District 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) 07. What type of settlement do you currently live in? 1 Moscow and St. Petersburg 2 Republican or regional centre, big city 3 District centre, small or medium-sized town |

| 5 Село, деревня | 5 Village, countryside |
|---|---|
| 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no asnwer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| А. СОЦИАЛЬНЫЕ КОНТАКТЫ И ЧЛЕНСТВО В | A. Social Contacts and Membership in Organisations |
| ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯХ | |
| A1. (Q5). Часто люди участвуют в работе различных групп, | A1. (Q5). Often people are involved in different groups, organisations, |
| организаций, сетей, ассоциаций. Это могут быть официально | networks, associations. These can be formally established groups such |
| созданные группы, например, общественные организации, | as voluntary organisations, political parties, hobby clubs, voluntary |
| политические партии, клубы по интересам, волонтёрские | organisations, or simply groups of people who meet regularly to work |
| организации, просто группы людей, которые регулярно | together or discuss different topics. How many of these groups do you |
| собираются для совместнои деятельности или обсуждения | or a family member belong to? |
| различных тем. членом скольких таких групп являетесь вы или | 1 VES WRITE DOWN THE NUMBER OF 1N |
| кто-лиоо из членов вашеи семьи: | 2 Not a member of such groups |
| 1 ПА ЗАПИЩИТЕ ЧИСЛО О5 1 N | 2 Not a member of such groups 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | <i>ib answer</i> , refuse to answer (DO NOT KEAD) |
| 99.3/O OTKA3 (HE 3A YUT HIBA TH) | |
| yy s/o, orkus (iii) or iiiibibirib) | |
| А5. (Q9). Теперь поговорим о Вашем повседневном общении. | A5. (Q9). Now let's talk about your everyday communication. Please |
| Укажите, пожалуйста, количество членов Вашей семьи и | indicate the number of your family members and relatives with whom |
| родственников, с которыми Вы обычно контактируете в течение | you usually have contact in one day in person, by telephone or via the |
| одного дня лично, по телефону или через Интернет без учёта тех, | internet, not including those with whom you live together |
| с кем Вы вместе живёте | |
| | 10 |
| 10 | 2 1-2 people |
| 2 1-2 человека | 3 3-4 people |
| 3 3-4 человека 4 5 0 | 4 5-9 people |
| 4 5-9 человек | 5 10-19 people |
| 5 10-19 человек | 6 more than 20 people |
| 00 p/p other (HE 2AUMTLID ATL) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 77 5/0, 01ka3 (11E SA 111 DIDA 1D) | |
| Аб. (Q10). Как часто вы общаетесь, советуетесь или просите | A6. (Q10). How often do you communicate, seek advice or help from |
| помощи у членов своей семьи или близких родственников? За | |
| | your family members or close relatives? Except for those who live |
| исключением тех из них, кто живёт вместе с Вами. | your family members or close relatives? Except for those who live with you. |

| 1 никогда (ЕСЛИ РЕСПОНДЕНТ СКАЗАЛ, ЧТО нет родственников, | 1 Never (IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS NO RELATIVES, ACCEPT |
|---|--|
| ОТМЕТЬТЕ ЭТОТ ВАРИАНТ) | THIS OPTION) |
| 2 один раз в год или раз в несколько лет | 2 Once a year or once every few years |
| 3 раз в месяц или несколько раз в год | 3 once a month or more than once a year |
| 4 раз в неделю или несколько раз в месяц | 4 once a week or more than once a month |
| 5 каждый день или несколько раз в неделю | 5 every day or several times a week |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| A7. (Q11). Среди Ваших соседей сколько тех, с кем Вы обычно здороваетесь? | A7. (Q11). Among your neighbours, how many people do you usually say hello to? |
| 1 0 человек | 1 0 people |
| 2 1-4 человек | 2 1-4 people |
| 3 5-9 человек | 3 5-9 people |
| 4 10-19 человек | 4 10-19 people |
| 5 20 человек и более | 5 20 people or more |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| А8 (О12) А у скольких соселей Вы можете попросить совета или | A8 (O12) How many neighbours can you ask for advice or help in |
| помощи в случае необходимости? | case of need? |
| 1 Очеловек | 1.0 neonle |
| 2 1-2 человека | 2 1-2 persons |
| 3 3-4 человека | 3 3-4 persons |
| 4 5-9 человек | 4 5 9 people |
| 5 более 10 человек | 5 more than 10 people |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| А9. (Q13). Сколько у Вас близких друзей, с которыми Вы | A9. (Q13). How many close friends do you have with whom you share |
| делитесь подробностями вашей личной жизни или просите совета | details of your personal life or ask for advice or help in difficult |
| или помощи в трудных жизненных ситуациях? | situations? |
| 1 0 человек | 1 0 persons |
| 2 1-2 человека | 2 1-2 persons |
| 3 3-4 человек | 3 3 3 4 people |
| 4 5-9 человек | 4 5-9 people |
| 5 10-19 человек | 5 10-19 people |

