

A child is playing in a water fountain. The child is partially obscured by a white semi-transparent text box at the top of the image. The water is splashing and spraying upwards, creating a dynamic and lively scene. The child is wearing a dark, patterned swimsuit. The background is slightly blurred, showing other people and the structure of the fountain.

Г. А. Фоменко

**СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНОЕ
ИЗМЕРЕНИЕ РАЗВИТИЯ
ПРИРОДООХРАННЫХ ИНСТИТУТОВ**

УДК 504.06
ББК 20.18
Ф 76

Рекомендовано к печати
Ученым советом АНО НИПИ «Кадастр»

Рецензенты:

Аниськина Н.Н., кандидат технических наук,
ректор Государственной академии промышленного менеджмента
им. Н.П. Пастухова;

Никитина Е.Н., кандидат экономических наук,
старший научный сотрудник ИМЭМО РАН

Фоменко Г. А.

Социокультурное измерение развития природоохранных институтов. – Ярославль: АНО НИПИ «Кадастр», 2014. – 96 с.
ISBN 978-5-902637-20-2

Книга посвящена важнейшей проблеме повышения эффективности природоохранной деятельности на устойчивой основе через «настройку» природоохранных институтов на социокультурные особенности территорий. Развитие в последние десятилетия инструментария этнометрики позволяет дополнить традиционные качественные методы институционального анализа количественными культурными измерениями развития природоохранных институтов. Показана целесообразность использования измерений Г. Хофстеде и дополнительного индекса стабильности прав собственности. Книга представляет интерес для всех, кто занимается проблемами устойчивого развития, особенно специалистов в области управления природоохранной деятельностью, институциональной и культурной географии.

Georgy A. Fomenko

Socio-cultural dimensions of the development of environmental institutes. – Yaroslavl: Cadaster Institute, 2014. – 96 pages.

This book discusses the fundamental obstacle to increasing the effectiveness of sustainable nature conservation practice through a “fine-tuning” of environmental institutes regarding geospatial socio-cultural characteristics. The growth in recent decades of a suite of ethnic measurements has led to supplanting traditional qualitative methods of institutional analysis with quantitative cultural measurements to assess the development of environmental institutes. A preference has been shown for using measurements conceived by Geert Hofstede, together with an additional index, the “stability of property rights”. This book will be of interest to all those concerned with sustainable development, in particular experts in environmental management practice, institutional and cultural geography.

ISBN 978-5-902637-20-2

© Фоменко Г.А., 2014
© АНО НИПИ «Кадастр» (оформление), 2014

CONTENTS

PREFACE	5
INTRODUCTION.....	10
CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL PREREQUISITES.....	16
CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF MODERNISATION PROCESSES.....	21
CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL SYSTEMS.....	25
CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY AND NATURE CONSERVATION INSTITUTES.....	30
CHAPTER 2. SOCIO-CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURE CONSERVATION INSTITUTES.....	34
POWER DISTANCE INDEX.....	35
INDIVIDUALISM VS COLLECTIVISM INDEX.....	44
UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE INDEX.....	51
MASCULINITY INDEX.....	55
LONG-TERM ORIENTATION INDEX.....	64
«INDULGENCE VS SELF-RESTRAINT» INDEX.....	67
STABILITY OF PROPERTY RIGHTS INDEX.....	71
CONCLUSION.....	80
LITERATURE.....	88

PREFACE

21st century post-industrial civilisation is still in its infancy, with its growth directly linked to earlier globalisation of the economic and information sectors. As a result, as predicted by Vladimir Vernadsky¹, the role played by humans has increased significantly, while science has been transformed into the major productive driving force². This has been accompanied by a reappraisal of the role of culture in growth, together with the realisation that cultural stereotypes influence management decisions more acutely than was originally thought, limiting and regulating the scope of practical solutions available to resource managers. What's more, the sharp increase in recent years of the public's access to information (thanks to the Internet, television and mobile devices) has created, on the one hand, socio-cultural barriers to the assimilation of the latest knowledge which limit their understanding and, in isolated instances, exert a damaging effect on community sustainable development as a result of traditional, cultural and somewhat alien «information exposure». On the other hand, a positive influence has emerged of different cultural codes and traditions that are stimulating modern-day practices and enabling society to master the latest technology and innovations. Consequently, it is now extremely important for environmental planning to include the study and measurement of cultural modernisation indicators.

The realisation that sustainable development is only possible with support from cultural traditions leads to a reappraisal of the rationale for managing environmental practices, together with an acknowledgement of the need to develop new approaches that will empower people with drive and creative talent.

