Theoretical Aspects of the Problem of Trust in Psychology

Halyna Chuyko, Yan Chaplak, Tetiana Koltunovych

The article deals with a theoretical analysis of the main aspects of understanding the phenomenon of trust (such as: types, features, principles, structure, functions, manifestation of trust) and its role in human life in psychology.

Authors note that common to interpretation of trust is implicit thought of the scientists about the apriori capacity of each person to define, who is worthy and who should not be trusted.

The authors argue that trust is a complex attitude towards another person, manifested in a subjectively justified confidence in the reliability and honesty of the person; in the expectation that they will not try to intentionally or consciously harm us. Trust is especially important for both full-valued interpersonal relationships, the functioning of society; is the foundation of a mentally healthy personality and their well-being.

Keywords: *communication, trust, distrust, risk, attitude, interpersonal relationships, hope, safety.*

Introduction

Not only interpersonal relationships, effective business or personal communication, but also the existence, functioning and development of every society since its existed, whether this was realized or not, based on trust as the foundation of all that exists in the world and has a future. This circumstance caused the increasing of the interest to the phenomenon of trust in western psychology as early as the middle of the last century, while the problem of trust was «reaching» for a few decades to domestic and post-soviet psychology, what reflected as the processes dominating in the soviet society so as the objective process of technization and informatization of postindustrial society to some extent. This process naturally began earlier in the developed countries of the West, causing the increasing of social vulnerability and alienation of human within the society, which worsened the relationship and raised the problem of trust both between people and society and to its abstract systems as a whole.

Just the trust, as a sign of humanity, makes possible healthy relationships between people and a sincere, open and communication, which based on mutual respect and appreciation of the other person's individuality, is necessary in the life and different activities of each person.

The role of trust in pedagogical communication is particularly significant, but imperceptible (because we rather notice the absence but not the presence of trust), and therefore – underestimated: without it, it turns into a subject-object interaction, an imperative strategy for influencing the child, depriving of opportunity to find a common language with her. But it is impossible to teach a child, and, moreover, to educate her as a deserve person without her trust in the caregiver.

All this explains, why interest in the problem of trust in psychology emerged relatively recently (although rightly, in our opinion, T.P. Skrypkina notes, that trust had long ago been «given the role of the condition of the very fact of the existence of a number of very heterogeneous socio-psychological phenomena: from friendship, love, authority to joint solving of tasks, different forms of cooperation, influence and mutual influence» (Skrypkina, 2000, p.13). But this did not harm the emergence of a large number of studies in various scientific fields and genres concerning the problem of trust (J. Rotter, E. Erikson, E. Giddens, P. Shtompka, A. Seligman, T. Williams, J. Catlett, J. Simpson, K. Rotenberg, H.-W. Bierhoff, B. Vornefeld, T.P. Skripkina, Ye.P. Ilin, A.B. Kupreychenko, S.P. Tabharova, T.S. Pukhareva, I.V. Antonenko, I.Yu. Leonova, D.P. Lysenko et al.).

However, to date, not only the united holistic psychological concept of trust is absent, there is no agreement among scientists even in interpreting of this phenomenon, under which everyone understands his own: from the most widening, especially in Russian science, is «position», «attitude» (T. Skripkina, A. Kupreychenko, D. Lysenko, S. Tabharova, T. Pukhareva), – to the specific (mainly of foreign scientists) «generalized expectation» (J. Rotter), «stake (bet)», «expectation» (P. Shtompka), «the mechanism of social interaction» (A. Seligman), «the role» (G.-V. Bergoff, B. Vornefeld) or going out of its bounds (A. Seligman) – with accenting its obvious connection with morality of personality (S. Tabharova, E. Giddens, P. Shtompka). In addition, Ukrainian psychology still rarely addresses the investigation of the problem of trust. Therefore, the analysis of the phenomenon of trust seems to us actual and timely.

The purpose of the article is to theoretically analyze the main aspects of understanding the phenomenon of trust in psychology, its role in human life.

Research methods

The article uses a system of methods of general scientific search: analysis of scientific literature on the problem of work, synthesis, comparison, classification, systematization, comprehension, interpretation and inductive generalization of theoretical data which are relevant to the outlined problem field and purpose of work.

Author's understanding of the phenomenon of trust in psychology

Basic approaches to interpreting of trust

J. Simpson points out that there are 2 main approaches to understanding the trust to another person, interpersonal, which shaped historically: 1. Dispositional: «trust entails general beliefs and attitudes about the degree to which other people are likely to be reliable, cooperative, or helpful in experimental game situations or in daily-life contexts» (Simpson, 2007). 2. Since the 1980s, trust «started to focus on specific partners and relationships» – dyadic (interpersonal) trust is the psychological state or orientation of a truster (whom they believe), from which a person is in some way independent (that is, the first requires the cooperation of the second to achieve valuable outcomes (consequences) or resources) (Simpson, 2007). This approach concludes that trust in relationships increases when: the result of each partner's own interest means the best to his or her partner or relationship; both partners believe that their partner's actions is best for the relationship, even if it harms their own interests (Simpson, 2007).

The dispositional direction found that individuals who were more disposed to danger had low self-esteem, less differentiated and poor self-concept (unformed), less inclined to trust; interpersonal – that trust was increasing when everyone relied on a partner as one who valued relationships and is more friendly, or both demonstrated behaviour self-sacrifice or favor (Simpson, 2007). Thus, S. Jourard proposes the term «trust norm» as an indicator of «personal health», meaning the ability to respond with trust to the trust according to the obligations in the dyad (Kornev, 2012). If a person does not know how to trust, it is difficult for they to build their relationships with people, notes Ye.P. Ilin, however, is much worse, if people do not trust them (Ilin, 2013, p.13).

Definition of the concept of trust in domestic and foreign psychology

Let's note that even dictionaries define the concept of trust in different ways. So, if the D.M. Ushakov's dictionary (Ushakov, 2013) emphasizes the moral nature of trust (it is «a conviction in someone's

honesty, decency; the belief in the sincerity and integrity of someone»), while the great psychological vocabulary focuses on the social role of trust (this is the «mental state, through which we rely on any opinion that seems to be authoritative to us, and therefore we refuse to independently investigate a problem that we can investigate» (Meshcheryakov & Zinchenko, 2008).

And just this definition cannot be considered as complete: we disposed to believe, not only because this allows us not to waste time researching a certain question about which an opinion authoritative for us exists. We trust, both when there is no possibility to explore something ourselves and when «authoritative thought» is absent (I mean, not «because» but even «despite»). So, V.Yu. Kravchenko found that «the ability of a person to a priori share the phenomena and objects of the surrounding world, as well as other people, their future actions, as their own, with signs of security (reliability) and significance (value) is the psychological basis of trust» (Kravchenko, 2009).