| 6 20-49 человек | 6 20-49 persons |
|--|---|
| 7 50-99 человек | 7 50-99 persons |
| 8 100 и более человек | 8 100 or more persons |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| A10. (Q14). Как часто Вы просите совета или помощи у своих | A10. (Q14). How often do you ask for advice or help from your friends |
| друзей и знакомых, исключая коллег по работе? | and acquaintances, excluding work colleagues? |
| 1 инкорля (ЕСПИ у распонданта нат таких другой и энаконых | 1 Never (IF the respondent does not have such friends and acquaintances |
| | MARK THIS OPTION) |
| $2 \qquad \text{OTMETOTE STOT DAT MATT}$ | 2 Once a year or once every few years |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ by the case of the second | 2 Once a month or more than once a year |
| | 4 once a week or more than once a month |
| ч раз в неделю или несколько раз в месяц 5 кажный день или несколько раз в неделю. | 5 every day or several times a week |
| 00 p/0. otrop (HE 3A UIITLIBATL) | 90 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| <i>37 3/0</i> , UIRd3 (IIE JA-WITDIDATD) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| А11. (Q15). Каким образом Вы чаще всего контактируете со | A11. (Q15). How do you most often have contact with your friends |
| своими друзьями и | and acquaintances? |
| знакомыми? | - |
| | 1 in person |
| 1 на личной встрече | 2 by phone |
| 2 по телефону | 3 by e-mail |
| 3 по электронной почте | 4 by social networks |
| 4 в социальных сетях | 5 other (specify) Q15 5T |
| 5 прочее (укажите, что именно) Q15 5T | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |
| А12. (Q16). Что из нижеперечисленного характеризует людей из | A12. (Q16). Which of the following best characterizes people in your |
| Вашего круга общения, исключая родственников? | social circle, excluding relatives? |
| 1 в моем кругу общения больше полей которые выше меня по | 1 there are more people in my social circle who are higher in status than |
| cratycy | me |
| 2 в моем кругу общения больше люлей с олинаковым со мной | 2 there are more people of the same status in my network |
| CTATVCOM | 3 I have more people below me in my network |
| 3 в моем кругу общения больше полей которые ниже меня по | 99 no answer refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| cratycy | |
| 99 3/0. отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |

| A16. (Q27). Кто из следующих лиц составляют наибольшую часть | A16. (Q27). Which of the following persons form the largest part of |
|--|---|
| круга Вашего общения? | your social circle? |
| семья и родственники соседи одноклассники, одногруппники друзья и знакомые (не включая одноклассников и одногруппников) коллеги по работе работники некоммерческих или волонтерских организаций представители церкви члены политических партий Q27_9T_ другие люди (указать кто) (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | family and relatives neighbours classmates, classmates friends and acquaintances (not including classmates and classmates) coworkers employees of non-profit or voluntary organisations church representatives members of political parties Q27_9T_other people (specify) (DO NOT ENTER) no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| А14.5 (Q22). К кому из следующих лиц Вы обращаетесь в первую | A14.5 (Q22). Which of the following persons do you go to first in case |
| очередь за помощью в случае | of |
| Q22возникновения чрезвычайных жизненных ситуаций? 1 к проживающим с вами членам семьи 2 к родственникам 3 к коллегам по работе 4 к соседям 5 к друзьям 6 к специалисту 7 в общественные организации 8 ни к кому 9 не было таких проблем (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 10 [Q18_10T] другое (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | Q22emergencies? 1 family members living with you 2 relatives 3 work colleagues 4 neighbours 5 friends 6 a professional 7 social organisations 8 no one (DO NOT READ) 9 no such problems (DO NOT READ) 10 [Q18_10T] other (DO NOT READ) 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| <i>Q25. УСЛОВИЕ Q4=5 (ДЛЯ СЕЛЬСКИХ ЖИТЕЛЕЙ)</i> A15.1 (Q25). Если вдруг Вам понадобилось занять небольшую сумму денег достаточную, чтобы <u>оплатить расходы Вашей семьи</u> <u>в течение одной недели</u> , есть ли люди помимо Ваших ближайших | Q25. CONDITION Q4=5 (FOR RURAL RESIDENTS) A15.1 (Q25). If you suddenly needed to borrow a small amount of money sufficient to cover your family's expenses for one week, are |

| домочадцев и близких родственников, к которым Вы могли бы обратиться и которые хотели бы и могли бы одолжить Вам эти леньги? | there people other than your family and close relatives you could turn to who would be willing and able to lend you the money? |
|---|---|
| | 1 Definitely yes |
| 1 определенно да | 2 Rather ves |
| 2 скорее да | 3 Not sure |
| 3 не уверен | 4 More likely no |
| 4 скорее нет | 5 Definitely not |
| 5 определенно нет | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |
| Q26. УСЛОВИЕ Q4 != 5 (ДЛЯ ГОРОЖАН) | Q26. CONDITION Q4 != 5 (FOR CITY RESIDENTS) |
| A15.2. (Q26). Если Вам вдруг понадобилось занять небольшую | A15.2. (Q26). If you suddenly needed to borrow a small amount of |
| сумму денег, равную примерно <u>недельной Вашей заработной</u> | money equal to about a week's wages, are there people other than |
| <u>плате</u> , есть ли люди помимо Ваших ближайших домочадцев и | your immediate household and close relatives whom you could turn to |
| олизких родственников, к которым вы могли оы ооратиться и | and who would be willing and able to lend you the money? |
| которые хотели оы и могли оы одолжить бам эти деньги: | 1 Definitely yes |
| | 2 Pother ves |
| 2 скорее да | 3 Not sure |
| 3 не уверен | 4 More likely no |
| 4 скорее нет | 5 Definitely not |
| 5 определенно нет | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | |
| Q14. (Q83). Вы сами получали от своего ближайшего окружения или оказывали его представителям сами такого рода помощь за послодино 12 мосянов? | Q14. (Q83). In the past 12 months, have you received or provided help listed below from your close surroundings? |
| последние 12 месяцев. | O83 1 Borrowing up to 100 000 rubles |
| [О83–1] Возможность взять в долг до 100 тыс. руб. | O83 2 Borrowing more than 100.000 rubles |
| [083 2] Возможность взять в долг свыше 100 тыс. руб. | O83 3 Getting a good job |
| [О83 3] Устройство на хорошую работу | O83 4 Entering a good university |
| [Q83 4] Поступление в хороший вуз | Q83 5 Career promotion |
| [Q83_5] Продвижение по карьерной лестнице | Q83_6 Ensuring entrance to a good school for children |
| [Q83_6] Устройство детей в хорошую школу | Q83_7 Solving a housing issue |
| [Q83_7] Решение жилищной проблемы | Q83_8 Introducing a good doctor or getting access to a good |
| | hospital |