Achieving such an objective requires a fresh look at the very basis of environmental management methodology, incorporating refined research models of certain processes, focusing on «responsible behavior», as well as at the specific coordination of standardized (characteristic for the majority of countries) socio-culturally orientated environmental institutes (both formal and informal) in different spatial institutional matrices. Only by paying attention to the socio-cultural basis of growth is it possible to create high levels of motivation among individuals for collective action in order to achieve socially important ecological objectives.

¹ Vernadsky, V.I. A few words on the noosphere/philosophical thoughts of a naturalist. Moscow, 1988

² At the end of the 1980s/beginning of the 1990s, new economic growth theories emerged that confirmed that Man was the real driving force behind economic progress. These theories were developed by economists such as Paul Romer and Robert Lucas and were concerned with the study of the impact of human capital on the rate of a country's economic growth within a long-term plan (Paper on Human Development, 1996, United Nations Development Programme, New York, Oxford, 1996, 227 pp)

Such an approach³ can be called socio-cultural in as far as it aims to incorporate an individual's and their local community's enthusiasm for nature conservation work, as well as an understanding that the conscious and unconscious aspirations of an individual enable effective systems for nature conservation practice to be established in different geographical conditions. A socio-cultural methodology focuses attention on ethical values specific to a country's individual culture in evaluating the relationship between Society and Nature, together with the presence of socio-cultural determinants, «the pillar of growth» in local areas; the humanisation of methods for evaluating environmental benefits and ecosystem services, as well as a range of other tools.

A socio-cultural methodology involves the use of a special set of tools designed to prevent conflict between imported, unified, external environmental institutes characteristic of a world economy with socio-culturally orientated bodies that have emerged during the developing historical relationship between humans and Nature in specific areas.

This book develops a socio-cultural approach to environmental management and examines the most important and poorly researched problem of measuring the influence of culture on the work of nature conservation institutes, with emphasis on the development in recent decades of a suite of ethic measures involving additional, more traditional qualitative institutional analysis methods, using quantified measures of cultural dimensions of the development of environmental bodies.

In writing this book, I am deeply indebted to my wife, Marina Alexandrovna, and daughter Valentina Georgievna Fomenko, who were not only deeply involved in its research (the results of which are included in the book) and in discussions on its findings, but also took on the bulk of the work in preparing the manuscript and in dealing with the printing of the final version.

This book will be of interest to all those concerned with the problems of sustainable development, particularly experts in environmental management practice, and institutional and cultural geography.

Georgy A. Fomenko

Doctor of Geographical Sciences, Professor

(Economic, Social, Political and Recreational Geography)

24.12.2013

³ 3Cf: More detail: Fomenko, G.A., Management of environmental practice: The basis of socio-cultural methodology M: Science, 2004 – page 390. Fomenko, G.A., Institutional limitations and regulation of environmental management//problems of regional ecology, 2012, No.6, pp 208-221 and others.

INTRODUCTION

Any human action depends on an individual's beliefs and their conviction is based on a culturally painted version of themselves and their environment. Institutes have value-standard norms that are driven by a common cultural value and verification system. So, in order to gain a better understanding of growth trends in Russia's environmental, institutional system, it is important to identify the socio-cultural conditions associated with these processes.

The concept of the influence of socio-cultural spatial characteristics on institutional dimensions of environmental protection has not received much attention to date. This can be explained by the fact ecological ethics, geographical behaviour (despite important changes in approaches to the study of human behaviour in the environment) and economics, as well as evidence of recent attempts to bring together different methodologies, are all developing to a large extent quite independently from each other.

The differences between various national and cultural stereotypes that influence the creation and development of institutional systems, including the environmental sector, are known to go back a long way. An excellent example of qualitative research into the national psyche was that undertaken at the beginning of the 20th century by a number of patriotic thinkers into the problem of the «Russian people's character». This work was enthusiastically taken up by distinguished, post-revolutionary émigrés, who looked for reasons for the «failure of traditional Russian culture». This research was conducted by Nikolay Berdyaev, Nikolay Lossky, Ivan Ilin, Sergey Bulgakov, Georgy Fedotov and others.

In recent times, the cultural aspect of the problems of growth has attracted increasing attention, particularly in the context of devising sustainable development theories. At the largest ever UN Rio +20 Summit in 2012, there was universal acceptance of the need for a variety of approaches (above all, cultural – author) to the self-development of geospatial institutional structures within a single, universal mainstream growth system⁴. To a large extent, this can be traced to the response to previous unsuccessful attempts to introduce institutional experience from abroad, undertaken by peripheral and semi-peripheral countries

⁴ cf: Final document from the Rio +20 Summit "The future we want"
<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N12/436/90/PDF/N1243690.pdf>

attempting to catch up with the more developed states. As Arnold G. Toynbee quite rightly points out «...unfortunately, the actions of expert Western advisers involved in managing the transition of post-communist countries to free-market capitalism, namely economists, financiers, business leaders and politicians, led to false hopes being raised...They lost sight of the fact that extremely complicated legal, institutional, and customs structures, which had existed in capitalist countries for centuries, were the main bedrocks of modern-day market systems». [38, page 75].