In this context, it is worth, following other scientists (Ilin, 2013; Leonova, 2015) to mention S. Castaldo, who, as a result of pursuering content analysis of the 72 definitions of trust, identified as a circumstance that scientists in reality call the trust different phenomena, so as fundamental understanding of the concept of trust: trust is directly related to expectations, persuasions, wills or attitudes; it manifests itself concerning to various objects: other people, groups, organizations, social institutions; trust is often defined through action or behavior, as a way of manifestation of trust; definitions of trust include the results and consequences of its discovery; the interpretation of trust means the riskiness of a decision-making situation.

According to J. Rotter, who gave (in our view, quite rational) a definition of trust one of the first, it is a generalized expectation of a person that they can rely on the world, promise, verbal or written statement of another person or group (Frager, Fadiman, 2002, p. 756).

It should be noted that the definition of trust by T. Skrypkina cite in many works mostly Russian and native authors: as a special attitude that arises in the inner world of the individual, as «… the ability of a person to a priori endow the phenomena and objects of the surrounding world, as well as other people, their possible future actions and their own foreseeable actions, with the properties of security (reliability) and situational utility (significance)» (Lysenko, 2018, p.124). At the same time, T. Skrypkina notes that «a priori knowledge» is not so in the true sense of the word (as knowledge that precedes experience), since it may contain previous experience (Skrypkina, 2000, p 86).

Another scientist defines trust in another interesting and non-trivial way, as «the readiness to let in a person into their personal intimate zone, the readiness to share by personal or secret information ... the basis of spiritual openness ... so «openness» and «trust» are commonly used as synonyms (Kozlov, 1999). A similar opinion was expressed by A.B. Kupreychenko, considering «the emotional-positive attitude, interests and openness of the subject towards the partner» «the primary basis of trust and its initial form» (Kupreichenko, 2008, p. 55).

T.S. Pukhareva regards trust as «a subjective attitude to personality of another person's based on a positive prediction of their future deeds», to oneself and to the world as a whole, which has an emotional and feeling basis and reflects the inner position of the person (Pukhareva, 2011, p.9). Then I.V. Antonenko came to the conclusion that «trust was a meta-attitude, that was, an attitude that was a generalization of the totality of the subject's attitudes to the object, beyond these attitudes and was an independent attitude of a higher level», «generalized attitude», obviously, was underlining the importance, complication and complexity of the phenomenon of trust (Antonenko, 2014, p. 42).

Ye.P. Ilin adds that generalized trust is «an outlooks attitude that expresses the individual's readiness to consider that others deserve the trust» (Ilin, 2013).

P. Shtompka understands trust as «expressed in the action expectation in relation to partner that his reactions will prove beneficial to us, that is, made in the context of uncertainty stake on a partner with an account at his favorable for us actions in answer» (Kozhemyakina, 2009). He divides his own interpretation of the concept of interpersonal trust into the following components: 1) expectations of the honest and contractual behavior of others regarding us; 2) our obligation not to violate other people's expectations from our actions; 3) limitation of themselves interests for the benefit of those whom person trusts (Sigitova, 2017). In addition, the scientist believes that trust is based on morality as «the basis of purposeful social actions that coordinate with the general conception of the justice» (Sigitova, 2017). The point, in our opinion, is that trust endow on another person with certain virtues (sometimes – involuntarily and not entirely justified), at the same time depriving the trusting person (the subject of trust) of psychological protection, so it is natural that initially it was thought as ethical category and now objectively and naturally related to human morality.

The opinion of the Polish scientist is supported by Ye.P. Ilin, noting that trust is «one of the important concepts of the sphere of moral foundation of behavior, acting as an ethical category of morality» (Ilin, 2013). And E. Giddens adds that trust in people involves «personal

obligations, following of which... Is regarded as a manifestation by individual of theirs decency» (Giddens, 2011, p. 222).

It should be noted that the research of S.P. Tabharova also argues that the ethical nature of a person's actions and the observance of moral norms of business conduct can affect on trust / distrust (Tabharova, 2008) to them; that a person has a different attitudes to the observance of moral norms, depending on whom them interact with: a person whom trusts or distrusts, with someone who does not trust them.

A. Seligman examines trust in the context of the concept of social role, noting that trust penetrates into social relations, when there is a possibility of deviation of the individual from the social role in the «free space» of roles and role's expectations (Seligman, 2002, p. 21). That is, when a person switches from one system of social roles for performance another, when they receives a temporary freedom from it, their will (and the person herself) manifest itself opaque (closed) to another person, on the one hand, and «is not reduced to the roles performed by them» (Seligman, 2002, p. 67), – on the other, a trust (Seligman, 2002, p. 21), connected with the «list of moral norms», arises at the time and as a consequence of this.

In addition, trust become the respond to the emergence of risk as a component of role's expectations as a result of «the transformation of social roles and the arising of role segmentation, which limited systematically defined expectations of role behavior» (Seligman, 2002, p. 197): social roles changed, and the mental world of another person is radically different from ours, and we had lost the confidence of what to expect from a performer of a certain role – the way out is only: to learn to trust people, inspite of their social roles, taking into account the risks and potential consequences. After all, one cannot be sure of the actions or intentions of another person that is why A. Seligman notes that person is forced or inclined to trust, when the opportunity to understand or verify another person is absent (Seligman, 2002).

According to T. Williams, trust is the feeling that the other person will not do anything that will harm our interests, while the individual demonstrates a readiness (desire) to avoid vulnerability (insecurity) or risk, based on the expectation of the other person's behavior (Williams, 2014).

J. Sipmson, for his part, asks, why, despite the importance of trust, in particular, in relationships, there are not much researches on this problem, and finds a regular and quite logical, in our opinion, answer: trust is a «complex multidimensional construct» – it is difficult to define, measure and explain it; it can form in different ways and have different meaning at different stages of the development of relations; it arises and changes in situations that are difficult to observe and study (Simpson, 2007).

To sum up: all definitions of trust a priori imply the objective capacity of each person to be so wise or insightful as to determine, who is worthy and who should not be trusted, though in reality it is not so easy, it is human's peculiar to make mistakes as well as to doubt.

As for us, we can trust a person if we have the confidence or at least the expectation that they do not want to harm us, and even if they find themselves in a situation where they have to do it, regardless of their own decision or desire, they will warn about this or try to reduce the harm to us from their actions other way.

