



Iryna CHUDOVSKA

Trust as an effective instrument in educational practice

Trust is manifested at many levels. It is one of the basic factors in the functioning of various social institutions, both political and economic. The article attempts to find out the relationship between the level of trust and an educational institution on the example of a variety of secondary empirical data. It shows how the state of education in some European countries and in Ukraine correlates with the level of trust existing there.

Trust as an invisible component of social processes verbalizing and manifesting in human relationships, providing understanding and consensus has become the subject of special attention of philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and economists during the recent fifty years. First of all this is due to the fact that “universality”, which is inherent in trust and manifests itself in the attitude to almost anything, at the same time is difficult to be subjected to social measurement, as if at the level of the quantitative statement of its availability. Dozens of studies have been conducted to study various manifestations of trust and trustfulness. Many methods and specific methodologies of measuring

trust in interpersonal relationships and the study of a procedural dynamic side of emergence and destruction of trust in joint and cooperative activities have been developed. In the system of anthropological and philosophical sciences trust is usually referred to ethical categories of morality, which reflects relations between people. Trust is defined both as a belief and as a factor of reliability and emotionality and as an "immense entity". "If we look at trust beyond the historical context it turns out that it is a fixed social construction that is given once and for all. Such scholars as F. Fukuyama and E. Giddens consider this static approach in their works. They interpret trust as an element of faith, i.e. an irrational attitude or social habit. Other scientists like N. Lowman, J. Coleman, P. Stompka, on the contrary, emphasize that trust is a rational attitude to the future. To solve the problem of determining trust is not an easy task because there are two opposing views on this concept. The difference between them is due to the different nature of trust in traditional (pre-modern) and modern societies" [Economics and Sociology of Trust: 2004, p. 11]. E. Giddens emphasizes that trust is not just a belief in someone or something but a relationship of the belief and confidence based on knowledge: "Trust can be defined as belief in reliability of a person or system concerning a certain number of phenomena or events where this confidence expresses belief in good, desirability or love of another person or the correctness of abstract principles ("technical knowledge")" [Economics and Sociology of Trust: 2004, p. 19]. Unlike E. Giddens who emphasizes the cognitive element in the attitude of an agent to those subjects N. Lowman treats trust as an appropriate social mechanism that governs the uncertainty of social relations and is designed to reduce risk. "Trust is a solution for a particular risk problems" [Economics and Sociology of Trust: 2004, p. 20]. In Western social psychology there are two main research areas of communication trust: in one case, trustful communication is explained by analyzing internal dynamics of a person, his features and qualities, and in the other case it is explained by analyzing the dynamics of interpersonal interaction. Both among psychologists and sociologists there is no consensus on what confidence is. If we point out the conventional field where scientists agree, the undeniable agreement is that trust is a complex phenomenon of social life that has a multilevel nature and should be investigated for various social sciences, in particular from sociology as a generalization discipline. "Among the levels of trust it is possible to distinguish the basic level, personal level, social and cultural levels. The first is associated with the general disposition of trust, which is inherent in every human being (basic

trust setting). The personal level of trust depends on psychological structure of an individual, his upbringing and the nature of his early socialization, his own experience of trust and distrust. The social level of trust involves the study of relations of interaction within social groups (both small and large), characterized by a clearly expressed indicator of trust to other people, i.e. it is a socially normative setting for “known – unknown” relation perception which implies the institutional nature of trust. Different types of groups and communities have different trust settings inside and outside the community. Nevertheless, the relationship of trust in social groups is characterized by a universal nature. In contrast, the cultural level of trust is not associated with universal, but with specific cultural attributes of trust in various national communities. Accordingly, different levels of trust fall into the competence of various disciplines, such as psychology of trust, sociology of trust, anthropology of trust” [Economics and Sociology of Trust: 2004, p. 16-17]. S. Dzhuard and P. Lasko were the first in the field of studying trust in foreign social psychology who began working in this direction in the late 1950s. They investigated trust from the standpoint of self-disclosure of the inner self and its functioning in the context of people’s communication. J. Allen began to study trust in the context of interpersonal relations and introduced the concept of positive trust, which is very important in the context of constructive function of trust because we can have processes or states that have different consequences. Absolute trust, as well as absolute distrust, can be a significant problem, since they generate different phenomena. Absolute confidence in authority in cases of uncontrolledness will shape preconditions for authoritarianism and absolutism, but vice versa, disbelief leads to total oppression. That is why, for the explanation of such processes, the concept of “positive trust” is important at both the macro and micro levels. Speaking about the culture of trust it is rather difficult to outline the concept of trust. As it was already mentioned we can consider trust as a moral concept that expresses the attitude of one person to another one in terms of good faith, loyalty, responsibility, honesty and truthfulness, and reflects precisely the specificity of relations that arise when it is present. But the concept of “trust” not only implies the connection between people but also the sphere of the internal, i.e. the subjective individual’s attitude to these connections without the internal convincing of one person in the sincerity of the intentions of another one, without the confidence that his behavior will correspond to moral norms adopted in society, there can not exist relationships based on trust. In fact,

