

TRUST AS A SOURCE OF EFFICIENCY IN EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATION

Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU

*Professor, PhD, CCSCMOP, University of Craiova, Romania;
E-mail vladutescu.stefan@ucv.ro*

Abstract

This study is interdisciplinary and is located at the intersection of three fields of knowledge: communication, pedagogy, educational communication. We argue in the direction of imposing the double thesis that

a) the main instrument of efficiency of the educational educational communication is the construction, maintenance, consolidation and improvement of the relation of mutual trust between the communicating agents and that

b) the method by which the confidence in the two artificial communication processes is initiated is the translation of the confidence from the natural communication plan into the institutional communication plan.

Keywords: trust, communication, education, educational communication

1. Introduction

The communication experience shows that there is natural communication and non-natural, artificial communication. Natural communication is free, takes place by itself, is natural, undirected and uncontrolled from the outside. Non-natural or artificial communication is planned, organized, implemented, commanded and controlled by oriented interests and/or social factors. From this perspective, education systems are places of non-natural, artificial communication.

In the axiological portfolio of people, freedom is fundamental. Therefore, any stimulated, injected or infused communication is perceived as limiting freedom and welcomed (Frederiksen, Larsen & Lolle, 2016; Dworkin, 2019; Bormann & Thies, 2019).

Generally, natural communication is based on trust. As forms of institutionalized communication, educational communication and e-Learning have a strong artificial communication component, have a high dose of organizational induction. Educational communication and e-Learning do not necessarily depend on trust; they are initiated by legal, objective mechanisms (Todoruț, 2018; Bunaiasu, 2018; Stejskalová, 2019). However, the success of these learning fashions is based on a subjective interpersonal criterion: trust.

2. Education and trust

The specialists found that trust is a fundamental component in all the relationships that people develop and that lack of trust affects the social, educational and informational processes: “Trust is a crucial element in any relationship and is inversely related to information distortion” (Mellinger, 1956); “A lack of trust leads to fears about misuse of information and, hence, to considerable gatekeeping” (Fulk J., Sirish M., 1, p. 485). Moreover, trust is a term of identity description and social desirability. People we do not trust we hold on the periphery of the values of our lives.

Trust, cooperation and association of people are a real bonding network of social life, a cement aggregation which helps people?

If we try to decipher the relationship between sociability and development, we find that the relationship between productive sociability (one that benefits stakeholders) and development is a two-way as Dumitru Sandu (2003, pp. 15-33) stated in his “Sociability in space development. “Social relationships are an efficient type of development, and development is an extension of the area of productive sociability opportunities by leveraging the value of survival.

“The need for trust, says Jean Hamburger (1984, p. 127), is a basic feature of human thought. It takes the form of a vacuum capable of attracting any nearby object ceasing to be void. It can evolve or devolve. When this need has found the object, it arises a feeling of relaxation, even elation, which annihilates some of the drawbacks of a life hardly fulfilled. “Satisfying the need to receive and to trust installed a sense of completeness, the free expression of personality, comfort of belonging to the community, a phenomenon that blurs or annihilates the feeling of solitude. Moreover, the social trust appears as solidarity, unconditional support, without reservation and without axiological interrogation.

The relationship of trust is crucial for communication normality, for human normality, because “being human is dependent on communication between people without reservations” (Jaspers, 1986, p. 144). Only the animated reliable communication can reach beings, as the essence of life. The relationship of trust subscribes to the opinion of H. Marcuse (1977, pp. 242- 293) within the fundamental relationships of a normal society, one in which “the decisive factor is solidarity.” The man opens the one-dimensional trust and solidarity is fulfilled. Trust exists not only as self-need, is not autotelic needed to him, but is part of the need for security. A healthy man is powerful and secure. Safety is built on relationships that he has with his peers. A man engaged in conflicts, disagreements, misunderstandings and confrontation is a man in trouble. Even

stronger, it is not fully insured. Tranquillity lays a contradiction. Similarly, a country in conflict is a country driven as strong as it is threatened. A threatened man, a threatened country is paradigms of insecurity, lack of trust, evidence. Delumeau considers that “The need for security is fundamental, it is the basis of affection and human morality” (Delumeau, 1986, p. 19). Unmet need, that feeling of insecurity, constitutes a mental disorder called the “Damocles Complex.” The need for trust is therefore double articulated: the need for standalone and as a pillar of the need for security.