P. Shtompka also defines three dimensions of trust, according to the ontological status of it: 1) trust as a characteristic of relationships (one-sided or mutual) – is rational in nature, focused on profit and minimizing losses «on the basis of balanced assessment of present information», which is insufficient; that's why uncertainty and risk are present; trust is based on cooperation; 2) trust as a personal trait – is the «basic trust», «momentum of trust», «fundamental credulity», which explains the elements of emotionality and irrationality in the displaing of trust; 3) «cultural context» of trust, norms that reserve or encourage its manifestation. They are also levels of trust – relational, psychological and cultural. The basis of trust at the first level is «an assessment of the information from the view of how extent the parties of the relationship are trustworthy» (the cognitive side of trust); on the second level, – personal experience, «individual, biographical genealogy». The third, cultural level is based on a genealogical foundation of trust of another scale – on the collective, historical experience of society; these are the value-normative systems that influence our attitude to other people. In this case, there are «cultures of trust», «where a positive experience of trust prevails», otherwise, a «culture of mistrust» is formed (Shtompka, 2012).

Types of trust

The researchers of trust traditionally note that the basis for the formation of different types and levels of human trust, the degree of their credulous, is a «basic trust» in the world, which, according to E. Erickson, is formed at an early stage of ontogenetic personality development, when the child successfully solves the first psychosocial crisis (conflict of trust and distrust). At that time the child is completely defenseless and dependent on others. «A child, raised by adults, who consistently respond to its needs, develops trust by the end of the first year of life» (Catlett, 2016). According to E. Erickson, «trust implies not only» that someone had learned to rely on the constancy and identity of those around him and takes care about him, but also that «he can trust himself» (Giddens, 2011, p. 226).

Trust in others «develops in conjunction with the formation of an inner sense of credibility that further provides the basis for stable self-identity«; trust includes the «reciprocity of experience», «... the child forms the basis of a sense of identity, which in the future will combine with the feeling that «everything is all right», the sense of self and the awareness that it becomes, what other people expect to see in it ...» (Giddens, 2011, p. 227). J. Bowlby concluded on this basis that basic trust was guite indispensable for the healthy mental development of personality throughout life, and D. Winnicott added that parental «predictability» was crucial to strengthening a child's trust (Catlett, 2016). T.P. Skripkina also notes that a lack of basic trust in childhood can manifest itself in pathology in adulthood (Skripkina, 2000). According to E. Erickson, the emergence of hope as a «strong faith in the fulfillment of passionate desires» is the result of achieving balance between trust / distrust (Fragger & Feudimen, 2002, p. 229).

A.B. Kupreychenko, continuing (in her words) the ideas of B.F. Potshnev, inclined to regard basic trust as «more primary, than a sense of independence», associating it with the instinct of self-preservation as a manifestation of «basal distrust of personality» (basal distrust is a sense of danger of the surrounding world, the desire to avoid adverse environmental factors) (Kupreychenko, 2008). It is not necessary to say what «more primordial», in this case, in our opinion, because instincts are innate, so we can say, for example, about the simultaneous appearance of trust and distrust in the world in the newborn. However, another «reading» of the situation is possible too: a child enters the world, or with a sense of natural distrust to it, because just this world that destroys its unity with the mother, the integrity and harmony of its world, – but just this the child perceived as a source of basic trust; or with experiencing the stress of destroying its former world and uncertainty about the future. Just is in this sense formation at the first stage of development of the child of the basic trust / distrust in the world and its further development acquires significance, according to E. Erickson. In addition, E. Giddens notes: «this period, obviously, brings to the psychic life a sense of inner disunity and all-encompassing nostalgia for the lost paradise, which becomes prototypical even in the most favorable circumstances. Basic trust is confronted just to the combination of feeling of deprivation, a sense of separation, and a feeling of abandonment throughout life» (Giddens, 2011, p. 139).

At the same time, the factors that determine the level of trust and the formation of the basic trust of the personality in the process of socialization divide, according to I.V. Antonenko, into the following groups: subject's, object's, environmental and situational (Antonenko, 2006).

There are different grounds of the classifications of types of trust, as noted by A.B. Kupreychenko: object, subject of trust (sometimes they are not identified); the spheres of its application; formal and dynamic characteristics; a combination of different levels of certain types of trust and distrust; grounds and degree of the expression of the components of trust and distrust as a psychological attitude; functions of trust (Kupreychenko, 2008).

However, in Russian psychology, the division of trust into such types: trust in oneself, in another person, in the surrounding world is the most spreading. Trust in the world is «the specific attitude of the subject to another object or fragment of the world, which lie in the experiencing the actual importance and security of these objects … for the person» (Skripkina, 2000, p.97). The scientist notes that «man and the world» form a indivisible inseparable ontology, so other types of trust «have the status of only relatively independent socio-psychological phenomena» (Skripkina, 2000, p. 118). Self-trust is «a form of value attitude to one's own subjectivity in combination with a value attitude to external conditions of activity» (Skripkina, 2000, p. 168). In addition, trust in another person «means a valuable attitude towards the personality of another man, based on … a positive prediction of their future actions» (Skripkina, 2000, p. 190).

According to T.P. Skripkina, the duality, «bipolarity», which is inherent to trust, manifest as the orientation of the human psychics: 1) to trust in the world as a condition of interaction with it; 2) trust in oneself as a condition of activity of the personality. «Trust in the world is always connected with trust in oneself …. In the case, when trust in the world and trust in oneself are not interconnected, the system «person and the world»» (Skripkina, 2000, p. 234) disintegrate. At the same time, «man aspires to harmony with the world and themselves», and this happens, when the trust in the world and the trust of the person towards themselves are balanced. However, balance does not mean the development of a personality, that become the result from the «situational unconformity» of the human to the world, or themselves; when a person get into new (uncertain) situations and circumstances, that do not correspond to their interests and opportunities; to which their need to adapt. In essence, solving the situation of cognitive dissonance, person aspires to restore the «trust» balance by choosing from two opportunities: to trust their's own needs and desires, or to deepen trust in the conditions and requirements of the world. As for us, the choice can correlate with a person's personal qualities.

P. Shtompka also distinguishes several types of trust (understanding it as a «bet«): the primary «targets» (trust's objects) of trust settle down as concentric circles – from the closest interpersonal relationships to more

abstract orientations towards social objects. It is *personal* trust in relation to those, with whom we enter the direct contact, including «virtual» personal trust (in particular, in relation to celebrities); *categorical* trust (gender, race, age, religion, well-being); *positional* – trust / distrust to certain social roles (mother, doctor, friend, tax inspector, spy, etc.); *group* (football team for fans, student group for professor); *institutional* (school, university, church, bank), including «*procedural*» trust in institutional practices and actions (trust in science, democracy, the free market); *commercial* (to products of a certain kind, country-producer, firm, author, etc.); *systemic* (to social systems, orders and regimes). That is, the object of trust, its level of generalization here becomes the basis of division (Freik, 2006).