| [Q83_8] Обращение к хорошим врачам или устройство в | Q83_9 Searching opportunities for earning extra income (e.g. |
|--|---|
| хорошую больницу | via one-time jobs) |
| [Q83_9] Поиск приработков | Q83_10 Getting access to people with authority who can help |
| [Q83 10] Содействие в доступе к должностным лицам, способным | solving your problems |
| помочь в решении Ваших проблем | Q83 11 Help in moving to other region of Russia |
| [О83 11] Помощь при необходимости переезда в другой | O83 12 Help in moving abroad |
| населенный пункт в России | |
| [О83–12] Помошь при необхолимости переезла за рубеж | 1 I received such help |
| | 2 I provided such help |
| 1 Получали | 3 Neither received nor provided such help |
| 2 Предоставля пи сами | 99 Cannot answer |
| 3 (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) Не получали и не предоставляли | |
| 99 (HF 3A UNTLIBATE) Setto y last in the hperoet addition of the set of the s | |
| (III SA III DIDATD) Salpydinings offernib/ofkas | |
| О15. (О84). Как за последние 12 месяцев изменилась | O15. (O84). How has the frequency of your communication with the |
| интенсивность общения с: | following people changed in the nast 12 months? |
| | fond i mg people enungea in the past 12 months. |
| [Q84 1]с близкими родственниками, не проживающими с вами | [Q84 1]with close relatives who do not live with you |
| [Q84 2] с друзьями | [Q84 2] with friends |
| [Q84_3] со знакомыми | [Q84 3] with acquaintances |
| [084 4] с коллегами | [Q84_4] with colleagues |
| [084-5] с соседями | [Q84_5] with neighbours |
| | |
| 1 Увеличилась | 1 Increased |
| 2 Не изменилась | 2 No change |
| 3 Уменьшилась | 3 Decreased |
| 4 3/0 | 4 Cannot answer |
| | |
| Q16. Q85. В течение последних 12 месяцев испытывали вы | Q16. (Q85). In the past 12 months, have you experienced the necessity |
| потребность в: | in the following matters? |
| | |
| [Q85_1] Общении в Интернете (социальных сетях, сайтах | [Q85_1] Communication on the Internet (social networks, dating sites, |
| знакомств и др.) | etc.) |
| [Q85_2] Новых друзьях, близких знакомых | [Q85_2] New friends, close acquaintances |
| [Q85_3] Партнерах для создания совместного бизнеса, проекта, | [Q85_3] Partners to create a joint business, project, start-up, etc. |
| стартапа и т.п. | [Q85–4] New counterparties to carry out their professional activity |
| | [Q85 5] Restoration of (trust) relations with close relatives |

| [О85 4] Новых контрагентах для осуществления своей | [O85 6] Restoration of communication (links) with close relatives in |
|--|--|
| профессиональной деятельности | other regions of the country |
| [085 5] Восстановлении (доверительных) отношений с близким | и [O85 7] Restoration of communication (ties) with those who left |
| ролственниками | Russia. |
| О85 6] Восстановлении общения (связей) с близкими в других | |
| пегионах страны | 1 Yes, and I have done this |
| рогнолих отраны [О85–7] Восстановлении общения (связей) с теми, кто уехал из | 2 Ves. and I plan to do this |
| России | 3 No it was not necessary |
| I OCCHI | 4 Cannot answer |
| 1 Ла и д это осущестриц(а) | |
| $2 \Pi_0$ μ σ τ_0 μ σ τ_0 μ σ τ_0 | |
| 2 Да, и я это планирую осуществить | |
| 5 пет, не обло неооходимости 4 м/с | |
| 4 3/0 | |
| 17 (028) Output to have the tage to the tage of 1 to 5 have the tage | A17 (028) On a scale from 1 to 5 please rate how important you |
| A17. (Q26). Ottehn ie, nowajiyucia, no mkaje ol 1 do 5, hackojisko pomulu M \mathbf{P}_{1} oputato no nume oputato i o program u MH, nom MH | think it is to have connections with influential needle (such as |
| важным ды считаете наличие связей с влиятельными людьми | nink it is to have connections with influential people (such as |
| (такими как политики, госслужащие, руководители предприяти | in politicians, civil servants, business leaders, etc.) in order to become |
| и т.п.) для того, чтооы стать успешным в ооществе. (1- наличие | successful in society. (1 is not important at an, 5 is extremely |
| связеи аосолютно не важно, 5 – наличие связеи краине важно) | important) |
| | 1 totally unimportant |
| 2 | 2 |
| 2 | $\frac{2}{2}$ |
| 3 | 5 |
| 4 | |
| \mathcal{O} краине важно | 5 extremely important |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| В СОЦИАЛЬНОЕ ЛОВЕРИЕ | B Social Trust |
| ВІ (О29) Если говорить в нелом, считаете ли Вы, что | O29 B1 Generally speaking, do you think that most people can be |
| | trusted or do you think you have to be very careful when dealing with |
| быть очень осторожным в отношениях с польми? | neonle? |
| obrid o tend ocropownibie d ornomennax e modbana. | headre . |
| 1 в большинстве случаях людям можно ловерять | 1 In most cases people can be trusted |
| 2 в некоторых случаях людям можно ловерять | 2 In some cases, people can be trusted |
| 3 в некоторых случаях нужно быть очень осторожным в отношения | |
| | x 3 Sometimes you have to be very careful in your dealings with people |