Finally, it is particularly important to understand that a country's natural environment resource⁵ management plan not only depends on an appreciation of the value of setting ecological limits and regulating the growth of an institutional spatial system, but also on cultural codes, which restrict the range of practical responses, despite the ever-increasing means of accessing the latest information (the Internet, etc.).

Following Rio +20, work resumed on developing a socio-cultural approach to resolving problems associated with the implementation of global principles and sustainable development objectives⁶, taking into account a country's institutional development characteristics. A socio-cultural methodology⁷ for managing environmental work draws attention to a particular area regarding the optimum ratio of environmental, universal and socio-culturally orientated institutes, supported by moral constraints and priorities, the basis of which being cultural traditions and socio-economic conditions. Up until recently, the influence of culture on the development of countries and their people has almost exclusively been measured using qualitative methods. However, in past decades, there has been a noticeable improvement in quantitative measurements of the influence of so-

⁵ Natural environmental resources combine two concepts: The natural environment and natural resources. The natural environment is the sum of natural components that have an influence on the quality of life, living conditions and human health. These components are air, water, soil, minerals, together with the world of animals and plants. Natural resources are naturally-occurring resources, which are part of all the elements that contribute to society's natural living conditions and which could be incorporated into society's production process. (Formenko, G.A. and others: Problems and perspectives of growth using a publically available statistical base to calculate and evaluate natural environment resources// Problems of regional ecology, 2013, No.1).

⁶ Natural environmental resources combine two concepts: The natural environment and natural resources. The natural environment is the sum of natural components that have an influence on the quality of life, living conditions and human health. These components are air, water, soil, minerals, together with the world of animals and plants. Natural resources are naturally-occurring resources, which are part of all the elements that contribute to society's natural living conditions and which could be incorporated into society's production process. (Formenko, G.A. and others: Problems and perspectives of growth using a publically available statistical base to calculate and evaluate natural environment resources// Problems of regional ecology, 2013, No.1).

⁷ Socio-cultural methodology for environmental management was conceived and developed by Georgy Fomenko back in 2002, and in 2004 was the subject of a monograph. Further research by the author has led to the dissemination of views on institutional limitations and development trends in environmental management.

socio-cultural factors on human behaviour. A suite of ethnic measures has emerged that provide a realistic evaluation of the influence of socio-cultural factors on the development of institutional systems, including in the environmental sector.

All this opens up new possibilities for research into area institutional systems, including an appraisal of their condition and growth dynamics, together with a better understanding of their historical background and cultural characteristics. In practical terms, the following options are possible: (1) Clarifying socio-cultural factors that depend on their being effectively measured by an environmental organisation in specific societies; (2) Use of emerging quantitative factor analysis methods, extended to like-for-like indicators, in assessing the influence of culture on environmental sustainability; (3) Agreeing on a variety of practical responses in the area of natural resource use, as well as a range of environmental constraints and regulation of the development of socio-environmental systems, using conditional value mechanisms that are mainly employed in a particular society.

CONCLUSION

A theoretical analysis of the character of socio-cultural orientated institutional development in the environmental sector that can be measured using the six cultural indices devised by Geert Hofstede, with the addition of another, known as the «stability of property rights», enables one to gain a greater understanding of the basis of environmental practice, to evaluate the influence of culture in resolving ecological problems, to refine and broaden ideas on institutional constraints and development trends in environmental institutional systems. On such a basis, it is possible to devise a range of practical solutions to implementing resource management.

In fact, in order to increase the effectiveness of environmental institutes in any culture, one has to find an answer to the question of what kind of innovative systems need to be put in place that enable judgements to be made on the success of proposed institutional changes. Consequently, a suite of ethnic measures has to be the most important element of a socio-cultural methodology for effective environmental management [35, 44–46] in that this allows a realistic assessment to be made of the influence of socio-cultural factors on the development of institutional systems in the environmental sector, as well as highlighting the effect of cultures on environmental sustainability. More importantly, the use of socio-cultural indices will provide an a priori value of a specific culture as a factor that sets the development trend and the constraints involved in choosing various practical responses to institutional or organisational change in the environmental field.