in the moral context trust is understood as a prediction, prognostication of a possible human behavior based on the knowledge of the person. The more complete and deeper knowledge about the other person is, the more accurate it is possible to predict his behavior. In ethical terms researchers consider the trust to be conscious rational manifestations of human behavior. In the psychological perspective it is not always a conscious and rational phenomenon. Psychologists consider trust from different angles: trust in yourself and others, trust and activity, trusting relationships in organizations and groups, trust and influence. The consensus is connected with trust as a scientific problem mainly because this phenomenon plays an important role not only in the life of society, but also in understanding its complex nature and multilevel structure. Trust is a systemic category that does not consist of the sum of personal beliefs of its constituent parts but has a subordinate character. This concordance of views on trust is over. P. Dumushel criticizes the most authoritative modern theories of trust. "The author believes that the central component of these theories, namely the expectation of future actions of other agents, leads to the fact that the definition of trust is too broad, and the act of confidence slips away from sociological analysis. Dumaschel proposes his own theory of trust which considers trust primarily as an action" [Dumushel: 2007, p.18]. "Trust as an act has two important characteristics: first, trust appears where the interests of agents partially coincide and partially diverge at the same time. Trust appears to overcome these differences". [Dumushel: 2007, p.22]. Trust, like any other phenomenon, can not have a static nature being in a dynamic social reality and experiencing its influence. It existed in traditional societies and takes place in modern ones. But its character is not typical and the same. "Trust is a triple procedure that includes awareness about the partner (cognitive aspect), moral behavior (the act of trust per se) and social pressure (trust culture)" [Dumushel: 2007, p.24]. After all, societies of the past differ from modern forms of organization of collective life. Therefore, the types or kinds of trust inherent in these societies are different. In 1979, Niclas Louman published an important analysis of the trust problem, in which he linked it with increasing complexity, uncertainty and risk. He first suggested that trust is not an outdated, typical means for traditional societies but, on the contrary, becomes more important along with the development of modern social forms, being truly indispensable for us at present. [Economics and Sociology of Trust: 2004, p. 51-52]. It is accepted that "in traditional societies, trust, as a rule, is based on faith (which also acts as a form of

knowledge and rationalization of the outside world, and in modern ones it is based on rational knowledge and calculation" [Economics and Sociology of Trust: 2004, p. 22]. The existence of an ideal type of trust would be impossible, and in today's society we can have both manifestations of one and the other kind of it. Trust as social capital means that, in general, an atmosphere of trust is created in a society giving this way significant benefit. People are better at understanding each other, which increases the possibility of cooperative action. Social effectiveness of the joint activity is increasing: strangers can plan their actions without fear. P.Shtompka distinguishes four systems of trust (though there are a variety of mixed types). "If during the process of communication expectations of partners and their mutual trust are muttered most often, cooperation becomes extremely flexible and even strengthened. Trust creates trust, leads to a trust culture where routine acts of trust and confirmation of related expectations turn into rules that bind both parties that interact. If a blind and naive trust prevails, a culture of confidence may appear for a while, but it will be one-sided (it only obliges a trusting party) and disappears quickly, along with repetitive cases of abuse of trust. If mistrust dominates, inevitably there is a culture of distrust, which creates a false circle of in-depth cynicism and suspicion. Conversely, if there is trust, then there is a simplification of the process of interactivity between agents" [Sztompka: 2007, p. 321-322]. Thus, being multilevel social creation, trust is seen as a phenomenon that has rational and irrational properties, and for different types of societies trust is different and manifests itself accordingly in different ways, also, it acts as a social capital of society, and as a regulatory social mechanism. Such a multiplicity emphasizes the complexity of this social formation and prompts for the same multilevel analysis. Mark Granovetter touches upon the issue of trust highlighting the question of why in the economic world in general people do not deceive each other. "If people who work together in the same company trust each other because of the commonality of their ethical standards, production costs will be lower. The society where this thing happens has the opportunity to introduce new forms of organization, since the level of trust allows the emergence of the most diverse types of social contacts" [Fukuyama: 2004, p. 55], in particular, educational ones.