| 4 в большинстве случаев нужно быть очень осторожным в | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
|---|---|
| отношениях с людьми | |
| 99 З з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |
| В2. (Q30). Насколько Вы доверяете Вашему ближайшему | B2. (Q30). How much do you trust your immediate environment? |
| окружению? Оцените по шкале от 1 до 5, где 1 – совсем не | Rate on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not trusted at all, 5 is fully trusted. |
| доверяю, 5 – полностью доверяю. 99 3/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | O30 1 family |
| | $O30_2$ relatives |
| | $O30_3$ friends |
| 030_3 myorg | $\mathbf{O30}$ 4 work colleagues |
| 030 4 коллеги по работе | O30 5 neighbours |
| 030.5 cocetu | O30 6 neonle I see for the first time |
| | O30 7 doctors |
| 030 7 pnau | O30 8 directors/Managers of companies |
| О30 8 рук - пи предприятий | O30 9 directors of NGOs or NPOs |
| О30 9 рук - пи общественных организаций или НКО | O30 10 teachers |
| О30-10 преполаватели | O30 11 scientists |
| 030 11 ученые | O30 12 municipal employees |
| Озо 12 муниципальные служащие | O30 13 civil servants |
| Озо 13 госуларственные служащие | O30 14 president of Russia |
| ОЗО 14 презилент России | O30 15 political parties |
| Озо 15 политические партии | O30 16 elections |
| О30 16 выборы | O30 17 courts |
| О30 17 сулы | O30 18 police |
| О30 18 полиция | O30 19 Russian army |
| ОЗО 19 российская армия | O30 20 church |
| О30 20 церковь | O30 21 traditional media (TV, radio, newspapers) |
| О30 21 СМИ (ТВ. радио, газеты) | O30 22 social media, information on the internet |
| О30 22 социальные сети, информация в интернете | O30 23 Russian government |
| О30 23 правительство России | O30 24 State Duma |
| 030 24 Государственная Дума России | |
| В4. (Q32). Как Вы считаете, чего больше в человеческой природе: | B4. (Q32). What do you think is more in human nature: good or evil? |
| добра или зла? Оцените по шкале от 1 до 7, где 1 – полное | Rate on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the total predominance of evil, 7 |
| преобладание зла, 7 – полное преобладание добра | is the total predominance of good. |
| | L U |

| 2 1 3 3 4 5 5 6 7 Полное преобладание ДОБРА 6 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 7 total predominance of good 99 ло, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) С. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ C. Оррогtunities and Influence | 1 Полное преобладание ЗЛА | 1 complete predominance of evil |
|---|--|--|
| 3 3 4 5 5 6 6 7 Полное преобладание ДОБРА 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 7 total predominance of good 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) С. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ C. Оррогtunities and Influence | 2 | |
| 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 Полное преобладание ДОБРА 6 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 7 total predominance of good 99 по answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) C. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ C. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ | 3 | 3 |
| 55667 Полное преобладание ДОБРА 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ)567 total predominance of good 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ)С. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕС. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕС. Оррогtunities and Influence | 4 | 4 |
| 6 7 Полное преобладание ДОБРА 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ)6 7 total predominance of good 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ)C. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕC. Оррогtunities and Influence | 5 | 5 |
| 7 Полное преобладание ДОБРА 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ)7 total predominance of good 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ)C. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕC. Оррогtunities and Influence | 6 | 6 |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 99 по answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) С. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ С. Оррогtunities and Influence | 7 Полное преобладание ЛОБРА | 7 total predominance of good |
| С. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ С. Оррогtunities and Influence | 99 3/0 отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| C. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ C. Opportunities and Influence | | |
| C. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ C. Opportunities and Influence | | |
| | С. ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ВЛИЯНИЕ | C. Opportunities and Influence |
| C1. (Q33). Оцените, насколько у Bac есть возможность принимать ражи на рашания, способщ на наменият. Вашу жили ? C1. (Q33). To what extent you are able to make important decisions that can change your life? | C1. (Q33). Оцените, насколько у Вас есть возможность принимать | C1. (Q33). To what extent you are able to make important decisions |
| that can change your me. | важные решения, спосооные изменить дашу жизнь. | that can thange your me. |
| 1 совершенно не способны изменить жизнь 1 absolutely unable to change my life | 1 совершенно не способны изменить жизнь | 1 absolutely unable to change my life |
| 2 в основном не способны изменить жизнь 2 somehwat unable to change my life | 2 в основном не способны изменить жизнь | 2 somehwat unable to change my life |
| 3 в основном способны изменить жизнь 3 somewhat able to change my life | 3 в основном способны изменить жизнь | 3 somewhat able to change my life |
| 4 в полной мере способны изменить жизнь 4 absolutely able to change my life | 4 в полной мере способны изменить жизнь | 4 absolutely able to change my life |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) | 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | | |
| C3. (Q35). Скажите, насколько Вы удовлетворены своей жизнью C3. (Q35). Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with your life? | C3. (Q35). Скажите, насколько Вы удовлетворены своей жизнью | C3. (Q35). Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with your life? |
| в целом? | в целом? | |
| 1 absolutely not satisfied | | 1 absolutely not satisfied |
| 1 совсем не удовлетворены 2 somewhat dissatisfied | 1 совсем не удовлетворены | 2 somewhat dissatisfied |
| 2 скорее не удовлетворены 3 somewhat satisfied and somewhat dissatisfied, it is difficult to say | 2 скорее не удовлетворены | 3 somewhat satisfied and somewhat dissatisfied, it is difficult to say |
| 3 вчём-то удовлетворены, в чём-то не удовлетворены, трудно сказать unequivocally | 3 вчём-то удовлетворены, в чём-то не удовлетворены, трудно сказать | unequivocally |
| однозначно 4 somehwat satisfied | однозначно | 4 somehwat satisfied |
| 4 скорее удовлетворены 5 absolutely satisfied | 4 скорее удовлетворены | 5 absolutely satisfied |
| 5 полностью удовлетворены 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) | 5 полностью удовлетворены | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| C5 (0127) (040) If an first Discontinuum and a structure of the second structure of the seco | C5 (0.127) (0.40) Were fix By a part | C5 (0127)(04() How would you door the owned and the |
| US. (Q15/) (Q40). Nak ob bb oxapaktepusobalu ceoe oobiyhoe, waraanaanaanaanaanaanaanaanaanaanaanaanaa | сэ. (Q157) (Q40). Как оы бы охарактеризовали свое ооычное, | co. (Q15/)(Q40). How would you describe your usual, everyday |
| повседневное эмоционально-психологическое состояние: епонопат апо psychological condition? | повседневное эмоционально-психологическое состояние? | emotional and psychological condition? |
| 1 ошущаете эмоциональный полъем 1 I feel emotionally unlifted | 1 ошушаете эмоциональный полъем | 1 I feel emotionally unlifted |
| 2 чувствуете себя спокойно, уравновешенно 2 I feel calm and well-balanced | | |