The dependence of environmental and institutional changes on cultural indices is very general in nature. Consequently, using a universal value scale to evaluate human behaviour should be treated with a degree of caution. In each specific case, it is advisable to go back to basics and treat cultural measurements merely as indicators, which help in assessing culture as a means of improving decision-making. It is important to note that socio-cultural indices themselves cannot predict a person's behaviour given their own individual

personality traits. Significant regional differences in socio-cultural conditions across Russia should be borne in mind, in particular the global process of growing behavioural differences between those who live in large towns (post-industrial trends) as opposed to in rural areas.

In practical terms, this involves including a special set of indicators as part of the toolkit in environmental management plans, within which the following indices devised by Geert Hofstede are particularly important, namely «power distance» (PDI); «uncertainty avoidance» (UAI); «individualism versus collectivism» (IDV); «masculinity versus femininity» (MAS); «long-term orientation» (LTO); «indulgence versus self-restraint» (IVR); supplemented by «stability of property rights» (SPR). Their use can be an opportunity to raise the quality of a priori choices for the importation of environmental institutes, taking account of socio-cultural conditions within a country and its regions, where states sign up to international agreements to develop an appropriate roadmap.

There is little in the numerous studies on the characteristics of Russia or Russian society which distinguishes the nature of institutional matrices, cultural indices, the public's mind set or behaviour. As Auzan and others [11, page 82] quite rightly say, there is widespread consensus among specialists, irrespective of their worldview, on the special nature of the «Russian way» and the «Russian type» that derives from the former. This is despite the fact that culture in modern-day Russian society is heterogeneous, displaying elements of pre-revolutionary Russian culture, which became directly influenced by the Soviet system and Soviet culture, and ultimately those elements derived from Western economic culture.

It is clear that in the years to come, the planning and design of the development of a system of environmental institutes in Russia will take place against a background of conservative growth in the country, as well as a strengthening of historically-based socio-cultural institutes, whose institutional plans include a solid base for devising potential solutions for improving environmental management at all levels within area organisations. A more complex issue that needs consideration within this context is that of eco-modernisation in as far as this goes to the very heart of institutional change, which today needs to be developed and undertaken within the constraints of a range of practical response

options. Consequently, it is now important to develop a wider understanding of conservatism, which includes ways of successfully updating and formalising cultural determinants of sustainable development within local areas and the country itself.

It is worth considering how, by drawing on the lessons from our own history and on the experiences of others, we can explain just how far a historically developed pathway and personality type can limit and regulate institutional changes in the eco-modernisation field. In other words, how all this determines the choice of practical socio-cultural responses at each regional organisation level, as well as the possibility of its institutional expansion as part of future post-industrial change. All this should be achieved without losing our individual cultural values and identity.

It should be noted that cultural indices are not timeless, albeit being prone to very slow change. In recent times, however, there has been an observed increase in their rates of change. For example, people's perception of growth in South Korea, one of the world's most dynamic economies, is today quite different from the situation in the North, despite the fact that they were one nation more than half a century ago. Behavioural patterns of people in the Federal Republic of Germany are substantially different from those prevalent in Germany at the beginning of the 20th century.

Whilst acknowledging the issue of the development of institutional systems that limit the range of constructive decisions [45, 46], one should nevertheless recognise the major potential of broadening the institutional track, despite the sluggish nature of the process. Even a general analysis of the significance and dynamics of the aforementioned socio-cultural indices is enough for us to conclude that Russia has an interest in the experiences and best practice of post-Soviet countries in Eastern and Central Europe.

The experiences of the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) are particularly important where, in recent decades, a systemic cultural modernisation has taken place, which has impinged on «Society and Nature». This has been seen as having strengthened traditional cultural codes as well as a rejection of those who are getting in the way of modernisation pro-

cesses⁷³. Very revealing are the quantitative indicators involved in implementing China's Cultural Modernisation Strategy, which includes 24 value indicators and 30 indicators covering cultural monitoring. Those of most interest are indicators such as the index on modernisation in a cultural society, a level of cultural competitiveness, and an index on cultural influence.

In future, Russia (as well as other countries I might add) cannot move forward outside of a global society and specific (modern in principle) growth trends in a global world system, *Globalschaft*. One way or another, changes in a world system determine the general direction in its civilised and national sub-systems. It is vital that such development is sustainable at all regional organisation levels. From an ecological perspective and in the country's long-term interests, it is important that the next stage of growth is sustainable and is achieved with minimal environmental impact, thereby creating a better quality of life. Consequently, research into ethnic measurements in relation to ecological sustainability and environmental practice should involve regular measuring (including monitoring) of socio-cultural indices, and incorporated within an appropriate methodology of target-driven environmental management at all levels of Government regulation.