J. Hoskins proposes to distinguish «thin», «dilute» trust (thin trust) – the unconscious, intuitive, when we know little about the object of trust, and, accordingly, «compact», «concentrated» trust (thick trust), «which we are guided by in situations, when there is enough information about the person or organization, which we had chosen for establishing a trusting relationship» (Hosking, 2016).

J. Catlett, in turn, emphasizes unconditional trust (naivety) and conditional, based on sober reasoning and past human experience (Catlett, 2016).

R. Levitsky and B. Banker identified already three types of trust: based on calculation (accordance between expectations and promises); on knowledge (experience, predictability of human's behavior) and on the identity (common interests, life principles, etc.) (Ilin, 2013).

We disposed to distinguish two occasions (types) of trust (to the world, society, other people, ourselves, to symbolic sign systems): trust «because» and trust «despite». Thus, in the first case, we inclined to trust because our experience testify that a particular object is trustworthy; in the second, – we are forced to trust (to «bet» on trust, rely on someone or something) because of lack (absence) of information, despite the absence of confirmation of experience.

Formal and meaningful features of trust

The main characteristics of trust

According to T.P. Skripkina, «the basic formal and dynamic characteristics of trust in another ... are the measure, selectivity and partiality, which manifests in the fact that person, as a rule, aware of whom, what, and how much they can trust» (Skripkina, 2000). Also, in the opinion of K. Rotenberg, an essential aspect of interpersonal trust is the principle of reciprocity or mutual quality, which pertains to the bidirectional influence of

trust between individuals: how much A believes in B, influences how much B trusts in A. Such trust, as scientist considers, potentially achieves by the behavioral and verbal reciprocity: partners must correspond to mutual expectations (Rotenberg, 1994, p. 154). T.P. Skripkina calls this the «congruence» of trust, noting (and we fully agree with her) that trust relations are not always reciprocal; moreover, man just not always aware of this (Skripkina, 2000, p. 190).

Equally important quantitative and qualitative characteristic of trust is its constancy / dynamism. On the one hand, it should be noted that J. Hosking considers that trust cannot be permanent, because it is based on emotions (Hosking, 2016). People's relationships and attitudes towards the world and themselves in it would be incredibly complicated, ultimately slowing the development and improvement of society, and sense in the existence of trust would disappear, if trust must be confirmed every time (by the famous proverb «Trust but verify!»), on the other hand.

Therefore, trust is a relatively constant, dynamic phenomenon, manifested in the subjective confidence in the reliability and decency of another person; a phenomenon with its rises and abatements, trust can be lost and destroyed (betray), at the same time destroying human freedom of action.

The structure of trust

Russian psychology, understanding trust as an attitude, tends to distinguish traditionally emotional, cognitive and behavioral components in its structure (as in a social attitude) (Kupreychenko, 2008; Skripkina, 2000). Thus, the cognitive component: includes the prediction of the consequences of the intended deed, based on knowledge and understanding of the world, people, types of interrelations and relationships, social and behavioral norms, as well as on knowledge of oneself and assumptions about one's capabilities, based on past experience. The emotional-evaluation component includes… the supposition of the level of security of the particular object, with which the subject intends to interact, and the assessment of the significance of the interaction situation as a whole and… an assessment of one's own capabilities in the given situation and the possible consequences of the planning mode of behavior for the personality. (Skripkina, 2000, p. 226).

A behavioral strategy, corresponding to trust, is then choosing.

And in foreign psychology K. Rothenberg's structure of trust is the most developed. Scientist considers trust as a complex phenomenon, a process, which consisting of three bases: reliability (to fulfill of word or

promise), emotional trust – the expectations, «reliance on others to refrain from causing emotional harm, such as being receptive to disclosures, maintaining confidentiality of them» (Rothenberg, 1994, p. 153), and honesty – telling the truth and behave accordingly without harming or manipulating – two domains of behaviour: cognitive and emotional (affective) (relative to the three bases of trust) – and two dimensions of the target of trust (whether to trust a person and whether they have the appropriate qualities for this): the specificity of trust – to generalized others or in a specific persons; and degree of acquaintance (from strangers to very familiar with) (Rotenberg, 1994).

The determination of the trust's structure by J. Simpson: the subject's possibilities (properties), the object's abilities, and the purpose of the situation (Simpson, 2007), which can be illustrated by the statement: «I trust you a secret», – is the simplest, though not less reasonable and completely logical.

Functions of trust

Trust functions are traditionally distinguished by many researchers of this phenomenon (Skripkina, 2000; Pukhareva, 2011; Kupreychenko, 2008; Nakhabich, 2013; Ilin, 2013, etc.). O.O. Dvoryanov even combined them into three blocks:

- Personal functions: existential, cognitive, harmonization, socialization, motivation, evaluation, social security, social relaxation, referentiality, authenticity, communicative, selective, assertiveness;

- Organizational functions: integration, social adaptation, coordination, emotional identification, socio-psychological, group motivation, resource, social efficiency;

- Public functions: constitutive, regulative, constructive, tolerance, broadcasting, legitimization, comparative, systemic technological (Nahabich, 2013).

However, in our opinion, it is possible and worth not to multiply the functions of trust from one scientist to another, which is quite possible, taking into account its role in society, but to confine oneself to the most important, fundamental and most generalized function of trust allocated by T.P. Skripkina (other functions we think derivative): trust binds person and the world into a united entire ontological system, enabling them to get to know and transform the world by testing their possibilities (Skripkina, 2000). Trust unites people in interaction and interrelations, opening opportunities for sincere communication and self-disclosure. We support the scientist's view that «it is just trust that enables a person not to be afraid to join the

relation with a world, which they does not fully know, to choose their own goals and realize them, considering themselves ... as a value» (Skripkina, 2000, p. 118).