| 3 находитесь в состоянии безразличия, апатии | 3 I feel apathetic |
|--|---|
| 4 ощущаете тревогу | 4 I feel anxious |
| 5 чувствуете раздражение | 5 I feel irritated |
| 6 ощущаете чувство озлобленности | 6 I feel angry |
| 7 ощущаете чувство агрессии | 7 I feel aggressive |
| 8 когда как, бывает по-разному | 8 It depends, my emotional condition varies |
| 9 O137 9 T другое () | 9 O137 9T other () |
| 99 3/о. отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| Q36. С4. (Q47)Кто из Вашего окружения является для Вас | Q36. C4. (Q47)Who in your environment is the most important person |
| наиболее значимым человеком: авторитетом, главным | for you: an authority, the main adviser or helper in solving your |
| советчиком или помощником в решении ваших проблем или | problems or achieving your goals? |
| лостижении ваших целей? | |
| | 1 boss at work |
| 1 начальник на работе | 2 state or local government official |
| 2 госуларственный или муниципальный служащий | 3 politician |
| 3 попитик | 4 teacher at school or university |
| 4 преполаватель школы или вуза | 5 member of a local community organization |
| 5 член местной общественной организации | 6 O36 6T other (specify) |
| 6 O36 6T provee (| 7 no one |
| 7 Her Takoro Henopeka | 99 no answer refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 = 3/0 otkas (HF 3AU/TLIBATL) | <i>y</i> no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT KEAD) |
| | |
| D. СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ СПЛОЧЕННОСТЬ И ИНКЛЮЗИВНОСТЬ | D. Social Cohesion and Inclusiveness |
| D1. (Q37). Часто бывает так, что между людьми, проживающими | D1. (Q37). It is often the case that there are significant differences |
| в одном районе, имеются существенные различия по | between people living in the same area in terms of social status, |
| социальному статусу, уровню дохода, национальности, родному | income, nationality, mother tongue, political preferences, religion, age, |
| языку, политическим предпочтениям, вероисповеданию, | gender, etc. How pronounced are such differences in your area of |
| возрасту, полу и т.д. Насколько сильно выражены такие | residence? Rate this on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is absolutely not |
| различия в районе вашего проживания? Оцените это по шкале от | pronounced and 5 is absolutely pronounced. |
| 1 до 5, где 1 – в очень незначительной степени, 5 – в очень | |
| значительной степени. | 1 absolutely not pronounced |
| | 2 |
| 1 в очень незначительной степени | 3 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 5 absolutely pronounced |
| 4 | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |

| 5 в очень значительной степени 99 отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
|---|--|
| ДЛЯ ВСЕХ D5. (Q41). По Вашим личным ощущениям, насколько безопасно гулять в Вашем районе одному в тёмное время суток? | FOR ALL RESPONDENTS D5. (Q41). In your personal experience, how safe is it to walk alone in your area at night? |
| 1 вполне безопасно 2 скорее безопасно 3 скорее небезопасно 4 совсем не безопасно 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 1 quite safe 2 somewhat safe 3 somewhat unsafe 4 not safe at all 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| Е. КОЛЛЕКТИВНЫЕ ДЕЙСТВИЯ И СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВО | E. Collective Actions and Cooperation |
| E2. (Q43). В каких из следующих видов общественной деятельности Вы лично или через Интернет участвовали в течение последних 12 месяцев? | E2. (Q43). In which of the following community activities have you personally participated in the last 12 months? (including online participation). |
| Q43_1_волонтерская деятельность по улучшению места (района) своего проживания (озеленение улиц, улучшение безопасности, организация мероприятий и пр.) Q43_2_волонтерская деятельность на спортивных, культурных, научно-популярных мероприятиях Q43_3_волонтёрская деятельность, связанная с оказанием социальной помощи инвалидам, детям, людям пожилого возраста и пр. Q43_4_добровольное участие в политических мероприятиях (сбор подписей, участие в митингах и пр.) 98Q43_98_ни в каких не участвовал (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) 99Q43_99_3/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | Q43_1_volunteering to improve the place (area) where you live (landscaping streets, improving security, organizing events, etc.) Q43_2_volunteering at sports, cultural, scientific and popular science events Q43_3_volunteer activities related to the provision of social assistance to persons with disabilities, children, elderly people, etc. Q43_4_voluntary participation in political activities (collection of signatures, participation in rallies, etc.) 98_Q43_98_did not participate in any (DO NOT READ) 99 Q43_99_ no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| E3. (Q44). По шкале от 1 до 5 оцените, насколько Вы согласны со следующими утверждениями. 1 – категорически не согласен, 5 – полностью согласен, 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | E3. (Q44). On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. 1 - absolutely disagree, 5 - absolutely agree, 99 - no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |

| Q44_1_простые люди, как я, никак не могут повлиять на то, что | Q44_1_ordinary people like myself have no influence whatsoever on what |
|--|--|
| происходит в государстве, В правительстве | happens in the country or its government |
| Q44_2_я не совсем понимаю, чем занимается государство и | Q44_2_I don't really understand what the government and politicians do, |
| политики, поскольку это сложная для меня сфера | because it's a difficult area for me |
| Q44_3_я интересуюсь политикой | Q44_3_I'm interested in politics |
| Q44 4 я хочу быть полезным обществу | Q44 4 I want to be useful to society. |
| Q44 5 я и мои соседи заботимся друг о друге | Q44 5 I and my neighbours care about each other |
| Q44 6 я могу рассчитывать на помощь моих соседей в случае | Q44 6 I can count on the help of my neighbours in case of need |
| необходимости | |
| | |
| E4. (Q45). Как часто за последние три года Вы собирались вместе | E4. (Q45). In the last three years, how often have you got together |
| с другими жителями Вашего района, чтобы совместно | with other residents of your area to jointly ask the authorities to solve |
| обратиться к власти с просьбой решить какую-то проблему в | a problem in your area? |
| Вашем районе? | |
| 1 ни разу | 1 never |
| 2 один раз | 2 once |
| 3 несколько раз (от 2 до 5) | 3 several times (2 to 5) |
| 4 более 5 раз (более 5 раз) | 4 more than 5 times |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| G. СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ УСТАНОВКИ | G. Socio-Political Orientations |
| G1. (Q55). Насколько Вы согласны с утверждением о том, что | G1. (Q55). To what extent do you agree with the statement that the |
| государство должно стремиться уменьшать разницу в доходах | state should strive to reduce the income gap between the citizens of the |
| между гражданами страны. Оцените свой ответ от 1 до 5, где 1 – | country. Rate your answer from 1 to 5, where 1 - strongly disagree, 5 - |
| абсолютно не согласен, 5 – абсолютно согласен | strongly agree. |
| | |
| l абсолютно не согласен | I totally disagree |
| 2 | $\frac{2}{2}$ |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 абсолютно согласен | 5 totally agree |
| 6 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 6 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| C^{2} (056) Kor for Bri onounce non-merry approximate n | C_2 (056) How would you rate the policies of the president and |
| 52. (250). Как обі бы оценили политику президента и | |
| правиталі стра в спалующих областах за пословнию 5 нот? 1 | government in the following areas over the last 5 years? 1 very |
| правительства в следующих областях за последние 5 лет? 1 – очень неоффективнов 5 – очень оффективнов | government in the following areas over the last 5 years? 1 - very inefficient 5 - very efficient |