⁷³ <http://userdocs.ru/pravo/144175/index.html>

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Аузан, А.А. Долгосрочная экономическая динамика: роль неформальных институтов [Электронный ресурс]: расшифровка лекции НАБ РК, 24.05.2013 / А.А. Аузан. — Режим доступа: <http://www.msu.kz/information/auzan.php>, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.
2. Бердяев, Н.А. Царство Духа и царство Кесаря, Дух и реальность / Н.А. Бердяев. — М.: АСТ; Харьков: Фолио, 2006.
3. Бернар, А.Л. Душа денег / А.Л. Бернар. — М.: Олимп; АСТ; Астрель, 2007.
4. Бессонова, О.Э. Институты раздаточной экономики России: ретроспективный анализ / О.Э. Бессонова, ИЭОПП. — Новосибирск, 1997. — 76 с.
5. Вернадский, В.И. Научная мысль как планетное явление / В.И. Вернадский; отв. ред. А. Л. Яншин. — М.: Наука, 1991.
6. Войтов, А. Г. Экономика. Общий курс (фундаментальная теория экономики): учебник / А.Г. Войтов. — 12-е изд., перераб. и доп. — М.: Издательско-торговая корпорация «Дашков и Ко», 2010. — 594 с.
7. Вольчик, В.В. Роль групп специальных интересов в поиске путей эволюции российского института власти-собственности / В.В. Вольчик // Постсоветский институционализм — 2007: варианты институционального развития России: предпосылки, закономерности, перспективы: сборник статей / под ред. Р.М. Нуреева. — Томск: Издательство Томского государственного педагогического университета, 2008. — С. 22 – 35.
8. Грачев, М. Менеджмент в «международной системе координат» / М. Грачев // Экономические стратегии. — 1999. — № 2.
9. Грачев, М. Пятипроцентный элемент / М. Грачев, С. Филонович // Эксперт. — 2000. — № 25.
10. Дернинг, А. Задаваясь вопросом: где мера достаточного / А. Дернинг // Экологическая антология. Экологические произведения западных авторов. М. — Бостон, 1992. — С. 218—240.
11. Доклад «Культурные факторы модернизации» [Электронный ресурс] / А.А. Аузан [и др.]. — М., СПб., 2011. — 221 с. — Режим доступа: http://www.intelros.ru/pdf/kulturnye_factory_modernizacii.pdf, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.

12. Инглхарт, Р. Культура и демократия / Р. Инглхарт // Культура имеет значение. Каким образом ценности способствуют общественному прогрессу. — М., 2002. — С. 126.
13. Инглхарт, Р. Модернизация, культурные изменения и демократия / Р. Инглхарт, К. Венцель. — М.: Новое издательство, 2011. — 464 с. — (Библиотека Фонда «Либеральная миссия»).
14. Инглхарт, Р. Постмодерн: меняющиеся ценности и изменяющиеся общества [Электронный ресурс] / Р. Инглхарт. — Режим доступа: http://www.polisportal.ru/files/File/puvlication/Starie_publicacii_Polisa/I/1997-4-2-Ingheart_Postmodern.pdf, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.
15. Институциональные ограничения экономической динамики / науч. ред. В.А. Тамбовцев. — М.: ТЕИС, 2009. — 524 с.
16. Кирдина, С.Г. Институциональные матрицы и развитие России / С.Г. Кирдина. — 2-е изд, перер. и доп. — Новосибирск: ИЭиОПП СО РАН, 2001.
17. Ключевский, В.О. Русская история. Полный курс лекций в трех книгах / В.О. Ключевский.— М.: Мысль, 1993.
18. Куликова, Л.В. Коммуникативный стиль в межкультурном общении: монография / Л.В. Куликова. — М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009.
19. Латов, Ю.В. Открытия и парадоксы этнометрического анализа российской хозяйственной культуры по методике Г. Хофстеда / Ю.В. Латов, Н.В. Латова // Мир России. — 2007. — № 4.
20. Латов, Ю.В. Региональная дифференциация и перспективы изменения российской хозяйственной культуры [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.В. Латов, Н.В. Латова // VIII Международная научная конференция «Модернизация экономики и общественное развитие». — 2007 г. - С. 113—125. — Режим доступа: http://conf.hse.ru/2007/kniga2_2007, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.
21. Латова, Н. В. Восточнославянские страны на ментальной карте мира по Г. Хофстеду / Н. В. Латова, В. Ю. Латов // Наук. пр. Донецького національного технічного університету. Серія: економічна. — Вип.38—1. — Донецьк: ДонНТУ, 2010.
22. Латова, Н.В. Российская экономическая ментальность на мировом фоне [Электронный ресурс] / Н.В. Латова, Ю.В. Латов. — Режим доступа: <http://ethnometr.parod.ru/ment.doc>, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.
23. Латова, Н.В. Этнометрические измерения: теория и практика [Электронный