Trust in the context of alike and related concepts

Trust, faith, hope, confidence

Attempts to differentiate the concepts of trust from alike in content (faith, confidence, hope, etc.) quite often appear in the scientific literature, just like as different variants of the list of trust's functions. So, D.P. Lysenko points out «a large number of theorizations in the study of the connection and differences of trust with alike in content and related concepts» and cites some of them (Lysenko, 2018, p. 202). In particular, S.M. Mykolyuk considers that faith is the innate quality of man, and trust is the result of experience (Lysenko, 2018). It should be noted that we are not inclined to consider faith as innate property of man; in our opinion, it is no different from trust here, also a result of positive experience. In addition, we think that attempts to represent trust and faith as a component (or form) of one another are not entirely appropriate: both can exist without each other. Thus, V.P. Zinchenko, who regards trust as one of the fundamental states of man, compares trust with faith, considering it as «accepting opportunity for reality» (Sigitova, 2017). But there are many opportunities, so trust is needed to choose whom (in what) to trust. Moreover, the basis of trust is the personality's traits of the person, who trust. We fully agree with the scientist that this is more important than the person (character) of the one we trust. After all, we are inclined, when necessary, to trust even strangers who have purely external signs of professional competence: it is enough for a man to put on a white coat in the hospital – and we will take him seriously as a doctor – and trust their recommendations and diagnoses.

According to A. Seligman, confidence, unlike trust, is the result of expectations that are mutually supporting. The scientist also notes, that trust is vitally important into relationships, whereas within society, «confidence, not trust», is need (Lysenko, 2018, p. 203).

But E. Giddens examined this question most detailed:

… an individual who is not considering alternatives, is in a situation of certainty, while one, who is considering these alternatives and trying to take measures concerning the risks, determined in such a way, involve in a situation of trust. Person responds to the frustration by accusations against others in a situation of confidence; he or she must assume part of the guilt and may be sorry that trusted someone or something in a situation of trust. (Giddens, 2011, p. 148).

A.B. Kupreychenko also adds that confidence can also be a consequence of the peculiarities of the situation, for example, to occur in the circumstances of uncertainty (Lysenko, 2018).

N. Luman, trying to differentiate the concepts of trust and confidence, identifies three criteria: the presence of a situation of choice (confidence, unlike trust, does not anticipate alternatives); nature of interaction (interpersonal – with trust, social – with confidence: «person and organization», «person and society«); social character (confidence – is the result of socialization, trust – «arises in the risk of making an independent decision»). According to N. Luman, certainty «means more or less the general attitude that familiar things do not change» (Sigitova, 2017).

In our opinion, the criteria for delineating these concepts are not really absolute: confidence is not always the evidence of a person's choice of the «only possible» – an optimal behavioral strategy, and trust, in turn, may be of such a level that does not imply an alternative choice. Confidence can express the highest level of trust in a partner in the interpersonal relationships; and in «human – society» relationships trust can be more important than confidence. Finally, trust is also the result of socialization in a certain society. That is, we tend not to separate these concepts, but to consider them related: confidence, in our opinion, reflects the degree of trust of a person both to the society and its functional components, and to the partner for communication in interpersonal relations. In particular, the connection of these concepts, in our opinion, evidence by the fact that in the Russian language it is a one-root words. In addition, this reveals their connection to the concepts of «faith» and «faithfulness«: trust in one, who is true to his word or duty. And the connection of these words may manifest in such a sequential chain: faith – trust – confidence. Faith in this context is trust without a single argument or confirmation, a priori. Trust is the result of previous experience: we trust a person or an organization if we have already encountered with their reliability, integrity, honesty, behavior or actions that confirm trust. That is, in essence, trust requires a reason, and for faith occasion is enough. Finally, we are confident enough in relationship's partners, if we have repeatedly «tested» on ourselves or loved ones their faithfulness; their actions correspond to our expectations and their promises.

In this context, P. Shtompka offers his triad of concepts: hope, confidence and trust. Hope (its opposition – humility, disappointment) is characterized by passivity, contemplation, distance, desire to avoid any obligations, uncertainty; it is presentiment, which has no rational explanation that the events will develop as it was planned. The second orientation is confidence (it is opposed to doubt). It is also passive, though there are a goal-orientation and a belief in something positive in it. «Confidence can be

defined as a sense of hope associated with conviction», doubt – as a sense of humility, associated with distrust» (Sigitova, 2017). The third orientation – trust – manifests itself in situations where, despite the uncertainty and risk, we still act. Trust contains two major components: 1) special expectations (about how the other will behave in the future situation) and 2) conviction, confidence in action (bet) (Freik, 2006).

Trust and risk

It is worth noting that the concept of trust scientists directly relates to risk. In particular, P. Shtompka believes that to trust means to act as if there is no risk, «to take the risk out of brackets». As a result, a display of trust is connected with risk, with the possibility to get many negative consequences: 1) the risk that others will not behave as expected, despite of the trust; 2) the risk connected with the act of trust itself: a negative psychological «precipitate» if someone did not justify our trust; 3) cases of risks related to the actions of trusted people who know and accept our trust (betrayal of a loved one, friend, etc.); 4) risk in situations, when we trust someone to worry about an object of value to us (eg, a child, grandparents) (Freik, 2006, p. 11). According to N. Luman, trust «must be understood precisely in its relation to «risk», a term that arises only in the period of the modernity» (Giddens, 2011, p. 146).

H.-W. Bierhoff & B. Vornefeld also argue that trust and risk are complementary terms in social relations. Focusing on risk is generally based on mistrust, while trust is associated with less doubt about security. And those «who trust in others do not look for high security before they act» (Bierhoff, 2004). In addition, the level of trust is the result of a degree of risk assessment.

E. Giddens compares risk to fortune, as they both imply danger «as a threat for achieving the desired result«; however, the scientist notes that «allowable risk» – as a minimization of danger – «almost always plays a major role in maintaining trust» (Giddens, 2011, p. 152).

Risk, in P. Shtompka's opinion, is alike to trust: similarly oriented to the future (unexpected, threatening); can be natural; caused by uncertainty; associated with the subjective involvement of the individual. Risk manifests itself in trust in 4 types: 1) the possibility of future disadvantageous events, completely independent of our trust; 2) trust in those, who do not deserve it; 3) the other knows about the trust and feels morally obliged to justify it; 4) what is of value to us is trusted to another person, who agrees to this themselves (Stompka, 2012, p. 95–97).

Trust and distrust

Finally, it is somewhat paradoxical, but in the psychology of trust the curiosity of scientists is particularly intriguing with the question of whether the concepts of trust and distrust are contrary, being antonyms, from the point of view of linguistics. So, trust and distrust are relatively autonomous psychological phenomena that have both similar and different characteristics, according to S.P. Tabharova: signs, conditions of origin, criteria and functions in the regulation of the subject's life. The main functions of trust are social cognition and exchange. The main functions of distrust are self-preservation and insulation (Tabharova, 2008).