Educational practices in a certain sense represent a field for manifestation of the most diverse types of disposition, with its specificity and the involvement of agents in them. Moreover, the criteria for typology are varied, which simultaneously generates their diverse understanding.

After all, agents that are included in the educational process, what way this process takes place, what results or competences we get at the output, the length of the educational process, all this can be regarded as educational practices in a broad sense. The very concept of practice is ambiguous. In the book "Practical Thought" P. Bourdieu, known as the manifestation of the practice theory, analyzes the process of formation and functioning of the logic of practice based on the research of ritual practices. Practice, according to P. Bourdieu, is carried out by the actor within the framework of objectively-subjective structures. It is always predetermined by something, depends on something, its conditions form a situation of readiness for action. The practice is everything that the social agent does himself and with what he encounters in the world around him. The key understanding of practice in the view of Bourdieu is about the concept of habitus. "Habitus is "mental or cognitive structures", through which people act in the surrounding world" [Bourdieu: 2001, p. 459]. It is practice that serves as an indirect link between habitus and the social world. Understanding the practice offered by Bourdieu allows us to speak about various types of practices that act as intermediaries between agents and, at the same time, affect their formation. Subjects of practice, in the field of education, are the kind of marking elements in the field of education, because we deal with agents who consciously and sometimes unconsciously become included in the educational process, having different experiences, motivation and different levels of trust. We can also state that in addition to the horizontal trust that arises or does not arise at the level of agents (parents, teachers, children and other adults interested in learning) we deal with a general "climate of trust" in society. These two levels of trust are both meaningful. However they have different instruments of manifestation and measurement accordingly. J. Dewey noted that "the problem of traditional education does not lie in the fact that it emphasized the external conditions that had come under the control of knowledge, but the fact that too little attention was paid to internal factors that also determine the quality of experience" [J. Dewey: 2003 , p. 40]. In this case, it is precisely trusted that we can consider both through the prism of internal experience and as a component of the mental structure according to P. Bourdieu and as an act according to P. Dumushel, both as an ethical characteristic, and as an integral context that constitutes a culture of trust in society, which are mentioned by several researchers: (P. Shtompka, F. Fukuyama). "Modern societies are different depending on the peculiarities of the culture of trust. The distrust that can take place

in a society “imposes on its entire economic activity something like an additional tax that a society with a high level of trust does not have to pay” (Fukuyama: 2004, p. 55]. Francis Fukuyama, one of the first to develop the concept of “trust culture”. Trust culture is a product of a definite period of a countries history; it is how trust or distrust accumulates in a variety of social practices. F. Fukuyama examines the national culture of trust separating modern states into three groups depending on the role of trust in these societies. The first group is the USA, Japan and Germany as the countries with the highest level of social co-operation and trust. The high level of economic development in these countries explains the role played by confidence in economic life. However, not all researchers agree with this typology. P. Shtompka, on the other hand, believes that it is in post-communist countries that an active trust culture is being formed, while in the Western world and America destruction and decline is being observed. It is difficult to agree or disagree with P. Shtompka, since we have a rather slow growth of confidence in the post-Soviet states and, conversely, stability in its indicators in European countries. So, according to one of the waves of the European Social Study (ESS), in which 24 states participated in the question “Can the majority of people be trusted, or vice versa, it is better to be cautious when dealing with people” (where the average score was calculated on a scale from 0 – “completely agree to 10 – totally disagree” five top countries with the highest level of confidence are the countries of northern Europe, where the average value is different from Ukraine (4.33), and from Poland (3.66). They are namely Denmark (6.76), Norway (6.63), Finland (6.52), Iceland (6.37), Sweden (6.05) [Ukrainian society in European space: 2007, p.207]. At the same time, it should be mentioned that in general confidence in other basic social institutions in these countries is also high; again, for example, the Parliament in Denmark scored an average of 6, 29, In Norway (5.42), Finland (6.01), Iceland (5, 92), respectively, the level of trust in Ukraine (4.8) and in Poland (2.4) [Fukuyama: 2004, p. 55]. The picture does not change much at the level of everyday practice when it comes to the attitude to others answering the question “Will most people try to use or deceive you if they have a chance or will they strive to behave honestly and decently”. For Ukraine the average point is 4.73, for Poland it is 4.59, and for Denmark it is 7.31, for Norway it is 6.93, for Iceland it is 6, 90, for Finland it is 6,82, and for Sweden it is (6,53) [Ukrainian society in European space: 2007, p.207]. As we see, the basic level of confidence in the Nordic countries varies and shows stability in the direction of trust. Denmark