- ресурс] / Н.В. Латова // Социология 4М. 2003. — № 17.— С. 142–166. — Режим доступа: <http://ethnometr.narod.ru/4M.doc>, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.
24. Лебедева, Н.М. Ценности культуры и развитие общества / Н.М. Лебедева, А.Н. Татарко. — М.: Изд. дом ГУ ВШЭ, 2007. — 527 с.
25. Лурье, С.В. Историческая этнология: учебное пособие для вузов / С.В. Лурье. — 2-е изд. — М., Аспект Пресс, 1998.
26. Моисеев, Н.Н. Время определять национальные цели / Н.Н. Моисеев. — М.: Изд-во МНЭПУ, 1997. — 256 с.
27. Наумов, А. Хофстедово измерение России (влияние национальной культуры на управление бизнесом) / А. Наумов // Менеджмент. — 1996. — № 3. — С. 70–103.
28. Нефедов, С. А. Реформы Ивана III и Ивана IV: османское влияние / С.А. Нефедов // Вопросы истории. — 2002. — № 11.
29. Норт, Д. Институты, институциональные изменения и функционирование экономики / Д. Норт; пер. с англ. А.Н. Нестеренко, предисл. и науч. ред. Б.З. Мильнера. — М.: Фонд экономической книги «Начала», 1997.— 180 с.
30. Норт, Д. Функционирование экономики во времени [Электронный ресурс]: Нобелевская лекция (9 декабря 1993 года) / Д. Норт. — Отечественные записки. — 2004. — № 6. — Режим доступа: URL: http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2004/6/2004_6_12-pr.html, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. — Яз. рус.
31. Обзорный доклад о модернизации в мире и Китае (2001 — 2010) : пер. с англ. / под общ. ред. Н.И. Лапина; предисл. Н.И. Лапин, Г.А. Тогунян. — М.: Изд-во «Весь мир», 2011. — 256 с.
32. Олейник, А.Н. Институциональная экономика / А.Н. Олейник. — М.: ИНФРА-М., 2002. — 416 с.
33. Паин, Э.А. Особый путь России: инерция без традиций / Э.А. Паин // Знамя. — 2008. — № 8.
34. Плискевич, Н.М. «Власть-собственность» в современной России: происхождение и перспективы мутации / Н.М. Плискевич // Мир России. — 2006. — Т. XV. — № 3.
35. Природоохранные институты в современной России / НИПИ «Кадастр»; науч. ред. Г.А. Фоменко. — М.: Наука, 2010. —447 с.
36. Проект эффективного природопользования (становление и развитие системы комплексного управления природопользованием Ярославской области). —Ярославль: НПП «Кадастр», 1996. — 78 с.

37. Рулан, Н. Юридическая антропология: учебник для вузов: пер. с франц. / Н. Рулан; отв. ред. В.С. Нерсисянц. — М.: НОРМА, 1999. — 310 с.
38. Тобин, Дж. Теорема о «невидимой руке» должна быть модифицирована / Дж. Тобин // Реформы глазами российских и американских ученых / под ред. О. Т. Богомолова. — М.: РЭЖ, Фонд «За экономическую грамотность». — 1996. — 273 с.
39. Тойнби, А. Дж. Цивилизация перед судом истории / А. Дж. Тойнби. — М.-СПб., 1995.
40. Тромпенаарс, Ф. Национально-культурные различия в контексте глобального бизнеса / Ф. Тромпенаарс, Ч. Хампден-Тернер. — Минск, 2004.
41. Уайт, Г. География, ресурсы и окружающая среда: пер. с англ. / Г. Уайт. — М.: Прогресс, 1990. — 544 с.
42. Уфодайк, Нзубе. Теория культурного разнообразия [Электронный ресурс] / Нзубе Уфодайк. — Режим доступа: <http://bricsmagazine.com/ru/articles/teoriya-kulturnogo-raznoobraziya>, свободный. — Загл. с экрана. —Яз.рус.
43. Фоменко, Г.А. Анализ выбора водоисточников жителями и его роль в планировании водоснабжения на селе / Г.А. Фоменко, М.А. Фоменко // Социокультурная методология охраны окружающей среды / под ред. Г.А. Фоменко. — Ярославль: НПП «Кадастр», 2001. — С. 36–49.
44. Фоменко, Г.А. Институциональные ограничения и регламентации управления природоохранной деятельностью / Г.А. Фоменко // Проблемы региональной экологии. – 2012. - № 6.- С. 208–216.
45. Фоменко, Г.А. Институциональные факторы импортирования природоохранных институтов: на примере механизмов стимулирования сокращение выпуска экологически неблагоприятной продукции / Г.А. Фоменко, В.Г. Фоменко // Формирование и реализация экологической политики на региональном уровне: материалы VI Всероссийской с международным участием научно-практической конференции 24 – 25 октября 2013 г. / под науч. ред. Г.А.Фоменко — Ярославль: Изд-во Академии Пастухова, 2013. — С. 216–222.
46. Фоменко, Г.А. Управление природоохранной деятельностью: Основы социокультурной методологии / Г.А. Фоменко. — М.: Наука, 2004. — 390 с.
47. Фоменко, М.А. Город для женщин и детей — новый подход к планированию устойчивого развития городских поселений / М.А. Фоменко, Х.Ю. Таурит // Труды Международного форума по проблемам науки, техники и образования / под ред.