| Q56 1 создание новых рабочих мест с | Q56 1 creation of new jobs with |
|--|--|
| Q56 2 сокращение экономического неравенства | Q56 2 reducing economic inequality |
| Q56 3 стимулирование экономического роста | Q56 3 stimulation of economic growth |
| Q56 4 развитие инфраструктуры | Q56 4 infrastructure development |
| Q56 5 обеспечение безопасности | Q56 5 ensuring security |
| 056 6 развитие образования и науки | 056 6 development of education and science |
| 056 7 развитие системы здравоохранения | 056 7 development of health care system |
| Q54 8 защита окружающей среды | Q54 8 environmental protection |
| | |
| 1 очень неэффективная | 1 very inefficient |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 очень эффективная | 5 very effective |
| 6 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 6 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| Q55. Q138. Каково Ваше отношение к текущей политике России в | Q55. (Q138). What is your attitude on the policy of Russian |
| отношении Украины? | government towards Ukraine? |
| | |
| 1 Точно не поддерживаю | 1 Absolutely do not support |
| 2 Скорее не поддерживаю | 2 Somewhat do not support |
| 3 Скорее поддерживаю | 3 Somewhat support |
| 4 Абсолютно поддерживаю | 4 Absolutely support |
| 98 Затрудняюсь ответить (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 Refusal (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| Q56. Q139. По вашему мнению, на ком лежит наибольшая | Q56. (Q139). In your view, who is mostly responsible for the special |
| ответственность за проведение специальной военной операции | military operation of Russia in Ukraine? |
| вооружённых сил России на территории Украины? | |
| | 1 Russian government |
| 1 На российской власти | 2 Ukrainian government |
| 2 На украинской власти | 3 Politicians and deputies of both countries |
| 3 На политиках и депутатах обеих стран | 4 Russian citizens |
| 4 На гражданах России | 5 Ukrainian citizens |
| 5 На гражданах Украины | 6 Government of foreign countries |
| 6 На руководстве иностранных государств | 7 Foreign businessmen |
| | 8 |

| 8 [Q139_8T] Другое () | 98 Difficult to answer (DO NOT READ OUT) |
|---|---|
| 98 З/О (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 99 Refusal (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 Отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |
| Н. ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА РЕСПОНДЕНТА | H. Respondent's Profile |
| Q57-Q62. H1. Образование | Q57-Q62. H1. Education: |
| 057 скажите, какое у Вас образование? | Q57 what is your educational background? |
| О58 вашего мужа/жены? | 058 your spouse's education? |
| О59 вашего отца? | 059 your father education? |
| Об1 вашей матери? | 061 your mother's education? |
| 062 вашего ближайшего друга? | Q62 your closest friend's education? |
| | |
| 1 начальное | 1 primary |
| 2 неполное среднее | 2 incomplete secondary education |
| 3 общее среднее | 3 general secondary education |
| 4 среднее специальное | 4 secondary special |
| 5 незаконченное высшее | 5 incomplete higher education |
| 6 высшее гуманитарное, в т.ч. экономическое | 6 higher liberal arts education, including economics |
| 7 высшее техническое или естественнонаучное | 7 higher technical or natural science education |
| 8 два высших образования, магистратура, аспирантура, кандидат или | 8 two higher education degrees, master's, post-graduate, candidate or |
| доктор наук | doctor of sciences |
| 98. затрудняюсь ответить / отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 98 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| | |
| Q59. Q63. H2. Сколько членов Вашей семьи живут | Q59. Q63. H2. How many members of your family live directly with |
| непосредственно вместе с Вами, включая Вас, в одной квартире | you, including you, in the same flat on a permanent basis? |
| на постоянной основе? | |
| | 1 FILL IN THE NUMBER FROM THE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER |
| 1 ЗАПИШИТЕ ЧИСЛО СО СЛОВ РЕСПОНДЕНТА [Q63_1N] | Q63_1N |
| 2 ОТМЕТЬТЕ, ЕСЛИ РЕСПОНДЕНТ ЖИВЕТ ОДИН | 2 TICK IF THE RESPONDENT LIVES ALONE |
| 3 OTKA3 | 3 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| | |
| $E_{C,NU} \bigcup_{0,0} 0 = 1$ | IJ U03=I |
| оо. (оо4). Сколько детеи, внуков или других олизких людеи | you. (yo4). now many children, grandchildren or other close persons |
| младше 16 лет живут вместе с бами? | under to years old live with you? |
| | |