stands out from the general trend of. As for educational practices "Leaders in the education index are Australia, Denmark, Ireland, Iceland, Canada, New Zealand, Norway, Finland (education index 0,99)" [O.M. Karpenko, M.D. Bershadskaya, Yu.A. Voznesenskaya: 2008]. The following European countries are included in the list: Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Finland, i.e. countries where confidence indicators are the highest. "It was during this period from 2002-2005 in Iceland and Denmark that the growth of the adult population with higher education was the highest (6%) in Poland it was 5% in Sweden – 4%, and Norway together with the United States shared the first place in the world according to indicators ... At the same time Finland during this period took a leading position in three ratings: 1) the quality of schooling 2006, 2) financial opportunities for higher education, 3) accessibility of higher education, and Sweden took the first place as a leader of the rating on financial opportunities for higher education" [O.M. Karpenko, M.D. Bershadskaya, Yu.A. Voznesenskaya: 2008]. If to compare the attitude of Ukrainians to people we can see that "After the revolutionary upsurge of 2004, it reached a minimum of 3.95 points. (where 0 means that people need to be very careful, 10 means that most people can be trusted). Since 2011 significant growth of trust to people has been observed, and according to 2014 the level of trust to people among Ukrainians is 5.06 points ... According to the results of the sixth wave of the ESS (2013), Ukrainians are more oriented towards horizontal trust (4.46), for example to the Polish (4.10) or to Russians (4.39). However they are significantly inferior to the citizens of countries with an effective and stable democratic regime, where this point does not fall below 5 and ranges from 5 to 7 points. (Denmark – 6,95, Estonia – 5,52, United Kingdom – 5,38) [Naumova, p.20]. Looking at the index of education in the modern world among the European countries, as of 2015, and published in 2016, we have an interesting picture where Denmark occupies the second position after Australia, Norway has the fourth one, Iceland – the seventh one, Sweden – the nineteenth one, Finland – the first one, Poland – the twentieth one, Ukraine – the fortieth one. Although quite universal this indicator still has some limitations. In particular, it does not reflect the quality of education itself, which in particular cases can be rather low or with certain limitations.

Also, it does not fully reflect the difference in access to education due to differences in age requirements or length of training. Indicators such as the average length of training or the expected duration of the training would be representative, but such data are not available in the statistics of most

states. "Drastic differences in the level of institutional trust are observed between Ukraine and the European countries with a stable democracy. Numerous studies of political culture indicate the existence of a correlation between the level of trust in social institutions and their effectiveness: the agent involuntarily involves in the system, invests his resources in its maintenance; institutions in turn become responsible. According to the results of the sixth wave of ESS (2013) in Denmark, Germany, and the UK, citizens have the highest expectations to the police (8.0, 7.0, 6.6 points respectively according to the 11-point scale, where 0 is complete distrust, 10 is absolute trust) and the judicial system (7.6, 5.9, 7.6, respectively). Among Ukrainians these figures are 2.0 and 1.9 points respectively. The data confirm the fact that an independent and effective judicial system and complementary value orientations that form positive expectations of citizens' relation is the core of democratic regimes [Naumova, p.8]. We have a high level of alienation of Ukrainians not only from political but also from the most state institutions. During all the years of Ukraine's independence none of them generated positive expectations from citizens. The slight dynamics of the level of trust in key social institutions over the past 20 years has fluctuated at the level of "I do not trust much". Undoubtedly, the political system is actively influencing the formation of trust or distrust, and the level of confidence in politics is also an indicator that can be captured. Open social communication is a formative factor for trust, while it is restored due to the factor: "Without trust, only very simple forms of cooperation between people are possible, the ones which can occur in face to face situations. Trust is indispensable to make the potential for action superior to simple elementary forms" [Sztompka: 2007 p. 320]. Being reproduced in communicative practices that take place in a society, trust relates in different ways to them, since it also depends on the formalization of these practices, censorship, the peculiarities of the socio-cultural environment, and the forms of manifestation.