Immanent trust. Trust is inherent to human nature. Born out of an irrepressible need, trust is a vital reflex. You cannot trust anyone: a world in which we would live in a man's unhealthy world. Without trust, the man would not have survived and especially would not have become what it is. Through the apple, the man has lost confidence in the biblical God, but also gained the power to grant himself and gain confidence, the ability to decide awareness regarding him. He kept the teacher, but changed his master. He became his own master (Stensaker & Harvey, 2010; Hooghe, Marien & de Vroome, 2012).

Trust opens as a spectrum, it multiplies, takes forms and gains changeable aspects. These metamorphoses explain once again the ambiguity they land, as its lack of transfer: there is a measure of the dose of credibility to something or someone to ensure the allocation of trust. Depending on the indication, criteria and other indicators we trust or not. The amount of trust increases, and people know to appreciate and practice it (Simons, 2017; Haynes, 2018; Vicol & Calechina, 2018).

Original trust. Trust is the foundation of most of the positive human emotions underlying the fundamental human feeling: love. Also, we find that the essential component of positive attitudes: “This is the premise of the original trust to all positive social attitudes, conditioning our ability to identify with a group in all social situations” (Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1998, p 240).

There are trusting feelings in opinions, in attitudes, in knowledge, in taste and in the intuition of someone. There is confidence in the work of a person, in an individual's action ("a reliable man"). In one word, we have confidence in a figure, in a unitary or sectorial manner, in a group, in a class of objects, in a society. It appears, the trustworthy behaviour is synthesized, and it is marked in personality. Confidence can be: emotional, cognitive or volitional.

Trust is original and withdrawing confidence is derived. Referring to E.H. Erikson and his "original trust", Irenaus Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1998, p. 239) wrote: "This trust is the fundamental basis of any healthy personalities." It is recognized, therefore, an individual and social value of trust. Trust is fundamental in building a personality originally adapted and the potential permanent adaptation to situations, contexts and frames changing.

The source of all evil is, according to Alfred Adler (1995, p 24, p 63), "an exaggerated sense of inferiority, lack of self-confidence." Lack of confidence is shown by looking for domination in force, money or influence. Moreover, the phenomenon spreads negativity on social levels above personality, and this was known to the Greeks and Romans "the lack of confidence and courage, frustration and art, and the study and advancement of himself", says Quintilian (1974, p 361), adding: "the best cure for shyness is self-trust" (Quintilian, 1974, p 362).

Social cognition and decision-making is based on trust. Source and target knowledge inexorably inform each other in continuing world, not in initiating it. Human activity would be virtually shut down if people would act only once, with the basic information or perceptions directly from the source. "In the vast majority of cases, decisions are based on trust, whatever the type of that trust is. Trust means in a further result, namely, of its predictability." (Watzlawick et al., 1972, p. 229). As a form of social knowledge, once installed, trust does not require evidence. If its conviction is supreme, intimate "social knowledge is based on trust and not on evidence," says J.-N. Kapferer (1993, p. 285). People

see their peers being reliable and interpret their behaviour as the basis of good faith. That everything is positive, fair and moral confidence is presumed. Trust binds man to others.

Trust in something. Trust in each other is the driving attitude towards it. It implies that the person leads to respect for others. Hegel does not say (1996, p. 59) that “the imperative duty is being a person and respect others as persons” Trust is a decent proposition we give the other and in most cases it takes over. When it returns to itself, it appears as a resource of energy and positive information to the targeted objectives. It generates much success as confident attitude focuses and leverages internal forces as well as external ones, in the form of thoughts, statements and events that shape profit oriented actions. “What you believe is done” (Cornelius and Faire 1996, 56). Trust is a worthwhile investment!

The trust in codes. The great examination of trust in something is to trust words, trust in “language”. It enjoys broad formulation capabilities, benefiting from a general principle of expression: can express any meaning created in any other language (gestures, sign-posts, kinesis, proxemics, etc.).

Language is a convictive means of communication (obtaining convictions through rational arguments and ideas) and a persuasive one (inducing belief by sophistry, seduction, threats, lies, confusion, misinformation and so on) (Massy, 2003; Charron & Rothstein, 2016; Güemes & Herreros, 2018). All this increases the field of possibilities that needs to divide trust. The area is so extensive that it reaches ambiguity and makes flash information hard to find an object of trust, and when one folds, it is a compact set of ambiguities.