| 0 Если нет детей, внуков или других близких людей младше 18 | 0 If there are no children, grandchildren or other close persons under 18 or |
|---|--|
| лет или они не живут с респонлентом | they do not live with the respondent. |
| 1 ЗАПИШИТЕ ЧИСЛО СО СЛОВ РЕСПОНЛЕНТА О64 1 N | 1 FILL IN THE NUMBER FROM THE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER |
| 2 ОТМЕТЬТЕ ЕСЛИ РЕСПОНЛЕНТ ЖИВЁТ ОЛИН | O64 1N |
| 3 OTKA3 | 2 TICK IF THE RESPONDENT LIVES ALONE |
| 5 011015 | 3 no answer refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| U3 (065) UTO HE HODOLHAROHUOFO GERGATAG HEG \mathbf{P} Dec Hotohumann | U3 (O65) Which of the following are your sources of income? (Mark |
| постоя (Q05). Что из перечисленного является для Бас источниками | all that are relevant to your family) |
| дохода: (Отметьте все, что относится к башей семье). | an that are relevant to your family). |
| | O(5.1 select from more in isl |
| Q65_1_зарплата по основному месту расоты | Q65_1_salary from your main job |
| Q65_2 _пенсии, посооия, алименты, помощь от государства и | Q65_2_pensions, allowances, alimony, help from the state and public |
| общественных организации и т.д. | organizations, etc. |
| Q65_3_собственный бизнес | Q65_3_own business |
| Q65_4_совместительство | Q65_4_outside employment (second job) |
| Q65_5_разовые приработки, заработки от случая к случаю | Q65_5_occasional earnings, one-time work |
| Q65_6_доходы от собственности, сдачи в аренду имущества, | Q65_6_income from property, rental property, interest on deposits |
| проценты по вкладам | Q65_7_material aid received from relatives, friends, neighbours, etc. |
| Q65_7_помощь, получаемая от родственников, друзей, соседей и т.п. | Q65_8_subsistence farming, dacha, garden plot |
| Q65 8 подсобное хозяйство, дача, приусадебный участок | Q65 9 other (specify) |
| Q65 9 другое () | 99 $\overline{065}$ 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 Об5 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |
| Н4. (О66-О73). Каков Ваш собственный среднемесячный доход | H4. (O66-O73). What is your own average monthly income (your |
| (Ваша зарплата, пенсия, приработки и т.д.)? | salary, pension, earnings, etc.)? |
| ЕСЛИ ЗАТРУЛНЯЕТСЯ С ОТВЕТОМ. ЗАЧИТАЙТЕ ВАРИАНТЫ – | IF IT IS DIFFICULT TO ANSWER. READ OUT THE OPTIONS - EACH |
| ΠΠЯ ΚΑЖΠΟΓΟ ΦΕΠΕΡΑΠЬΗΟΓΟ ΟΚΡΥΓΑ СВОИ ΓΡΑΗИΙЫ | FEDERAL DISTRICT HAS DIFFERENT INCOME LEVELS |
| ΠΟΧΟΠΑ | |
| долоди | Central Federal District 1066 <i>If 06001=1</i> 1 |
| Пентральный Фелеральный Округ [О66 F_{CDU} О6001=1] | $\frac{1}{2} \log t \ln 21000$ |
| | 2 21 000 to 30 000 |
| 2 or 21,000 to 30,000 | 2 21 000 to 50 000 |
| 3 or 31 000 po 50 000 | 4 51 000 to 81 000 |
| Δ οτ 51 000 πο 81 000 | = 51000 to 01000 |
| 5 82 000 H GOHOO | 5 more man 62 000 |
| J 62 000 и облес | North West Federal District 1067 1806001-21 |
| C | North-west rederal District $[Q07 I] Q0001-2]$ |
| северо-западныи Федеральный Округ [Q67 Если Q0001=2] | 1 less than 18 000 |
| 1 mehee 18 000 | 2 18 000 to 26 000 |

| 2 от 18 000 до 26 000 | 3 27 000 to 44 000 |
|--|---|
| 3 от 27 000 до 44 000 | 4 45 000 to 71 000 |
| 4 от 45 000 до 71 000 | 5 more than 72 000 |
| 5 72 000 и более | |
| | Southern Federal District [Q68 If Q6001=3] |
| Южный Федеральный Округ [Q68 Если Q6001=3] | 1 less than 12 000 |
| 1 менее 12 000 | 2 12 000 to 17 000 |
| 2 от 12 000 до 17 000 | 3 18 000 to 28 000 |
| 3 от 18 000 до 28 000 | 4 29 000 to 45 000 |
| 4 от 29 000 до 45 000 | 5 more than 46 000 |
| 5 46 000 и более | |
| | North Caucasian Federal District [Q69 If Q6001=4] |
| Северо-Кавказский Федеральный Округ [Q69 Если Q6001=4] | 1 less than 10 000 |
| 1 менее 10 000 | 2 10 000 to 14 000 |
| 2 от 10 000 до 14 000 | 3 15 000 to 24 000 |
| 3 от 15 000 до 24 000 | 4 25 000 to 39 000 |
| 4 от 25 000 до 39 000 | 5 more than 40 000 |
| 5 40 000 и более | |
| Приволжский Фелеральный Округ [О70 Если О6001=5] | Volga Federal District [O70 If O6001=5] |
| 1 менее 12.000 | 1 less than 12 000 |
| 2 от 12 000 ло 17 000 | 2 12 000 to 17 000 |
| 3 от 18 000 до 28 000 | 3 18 000 to 28 000 |
| 4 от 29 000 до 46 000 | 4 29 000 to 46 000 |
| 5 47 000 и более | 5 more than 47 000 |
| Vральский Фелеральный Округ 1071 Если 06001=61 | Ural Federal District 1071 If 06001=61 |
| 1 менее 17 000 | 1 less than 17 000 |
| 2 от 17 000 ло 25 000 | 2 17 000 and 25 000 |
| 3 от 26 000 ло 42 000 | 3 26 000 to 42 000 |
| 4 от 43 000 до 68 000 | 4 43 000 to 68 000 |
| 5. 69 000 и более | 5 More than 69 000 |
| Сибирский Фелеральный Округ 1072 Если О6001=71 | Siberian Federal District [O72 if O6001=7] |
| 1 menee 14 000 | 1 less than 14 000 |
| 2 от 14 000 до 20 000 | 2 14 000 to 20 000 |
| 3 of 21 000 to 34 000 | 3 21 000 to 34 000 |