A.B. Kupreychenko tries to reliably differentiate the concepts of trust and distrust, because, in her opinion, there are «simplified approaches» to their interpretation, – as «opposite and mutually excluding and thus interconnected in psychology» (Kupreychenko, 2008, p.46). So, «trust and distrust should be considered as independent phenomena. Despite the overall common positive emotional background of trust and negative background of distrust, phenomena ambiguously influence in interpersonal relations: moderate distrust can promote more effective contact, too high trust – can have negative consequences, according to D.P. Lysenko (Lysenko, 2018, p. 204). A.B. Kupreychenko considers these concepts to be independent of each other and distinguishes such their signs, as «expectation of benefit» (sign of trust) and «expectation of harm» (sign of distrust), to which by the meaning the dichotomy of «the expectation of good – the fear of evil», according to the scientist, is corresponded, explaining this by the fact that in philosophy, trust is an «ethical category that reflects moral relations» between people (Kupreichenko, 2008, p. 91).

In our opinion, it should be noted here that the fact that the sign of trust is not necessarily to be an «expectation of benefit» (such trust is associated not with ethical understanding but with economic, material benefit; for trust (in particular, «background's» (Giddens, 2011)) is enough not to expect harm. Similarly, distrust is not directly related to the expectation of harm or fear of evil – we can simply not hope that a person will fulfill their promise in response to our request. That is, A.B. Kupreychenko elects the most extreme criteria / marks to determine trust / distrust, while «forgetting» about the different stages of their manifestation in a continuum «complete trust – absolute distrust». In addition, the trust is not always good, and distrust – not always evil: it is wort to take into account the objects of trust / distrust and the context of their displaing in the ethical evaluation.

On the one hand, we fully agree with A.B. Kupreychenko's position regarding the non-equivalence of the consequences of violation of trust / distrust it is obvious. On the other, – it raises doubts as the validity of the scientist's statement that «if the expectation of trust is not justified, nothing terrible will happen ...», but when «the expectations of distrust are confirmed», «we can lose something highly significant», admitting a dangerous partner to our territory (Kupreychenko, 2008: 51). In our opinion, betrayed trust, – is really awfully, it is a psychic trauma; while trusting a dangerous partner (not worthy of trust) is at least a mistake, and if person venture to this they should blame themselves for the loss of «high value». The scientist concludes, as a result, that the «defining trust and distrust as mutually exclusive phenomena» is illegitimate and that they are ambivalente (Kupreychenko, 2008) (let's note that earlier the scientist used the concept of «dichotomy», in our view, more appropriate to trust / distrust).

In this context, it should be noted that ambivalence implies the simultaneous manifestation of psychic phenomena (in particular, feelings) (Chuyko, 2000, p. 77), that can hardly concern to trust / distrust: first, it is impossible to simultaneously mainly or completely trust and distrust is one person; second, the reduction of these phenomena solely to the affective dimension (level of feelings) have significantly impoverish their meaning. Ambivalente opposites, in the context of philosophical ambivalence, constitute integrity, these are just this obvious extremes that «meet» (which, in our view, cannot concern to trust / distrust). In addition, ambivalent phenomena do not usually contain an «intermediate» concept that is equidistant from both basic (extreme) concepts, whereas such concept can be distinguished in a situation of trust / distrust – indifference, especially this is obviously if personificate concepts of trust / distrust in objects «ours» / «strangers». We usually trust the promises of «ours», friends, but not of our enemies – but we can be indifferent to both: neither trust nor distrust.

P. Shtompka proposes to use the term «mistrust» for neutral situations, where they are keeping from the manifestation both trust and distrust. Mistrust is a temporary, intermediate phase of the process of building / violation of trust, when one's former trust is lost or one's former distrust is dissipated (Freik, 2006).

S.P. Tabharova notes that trust «implies an interest in a partner, an expectation of mutual benefit (including related to restriction, censure or punishment), positive emotional evaluations of this person, a readiness to do good deeds towards them, openness and relaxation«; and distrust «includes awareness of the risks that appear in the openness of the subject and the partner of interaction, feeling of danger and negative evaluations of the

partner, alertness and tension (to respond to aggression or to show outstripping hostility), differentiating trust and distrust somehow descriptively (Tabharova, 2008).

According to I.V. Antonenko, trust is a «meet-equivalent positive meta-attitude of the subject to the object, based on the predictability of the object's positivity that stipulates the success of the subject's activity», whereas «distrust is a counter-equivalent negative meta-attitude of the subject to the object, based on the predictability by him of object's negativity or unpredictability of object's attitude, which stipulates unsuccessfulness of the subject's activity» (Antonenko, 2006, p. 11).

Taking into account of the definition of trust / distrust of S.P. Tabkharova and I.V. Antonenko, it becomes clear, why P. Shtompka affirms that distrust is a «mirror» reflection of trust (Shtompka, 2012). A.B. Kupreychenko rightly explains in this context that trust and distrust «have a value basis and therefore may manifest as a conscious position or an unconscious attitude to the values of a partner or object» (Kupreychenko, 2008, p. 473).

That is, in reality, scientists mainly argue that trust / distrust are different, using the opposite (antonymic) in the meaning words: positive – negative (object's estimates); successful – unsuccessful activity of the subject; expectation of benefit – expectation of harm.

E. Giddens propose his own view on the trust / distrust correlation, which somewhat different from the previous, points that «for people, distrust means doubt about the honesty of the intentions that demonstrate their action» (Giddens, 2011, p. 232). Distrust, however, according to the scientist, is too faint term to express the fundamental opposition to basic trust. If trust is not developed, «the constant existential uneasiness increases. Therefore, in the deepest sense, the opposition to trust is such mentality, which can best be described as existential anxiety or horror» (Giddens, 2011, p. 232).

In addition, as S.P. Tabharova proved, the criteria of trust and distrust in certain categories of people differ. The number of criteria of distrust in the partner diminishes, and the criteria of trust – increases with increasing closeness and degree of acquaintance with him partner. Majority of the positive characteristics is the most important for trusting in a loved one, of negative characteristics – for distrust in a stranger (Tabharova, 2008).

We also note that we tend to trust loved ones, even knowing almost all of their pluses and minuses, whereas if we dispose to people mostly negatively, considering them as not enemies or malefactors, at least as detractor, or indifferent, we do not trust, even knowing that they have positive qualities; that is, in the relationships, the main criterion of trust / distrust is the character of those relationships itself.

The mail manifestations of trust

Trust in interpersonal relationships

Awareness (conclusion) that another person is trustworthy is determined based the following factors:

- This person has collaborated with other people before;

- They were involved in a conflict situation with another person in the past, in which a common solution was found;

- This person said they intended to cooperate;

- It can be concluded that the other person has realized that «his / her own interests are best served by cooperating, because a mutual dependence is given» (Bierhoff, & Vornefeld, 2004, p. 50).