В.П.Савиных, В.В.Вишневого. — М. 1997. — С. 29—31.

48. Фоменко, М.А. Местные программы действий в сфере природопользования для устойчивого развития / М.А. Фоменко. — Ярославль: НПП «Кадастр», 2001. — 160 с.

49. Этциони, А. От империи к сообществу: новый подход к международным отношениям / А. Этциони. — М.: Ладомир, 2004. — 384 с.

50. Ядов, В. А. Некоторые социологические основания для предвидения будущего российского общества / В.А. Ядов // Россия реформирующаяся. — М., 2002. — С. 349—363.

51. Якушкин, Е. Заметки о влиянии религиозных верований и предрассудков на народные юридические обычаи и понятия / Е. Якушкин // ЭО. — 1891. — № 2. — С. 3.

52. Яницкий, О.Н. Модернизация в России в свете концепции «общества риска» / О.Н. Яницкий // Куда идет Россия?.. Общее и особенное в современном развитии. Вып. 4 / под общей ред. Т.И.Заславской. — М., 1997. — С. 37—48.

53. Яницкий, О.Н. Экологическая политика в «обществе всеобщего риска» / О.Н. Яницкий // Евразия. Природа и люди. —1997. — № 2-3. — С. 2-6.

54. Arthur, Jeffrey. Effects of Human Resource Systems on Manufacturing Performance and Turnover / Academy of Management Journal. — 1994. — Vol. 37, No. 4. — P. 670—687.

55. Baumast Annett. Environmental Management Systems and Cultural Differences An Explorative Study of Germany, Great Britain, and Sweden. DISSERTATION der Universität St. Gallen, Hochschule für WirtschaftsRechts- und Sozialwissenschaften (HSG) zur Erlangung der Würde einer Doktorin der Wirtschaftswissenschaften vorgelegt von aus Deutschland Genehmigt auf Antrag der Herren Prof. Dr. Thomas Dyllick-Brenzinger und Prof. Dr. Winfried Ruigrok. Dissertation Nr. 2659. Maus Druck & Medien, Konstanz 2002.

56. Beck, U. Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity. — L., 1992.

57. Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Au, A., Tong, K. K., Reimel de Carrasquel, S., Murakami, F., et al. Culture-level dimensions of social axioms and their societal correlates across 41 cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2004. — 35. — P. 548—570.

58. Coughlin, Richard M. (ed.) Morality, Rationality, and Efficiency: New Perspectives on Socio-Economics 1990, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1991.

59. David, P.A. Clio and the Economics of QWERTY // American Economic Review. — 1985. — V. 75, № 2.

60. David, P.A. Path Dependence, its critics, and the quest for 'historical economics. - Stanford, CA: Economics Department, Working Paper No. 00-011. 2000.