Trust in educational practices manifests itself at the micro-level – through interpersonal communication and social interaction and mass communication in more formalized communicative processes. It simultaneously acts as a standpoint, an action, a mental thing, a moral proposition; it finds a verbalization in the pursuit of agents for cooperation and the formation of appropriate facilities, and its absence produces alienation and disintegration. From the macro-level trust certainly goes to the micro-level and vice versa because the carriers of social structures act as agents who voluntarily engage in a variety of

social practices. States with a high degree of trust in social institutions, as well as people in general, tend to show the same high level of education. Trust in educational practices create a certain square, which is formed between agents representing parents, teachers, children, as well as social institutions and institutions presented in society. The level of trust in people as a whole is a “background” of trust that takes place in society; studies show that in societies with a high level of horizontal and vertical trust, education levels also differ from societies where there is no or is a low level of trust on both levels. The mechanisms of confidence building, taking into account the sociocultural context, the influence of global trends, the development of new technologies, and the autonomy of agents, remain complex and open. Trust can be an effective factor in reducing the distance in the educational process between its key players, both at the micro and at the macro level.

References:

1. Бурдые П. Практический смысл / П. Бурдые ; общ. ред. пер. Н. А. Шматко. – СПб. : Алетейя ; М. : Ин-т эксперимент. социологии, 2001. – 562 с.
2. Дюмушель П. Доверие как действие / П. Дюмушель // Социальные и гуманитарные науки : реферат. журн. Серия 11, Социология. – 2007. – № 2. – С. 18-41.
3. Дюї Джон. Досвід і освіта / Перекл.з англ.Марії Василечко.- Львів Кальварія, 2003.- 84с.)
4. Карпенко О.М., Бершадская М.Д., Вознесенская Ю.А. (Опубликовано в журнале «Социология образования», 2008, №6, с.4-2. Электронный ресурс: https://www.demoscope.ru/Демоскоп_weekly/Показатели_уровня_образования_населения_в_странах_мира:_анализ_данных_международной_статистики.)
5. Наумова М. Рухливість соціально-політичних цінностей українців і перспективи ефективної демократії – 24с. Электронный ресурс: www.academia.edu/33277408
6. Украинское общество в европейском пространстве/Под редакцией Е.Головаха, С.Макеева.-Киев: Институт социологии НАНУ: Харьковский национальный университет им.В.Н.Каразина, 2007.-274с.
7. Ритцер Дж. Современные социологические теории / Дж. Ритцер. – 5-е изд. – СПб. : Питер, 2003. – 688 с.
8. Экономика и социология доверия / Ю. В. Веселов, Е. В. Капустина, В. Н. Минина [и др.] ; под. ред. Ю. В. Веселова. – СПб. : Социол. о-во им. М. М. Ковалевского, 2004. – 192 с.
9. Sztompka P. Zaufanie: fundament społeczeństwa / Piotr Sztompka. – Kraków : Znak, 2007. – 420, [4] s.
10. Фукуяма Ф. Доверие: социальные добродетели и путь к процветанию /

Ф.Фукуяма ; пер. с англ. Д. Павловой, В. Кирющенко, М. Колопотина. – М. : АСТ : Ермак, 2004. – 730, [1] с.