The project of confidence is shaken, on the other hand, the fact that language is both a field of power and one of servility, as stated by R. Barthes (1987, pp. 345-348): power lurks hidden in every discourse, it is present in the most subtle mechanisms of social edifice (in the state, classes, group of fashion's current views, private and family relationships) (Negrea, 2019; Voinea, 2019).

In the same speech still, language does not say it all with the message, but the fascist forces you to say; servitude and power inevitably confused.

REFERENCES

Bormann, I., & Thies, B. (2019). Trust and trusting practices during transition to higher education: Introducing a framework of habitual trust. *Educational Research*, 61(2), 161-180.

Bunaiasu, C. M. (2018). The Conceptual Framework Of The Emotional Competences Of The Teacher—A Comprehensive Approach. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 5(2), 62-70.

Charron, N., & Rothstein, B. (2016). Does education lead to higher generalized trust? The importance of quality of government. *International journal of educational development*, 50, 59-73.

Cornelius, H., & Faire, S. (1996). *Știința rezolvării conflictelor*. Editura Știință și Tehnică, București.

Delumeau, J. (1986). *Frica în Occident:(secolele XIV-XVIII): o cetate asediată*. Editura Meridiane.

Dworkin, A. G. (2019). Social Cohesion, Trust, Accountability and Education. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Race and Ethnic Inequalities in Education* (pp. 1217-1236). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1998). *Iubire și ură*. București: Editura Trei.

Frederiksen, M., Larsen, C. A., & Lolle, H. L. (2016). Education and trust: Exploring the association across social relationships and nations. *Acta Sociologica*, 59(4), 293-308.

Fulk, J., & Sirish, M. (1986). Distortion of Communication in Hierarchical Relationships. In M. L. L. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 9* (pp 483-510). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Güemes, C., & Herreros, F. (2018). Education and trust: A tale of three continents. *International Political Science Review*, 0192512118779184.

Hamburger, J. (1984). *La raison et la passion: réflexion sur les limites de la connaissance*. FeniXX.

Haynes, B. (2018). The role of trust in the teaching of history. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 50(2), 174-182.

Hooghe, M., Marien, S., & de Vroome, T. (2012). The cognitive basis of trust. The relation between education, cognitive ability, and generalized and political trust. *Intelligence*, 40(6), 604-613.

Marcuse, H. (1977). *Scrieri filozofice*. Editura Politică.

Massy, W. F. (2003). *Honoring the trust: Quality and cost containment in higher education*. Anker Publishing Company, Inc., PO Box 2247, Williston. VT 05495-2247.

Mellinger, G. D. (1956). Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 304.

Negrea, X. (2019). Local Journalism and Social Journalism-Isomorphism and Proximity. In *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice* (pp. 225-231). Editura Lumen, Asociația Lumen.

Quintilian, M. F. (1974). *Arta oratorică*. Minerva.

Simons, G. (2017). Tangible Threats Through Intangible Means: Aspects of BRICS Information and Communication Security. *Systems Psychology and Sociology*, 21(1), 87-98.

Starkey, R. (2019). How education can help to build trust and understanding—a case study of our education programme. *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin*, 59(2), 10-16.

Stejskalová, J. (2019). Geneze ruské propagandy jako vážné bezpečnostní hrozby 21. století z pohledu NATO a EU.

Stensaker, B., & Harvey, L. (Eds.). (2010). *Accountability in higher education: Global perspectives on trust and power*. Routledge.

Todoruț, A. V. (2018). Reconfigurarea valorilor și a experiențelor de învățare-fundament cultural pentru o educație sustenabilă. *Analele Universitatii” Constantin Brancusi” din Targu Jiu. Serie Litere si Stiinte Sociale*, (1), 132-138.

Vicol, N., & Calechina, O. (2018). Construcția identității prin limbă și prin educație. *Analele Universității” Dunărea de Jos” din Galați. Fascicula XXIV, Lexic comun/lexic specializat*, 20(2), 179-185.

Voinea, D. V. (2019). Newsworthiness and the expectations of sources in health journalism. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 6(1), 222-226.

Watzlawick, P., et al. (1972). *Une logic de la communication*. Seuil.