61. Dr. Ann M. Hackert, Dr. Dennis Krumwiede, Dr. Joanne Tokle, Dr. Robert J. Vokurka. GLOBAL CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PRACTICES AND CULTURAL DIMENSIONS. Paper for the 2012 SAM International Conference. March 30–April 1, 2012.
62. Etzioni A., Lawrence P. (eds.). Socio-Economics: Toward a New Synthesis. — New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc, 1990.
63. Etzioni, A. «The Attack on Community: The Grooved Debate» Society, Volume 32, No. 5, (July/August 1995). — P. 12–17.
64. Etzioni, A. The Moral Dimension. — New York: The Free Press, 1988.
65. Frank, A.G. The Thirteenth Century World System: A Review Essay Journal of World History. — 1990. — Vol. № 1, № 2, Autumn.
66. Freimann, J. Betriebliche Umweltpolitik (Corporate Environmental Policy). — Bern etc.: Haupt, 1996.
67. Hardin, R. The Psychology of Business Ethics, in David M. Messick and Ann Tenbrunsel, eds., Codes of Conduct: Behavioral Research and Business Ethics. — New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996. — P. 342–361.
68. House, R. Cultural influences on Leadership and Organizations. Project GLOBE / R. House, P. Hanges // Advances in Global Leadership. — 1999. — Vol. 1. — P. 171–233.
69. Geert Hofstede & Gert Jan Hofstede [Electronic resource]. — URL: <http://www.geerthofstede.com/index.aspx>.
70. Giddens, A. The Consequences of Modernity. — Cambridge, 1992.
71. Hofstede G., Hofstede GJ, and Minkov M. Cultures and Organizations, McGraw-Hill Publishing: New York, NY, 2010. — 281 p.
72. Hofstede, G. Culture`s consequences: Intern Differences in work-related values. — Beverly Hills, L., 1980.
73. Hofstede, G. Lokales Denken, globales Handeln. Kulturen, Zusammenarbeit und Management.— Munchen. 1997. — S.110–113.
74. Husted, Bryan W. Culture and Ecology: A Cross-National Study of the Determinants of Environmental Sustainability. Management International Review. — 2005. — 45(3). — P. 349–371.
75. Idem. Ecological Politics in the Age of Risk. — Cambridge, 1994.
76. Inglehart, R. Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society. —Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1990.
77. Inglehart, R. Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural economic and political

- changein 43 societies. — L.: Princeton; N. J., Princeton University Press, 1997. — 168 p.
78. Inglehart, R. Trust, well-being and democracy. In M. Warren (Ed.), *Democracy and Trust*. — New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. — P. 88–120.
79. Liebowitz, S. J. *Re-thinking the Network Economy: The True Forces that Drive the Digital Marketplace*. — New York: AMACOM, 2002. — 224 p.
80. Luhmann, N. *Risk: a Sociological Theory*. — N.Y., 1993.
81. Muchow, Marta; Muchow, Hans-Jurgen: *Der Lebensraum des Grossstadtkindes*, 2. Aufl. Bensheim, 1980.
82. Norberg-Hodge, H. *The Pressure to Modernise / The Future of Progress*. — 1996. — P. 91–120.
83. Ohmae, Kenichi. *The Mind of the Strategist*. — 1982.
84. Park, Hoon, Clifford Russell and Junsoo Lee. *National Culture and Environmental Sustainability: A Cross-National Analysis*. *Journal of Economics and Finance*. — 2007. — 31(1): 104–120.
85. Peng, Yu-Shu and Shing-Shiuan Lin. *National Culture, Economic Development, Population Growth and Environmental Performance: The Mediating Role of Education*. *Journal of Business Ethics*. — 2009. — 90. — P. 203–219.
86. Polanyi, K. *The Great Transformation*. — Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1957.
87. *Reflexive Modernization. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in Modern Social Order / Ed. U.Beck, A.Giddens, L.Scott*. — Stanford, 1994.
88. Roberts, S. *Order and Dispute. An Introduction to Legal Anthropology*. — N.Y., 1979.
89. Schwartz, S. H. Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? — *Journal of Social Issues*. — 1994. — 50. — P. 19-45.
90. Schwartz, S. H. *Beyond Individualism / Collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values*. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications*. — Newbury Park, 1994. — P. 85–119.
91. Schwartz, S. H. *Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries*. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25) New York: Academic Press, 1992. — P. 1–65.
92. Taurit H.-J., Scholz C., Seiler C. u.a. *Freiflaechen zum Spielen in: Freiflaechen zum Spielen. Kommentar zu DIN 18 034/ Beuth Verlag Berlin Koeln*. — 1991. — S. 17–46.
93. Triandis, H. C. *Individualism and collectivism*. — Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1995.

94. Trompenaars, F. Riding the waves of culture: understanding diversity in Global Business. — Burr Bridge, NJ & New York, NY: IRWIN, 1994. — P. 152–154.
95. Tuvshinzaya S., Narantungalag G. Cultural Dimensions-Mongolia and China. Marketing communication and competition. — Praha: Professional Publishing, 2007. — P. 150–158.
96. Vachon, S. International Operations and Sustainable Development: Should National Culture Matter? Sustainable Development. — 2010. — 18. — P. 350–361.
97. Williams, Geoffrey and John Zinkin. The effect of culture on consumers' willingness to punish irresponsible corporate behavior: applying Hofstede's typology to the punishment aspect of corporate social responsibility. Business Ethics: A European Review. — 2008. — 17(2). — P. 210–226.