Transliteration of References:

1. Burde P. *Praktycheskyi smysl* / P. Burde ; obshch. red. per. N. A. Shmatko. – SPb. : Aleteia ; M. : Yn-t eksperyment. sotsiologii, 2001. – 562 s.
2. Diumushel P. *Doverie kak deistvie* / P. Diumushel // *Sotsialnie y humanytarnye nauki* : referat. zhurn. Seryia 11, Sotsiologia. – 2007. – № 2. – S. 18-41.
3. Diui Dzhon. *Dosvid i osvita* / Perekl. z anhl. Marii Vasylechko. – Lviv Kalvariia, 2003. – 84 s.)
4. Karpenko O.M., Bershadskaiia M.D., Voznesenskaia Yu.A. (Opublikovano v jurnale «Sotsiologiia obrazovaniia», 2008, №6, s.4-2. Elektronnyi resurs: <https://www.demoscope.ru> Demoskop weekly Pokazateli urovnia obrazovaniia naseleniia v stranakh myra: analiz dannikh mezhdunarodnoi statystyky.
5. Naumova M. *Rukhlyvist sotsialno-politychnykh tsinnostei ukrainsiv i perspektyvy efektyvnoi demokratii* – 24c. Elektronnyi resurs: www.academia.edu/33277408
6. *Ukrainskoe obshchestvo v evropeiskom prostranstve* / Pod redaktsiei E.Holovakha, S.Makeeva. – Kiev: Instytut sotsiolohii NANU: Kharkovskiy natsionalnyi universitet im.V.N. Karazyna, 2007. – 274 s.
7. Ryttsen Dzh. *Sovremennye sotsiologicheskie teorii* / Dzh. Ryttsen. – 5-e yzd. – SPb. : Piter, 2003. – 688 s.
8. *Ekonomyika y sotsiologiia doveriia* / Yu. V. Veselov, E. V. Kapustina, V. N. Minina [y dr.] ; pod. red. Yu. V. Veselova. – SPb. : Sotsiol. o-vo im. M. M. Kovalevskogo, 2004. – 192 s.
9. Sztompka P. *Zaufanie: fundament społeczeństwa* / Piotr Sztompka. – Kraków : Znak, 2007. – 420, [4] s.
10. Fukuiama F. *Doverie: sotsyalnye dobrodeteli i put k protsvetaniiu* / F.Fukuiama; per. s angl. D. Pavlovoi, V. Kyriushchenko, M. Kolopotyna. – М. : АСТ : Ермак, 2004. – 730, [1] с.

The Author

Iryna Chudovska
Doctor of Sociological Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Faculty of Sociology,
Kyiv National University
by Taras Shevchenko,
Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: chud2004@ukr.net

Abstracts

CZUDOWSKA IRENA. Zaufanie jako efektywne narzędzie w praktykach edukacyjnych. Zaufanie przejawia się na wielu poziomach. Ono jest jednym z podstawowych czynników funkcjonowania różnych instytucji społecznych, zarówno politycznych, jak i ekonomicznych. W tym artykule podjęto próbę zrozumienia współzależności poziomu zaufania i instytucji edukacji, na przykładzie rozmaitych wtórnych danych empirycznych. Przedstawiono również jak stan edukacji w niektórych krajach europejskich i w Ukrainie zestawia się z istniejącym tam poziomem zaufania.

Słowa kluczowe: zaufanie, edukacja, nowoczesne praktyki edukacyjne.

ЧУДОВСЬКА ІРИНА. Довіра як ефективний інструмент в освітніх практиках. Довіра проявляється на багатьох рівнях. Вона є одним із базових чинників функціонування різних соціальних інститутів - як політичних, так і економічних. У даній статті зроблена спроба з'ясувати співвідношення рівня довіри і інституту освіти на прикладі різноманітних вторинних емпіричних даних. Показано, як стан освіти у деяких європейських країнах та в Україні корелює з наявним рівнем довіри.

Ключові слова: довіра, освіта, сучасні освітні практики.

ЧУДОВСКАЯ ИРИНА. Доверие как эффективный инструмент в образовательных практиках. Доверие проявляется на многих уровнях. Оно представляет один из базовых факторов функционирования разных социальных институтов - как политических, так и экономических. В данной статье сделана попытка понять соотношение доверия и института образования на примере различных вторичных эмпирических данных. Показано, как состояние образования в некоторых европейских странах соотносится с имеющимся уровнем доверия. **Ключевые слова:** доверие, образование, современные образовательные практики.

CHUDOVSKA IRYNA. Trust as an efficient tool in educational practices. Trust is revealed on many different levels. It is a basic factor of functioning for different social institutions both political and economical. In this article an attempt was made to figure out the correlation between the level of trust and educational institution by the example of empirical data. It shows how education level in some European countries relate to the general level of trust. **Keywords:** trust, education, modern educational practices.