In addition, one can rely on information about the particular person from third party persons, who are trustworthy, if no own experience of cooperation with them, were (Bierhoff, & Vornefeld, 2004).

It should be noted that J. Simpson sees an interesting paradox in the fact that dyads with long-term relationships are accustomed to behaving in stressful situations to the benefit of others and relationships (this incorporate in the personality structure). That's why, to test the validity of their trust, they invent the diagnostic trust situations, where the interests of the partners are fundamentally different among us and from the point of view of the relationship as a whole. As a result, if partners confirm the disposition to trust, changing in new situations again; this increases the trust (Simpson, 2007, p. 267). We completely agree with the definition of the situation as paradoxical: in fact, we see no sense in either recheck a loved one or in creating a special situation for this purpose: life is more difficult than any artificially created situation. In addition, it is, in our view, a paradox, partly deprived of logic: the attempt to test a person, especially one, who had fully trusted, is in fact the evidence of a loss of former trust in they, doubt in they, and not a verification of trust: if trusting genuine – this does not require new confirmations of trust; a person we consider to be decent, reliable, responsible and honest, remains the same, regardless of time or situation.

O.I. Dontsov, Ye.B. Pereligina, O.Yu. Zotova, & S.V. Mostykov, in turn, identify three conditions that promote mutual trust between the parties or establishing a strategy for corporate behavior: the presence of third (neutral) persons (mediators), whose function is to facilitate the interaction, especially in a conflict situation; the nature of the communicative relationships of the cooperative parties (presence the necessary information

about the partner) personal peculiarities of the interaction's participants (Dontsov, Pereligina, Zotova, & Mostykov, 2018; Skripkina, 2000).

According to E. Giddens: «personal trust becomes a project on which its participants «work», and which requires one individual to disclose to another. Where this interaction cannot be controlled by fixed normative codes, trust must be gained (in ways of demonstrative cordiality and openness)… Relationships are connections based on trust, where trust is not initially given, but is producing, and where the work connected with this means a mutual process of self-disclosure» (Giddens, 2011, p. 257).

I.V. Antonenko adds that trust in interpersonal relationships is a second time result of mutual activity. The criterion of the degree of trust is the success of the actual activity in achieving the goal of the activity (Antonenko, 2006, p. 16).

Loss of trust in all, as P. Shtompka rightly explains, «is equivalent to the loss of common sense in everything that happens in the circle of everyday life and at all other levels of the social structure of society» (Shtompka, 2012, p. 15). If only deprive of trust the external and stop trusting ourselves, as «all other social relations and institutions are destroying, the world is fragmenting and broking down into separate parts» (Stompka, 2012, p. 15).

Sh. Glass proposes four principles for strengthening of the trust in close relationships: honesty and integrality – to be honest and sincere (open) in interaction (including yourself); non defensiveness – to learn not to defend yourself in communication with a partner, to perceive him and yourself realistically, to be open for feedback; understanding the difference between yourself and your partner without perceiving it as a cause of disagreement or distrust; direct communication – expressing thoughts and feelings directly, being aware that words must correspond to the actions (Catlett, 2016).

Trust and types of people

S.P. Tabharova also notes that the combination and the degree of expressiveness of level of the attitude to observing of moral standards, depending on the focus of trust / distrust, allowed her to distinguish five personality types: the first – sincerely-true and categorical in manifestation of trust or distrust, demanding to others, moral, frank, the second is principled, friendly, but strongly differentiates attitudes towards observing of the norms of morality depending on trust / distrust and closeness of relationships; the third is tolerant, but not enough fair and not very truthful, underestimates trust and morality in business relationships; fourth – with an average level of

the attitude to observing of moral norms, which depend from trust and distrust; the fifth is tolerant, responsible, fair, but not principled, aspires to justify trust and overcome distrust (Tabharova, 2008).

We tend to consider that by the degree of manifestation of trust people can be conditionally divided into 3 groups, where the first will make up by persons to whom the validity of their trust to partner will have necessarily proved seriously and for a long time; and even in this case the trust will not be complete, and such a person is guided by the principles, that no one really worth trust and «trust, but verify!» (and most often). Representatives of the opposite group trust so easily that they deserve to be called gullible, because they initially believe in the good nature of man, and in their assessment of whether to trust another person, they rely less on objective confirmation that they can (should) trust, and they will not be betrayed, but on their own impression of the person. Therefore, the chances of them being deceived in their trust are quite high, although in reality they are faced with such situation not more than the rest of the people. In addition, they understand that it is human nature to make mistakes, so it is easier to experience a loss of trust for them. The intermediate group will consist of those, whose level of trust in the interaction's partner depends directly on his personal characteristics and the nature of the relationship, which formed, where the trust was confirmed, was not in doubt, motivating it losing or necessity for it re-verification.

Principles of trust

J. Simpson distinguishes the basic principles of trust: 1) the person determines the degree to which they can trust the partner, by observing whether he displays a transformation in his own motivation in situations related to trust (where the partners make decisions that go against their own interests and supports the interests of the partner or relationship), or not; 2) these situations often occur naturally and unintentionally throughout everyday life, but people can create such situations themselves to test the validity of their trust; 3) individual difference in attachment (devotion), self-esteem, self-determination (self and partners) can influence the increasing or decreasing of trust during the relationship; «people, who are more disposed safety», with a high self-esteem or differentiated self-concept tends to trust more and especially in a long-term relationships; 4) neither the level nor the direction of trust in a relationship can be fully understood without comprehending the positions and actions of both partners, especially in trust-diagnostic situations (Simpson, 2007, p. 265–266).

However, some of the ways of demonstrating of interpersonal trust («Importance of trust», (n. d.)) can also be understand as the principles of its expression: to listen and support each other; to show consideration and care; demonstrate mutual respect for individual boundaries of partner; be dependable for the other person; to feel safe, despite of external circumstances; matchup between words and actions; not control or monitoring each other; trust another person, wherever and with whom he or she is; keep a tight, strong relation.

Conclusions

The understanding of the phenomenon of trust depends on both the science, in which the concept is used, and the situational context. Thus, in the context of the profession, trust is the trust exactly in the professional competence of the professional, and to the world (society) – the trust in its structural systems and institutions, operating under the rules of morality and law. In the interpersonal relationships, trust is connected with the trustworthiness, honesty, decency and frankness (sincerity) of another person about us in matters of vital importance to us. We trust when: we feel safe and secure with the person, they are responsible for their words, and the words do not disagree with deeds, there are mutual understanding, common interests and values. In society, we are more likely to show trust in words, in relationships – to actions and deeds. Trust is a complex attitude towards another person, manifested in a subjectively justified confidence in the reliability and honesty of the person; in the expectation that they will not try to intentionally or consciously harm us.