| 4 от 35 000 до 55 000 | 4 35 000 to 55 000 |
|--|--|
| 5 56 000 и более | 5 more than 56 000 |
| Дальневосточный Федеральный Округ [Q73 Если Q6001=8] 1 менее 19 000 2 от 19 000 до 27 000 3 от 28 000 до 47 000 4 от 48 000 до 75 000 5 76 000 и более 99 ОТКАЗ Н5. (Q74). Есть ли у других членов вашей семьи источники дохода? | Far East Federal District [Q73 If Q6001=8] 1 less than 19 000 2 19 000 to 27 000 3 28 000 to 47 000 4 48 000 to 75 000 5 more than 76 000 or more 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) H5. (Q74). Do other members of your family have sources of income? |
| 1 По | 1 yes |
| 2 Нет | 99 no answer refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| 99 з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | |
| H6. (Q75). Что из нижеперечисленного характеризует Ваше финансовое положение в настоящее время? Выберете все, что Вам подходит Q75_1_у меня имеются сбережения, на которые можно прожить более одного года Q75_2_у меня имеются сбережения, на которые можно прожить лишь непродолжительное время Q75_3_у меня есть непогашенные кредиты в банке или других финансовых организациях Q75_4_у меня есть непогашенные кредиты, предоставленные по месту работы Q75_5_у меня есть большие долги перед частными физическими лицами Q75_6_у меня есть небольшие накопленные долги Q75_7_у меня есть задолженность по аренде более чем за 2 месяца Q75_8_ничего из вышеперечисленного Q75_99_ з/о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | H6. (Q75). Which of the following best characterises your financial situation at present? Choose all that applies to you. Q75_1_I have savings to live on for more than one year Q75_2_I have some money to live on for a short time Q75_3_I have outstanding loans from a bank or other financial institutions Q75_4_I have outstanding loans from my workplace Q75_5_I have large debts to private individuals Q75_6_I have small accumulated debts Q75_7_I have more than 2 month-rent arrears Q75_8_none of the above Q75_99_ no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |

| Q65. Q76. H7. Каково Ваше трудовое положение в настоящее | Q65. Q76. H7. What is your current employment status? Are you. |
|--|---|
| время? Вы | |
| Работаете по найму полный рабочий день (в том числе работающий пенсионер или работающий студент) Работаете по найму неполный рабочий день (в том числе работающий пенсионер или работающий студент) Предприниматель, имеющий наемных работников Индивидуальный предприниматель без наемных работников или имеющий чисто семейный бизнес, фермерском хозяйстве «Самозанятый» Работаете без оплаты (волонтёрство или стажировка) Неработающий студент учебного заведения Не работаете по состоянию здоровья/ инвалид Временно без работы, но ищете работу Находитесь в декретном отпуске или в отпуске по уходу за ребенком Занимаетесь домашним хозяйством, воспитываете детей Неработающий пенсионер [Q76_98T] Другое (что именно) З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | 1 Employed full-time (including working pensioner or working student) 2 Employed part-time (including working pensioner or working student) 3 Entrepreneur with employees 4 Self-employed entrepreneur without hired employees or with a purely family business, farming business 5 Self-employed 6 Working without pay (volunteering or internship) 7 Non-working student of an educational institution 8 Not working for health reasons/disabled person 9 Temporarily unemployed but looking for a job 10 On maternity or parental leave 11 Doing household chores, raising children 12 Non-working pensioner 98 [Q76_98T] Other (what kind) 99 Refusal (DO NOT REQUIRE) |
| Если Q76<3 Q66. Q77. Н8. Кем Вы работаете в настоящее время? Работающие в нескольких местах указывают работу, на которой получают основной доход; работающие пенсионеры отмечают, кем они сейчас работают. 1 Руководитель, заместитель руководителя предприятия или учреждения 2 Руководитель среднего или низшего звена 3 Специалист на должности, предполагающей высшее | If Q76<3 Q66. Q77. H8. What is your current job? Those working in more than one job indicate the job in which they receive their main income; working pensioners indicate what they are currently working as. 1 Manager, deputy manager of an enterprise or institution 2 Middle or lower level manager 3 Specialist in a position involving higher education, including officers 4 An employee in a position that does not require higher education |
| образование, в т.ч. офицеры 4 Служащий на должности, не требующей высшего образования (в т.ч. офисные работники, неофицерский состав силовых структур, лаборанты, библиотекари, секретари, администраторы и т.д.) | (including office workers, unofficial staff of the security forces, lab technicians, librarians, secretaries, administrators, etc.) 5 An ordinary worker in trade or consumer services 6 Worker of 5 grade and above |

| 5 | Рядовой работник торговли или сферы бытовых услуг | 7 Labourer (3-4 grade) |
|-------------|---|---|
| 6 | Рабочий от 5 разряда | 8 Labourer (1-2 grade and no grade, handyman) |
| 7 | Рабочий (3-4 разряд) | 9 [Q77_9T] Other (specify what) |
| 8 | Рабочий (1-2 разряд и без разряда, разнорабочий) | 99 Refusal (do not count) |
| 9 | [Q77 9T] Другое (указать что именно) | |
| 99 | З/О, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |
| | | |
| Есл | u Q76<3 | If Q76<3 |
| Н9. | (Q78). Если говорить о Вашей нынешней работе, то можете | H9. (Q78). Talking about your current job, can you say that? |
| ЛИ | Вы сказать, что Вы? | |
| | | 1 you are able to influence enterprise-wide decision-making process |
| 1 cī | юсобны повлиять на принятие решений в масштабах всего | 2 you are able to influence decision making across your unit/department |
| пре | дприятия | 3 virtually nothing at work depends on your opinion |
| 2 c1 | особны повлиять на принятие решений в масштабах Вашего | 99 no answer, refuse to answer (DO NOT READ) |
| под | разделения | |
| 3 or | Вашего мнения у Вас на работе практически ничего не зависит | |
| 99 a | /о, отказ (НЕ ЗАЧИТЫВАТЬ) | |