Trust can be complete and partial, constant and dynamic, without the need for additional testing. The factors of manifestation of trust are: psychological characteristics of the trust subject; properties of trust object; peculiarities of the trust situation (influence of external circumstances).

Trust is especially important for both full-valued interpersonal relationships, the functioning of society, even the existence of the world; is the foundation of a mentally healthy personality and their well-being; in pedagogical communication of the teacher with the child. It is easy to lose it but to gain or restore to its original level and character practically impossible. Destruction of trust is especially painful, because it destroys both the picture of the world of a person and part of themselves, intervening into the life meanings and values of man. Even being stable and well-founded, trust remains the most fragile and volatile psychic phenomenon.

References

Antonenko, I.V. (2006). *Social psychology of trust*. Doctor's thesis. Yaroslavl: JGU.

Antonenko, I.V. (2014). Social psychology of trust. *Volga Scientific Bulletin, 11-2* (39), 99–104. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sotsialnaya-psihologiya-doveriya

Bierhoff, H.-W., & Vornefeld, B. (2004). The Social Psychology of Trust with Applications in the Internet. *Analyse & Kritik, 26*, 48–62. https://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/soc-psy/scholar/2004_The_social_psychology_of_trust_with_applications_in_the_Internet.pdf

Catlett, J. (2016). *Trust Issues: Why Is It So Hard for Some People to Trust? Communication between couples, relationship problems, relationships.* https://www.psychalive.org/trust-issues/

Chujko, G.V. (2000). The ambivalence of the personality and the consequences of its destruction. *Psychology*, *2 (9),* 75–81.

Doncov, A.I., Perelygina, E.B., Zotova, O.Ju., & Mostikov S.V. (2018). Trust as a factor of psychological security in interethnic interaction. *Social psychology and society*, *2 (9)*, 21–34. DOI:10.17759/sps.2018090202.

Doverie. (2008). In Meshherjakova B.G., & Zinchenko V.P. *Large psychological dictionary*. Moscow: AST, St. Petersburg: Prajm-Evroznak. https://gufo.me/dict/psychologie_dict/DOVERIE

Doverie. (2013). In Ushakov, D.N. *Explanatory dictionary of modern Russian*. Moskva : Adelant. https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ushakov/790118

Freik, N.V. (2006). The concept of trust in studies by P.Sztompka. *Sociological researches*, *11*, 10–18. http://ecsocman.hse.ru/socis/msg/19034149.html

Frejdzher, R., & Fejdimen, Dzh. (2002). *Julian Rotter and the theory of social cognitive learning*. In Frejdzher, R., & Fejdimen Dzh. Personality: theories, experiments, exercises (pp. 742–760). St. Petersburg: prajm-EVROZNAK.

Frejdzher, R., & Fejdimen, Dzh. (2002). *Eric Erickson and the life cycle*. In Frejdzher, R., & Fejdimen, Dzh. Personality: theories, experiments, exercises (pp. 221–253). St. Petersburg: Prajm-EVROZNAK.

Giddens, Je. (2011). *The consequences of modernity*. Moscow : Praksis.

Hosking, Dzh. (2016). Our current crisis is a crisis of trust. Interview with Maria Jashkova. *Emergency ration*, *2*(106). http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2016/2/nash-segodnyashnij-krizis-est-krizis-doveriya.html.

Ilin, E.P. (2013). *Psychology of trust*. St. Petersburg : Piter.

Importance of Trust in a Relationship (n. d.). https://strategicpsychology.com.au/importance-of-trust-in-a-relationship/

Kornev, S.A. (2012). The problem of trust in foreign psychological researches. https://superinf.ru/view_helpstud.php?id=3273.

Kozhem'jakina, O. M. (2009). Trust in the dynamics of social changes. *Philosophical problems of the Humanities*. http://www.info-library.com.ua/books-text-11430.html.

Kozlov, N.I. (n.d.) Trust between people: where are the reasonable boundaries? https://www.psychologos.ru/articles/view/doverie-mezhdu-lyudmi-dvoe-zn--gde-razumnye-granicy-vop-zn-.

Kravchenko, V.Ju. (2009). Trust as a manifestation of the affiliate need of a person at a young age. Candidat's thesis. Ivano-Frankivsk: PNU.

Kuprejchenko, A.B. (2008). *The psychology of trust and distrust*. Moscow: Institute of psychology RAN.

Leonova, I.Ju. (2015). Trust: concepts, types, functions. *Bulletin of Udmurt university. Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy,* 2 (25), 34–41. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/doverie-ponyatie-vidy-i-funktsii.

Lysenko, D.P. (2018). Trust as a socio-psychological phenomenon. *Theory and practice of modern psychology*, *3*, 123–126.

Lysenko, D.P. (2018). Trust in the subject field of psychological researches. *Problems of modern psychology*, *40,* 196–208. DOI: 10.32626/2227-6246.2018-40.196-208.

Nahabych, N.S. (2013). Trust as a phenomenon and a process of social life. *Actual problems of sociology, psychology, pedagogy*, *4* (21), 55–63. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apspp_2013_4_10.

Puhareva, T.S. (2011). *Psychological features of trust in themselves and others in future lawyers at the stage of professional training at the university.* Extended abstract of candidate's thesis. Rostov-on-Don: JuFU.

Rotenberg, K.J. (1994). Loneliness and interpersonal trust. *Journal of social and clinical psychology. 2*, Vol.13, 152–173.

Seligman, A. (2002). *The problem of trust*. Moscow : Idea-Press.

Shtompka, P. (2012). *Trust is the foundation of society*. Moscow: Logos.

Sigitova, V.S. (2017). Basic approaches to the study of trust in psychology. *Modern scientific research and innovations, 4*. http://web.snauka.ru/issues/2017/04/80706

Simpson, J. A. (2007). Psychological Foundations of Trust. *Current directions in psychological science, 5*, Vol.16, 264–268. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00517.x.

Skripkina, T.P. (2000). *Psychology of trust*. Moscow: Academia.

Tabharova, S.P. (2008). T*he relationship of trust and distrust of personality to other people with the attitude to the observance of moral norms of business behavior.* Extended abstract of candidate's thesis. Moscow: IP RAN GUGN.

Williams, T. (2014). The psychology of interpersonal trust. How people feel when it comes to trusting someone. *McKendree University, 22*, 1–17. https://www.mckendree.edu/academics/scholars/issue22/tiara-williams.pdf