

Service Satisfaction, Competence and Caring:
Examining the Influence of Experience with the Public
Bureaucracy on Citizen Attitudes of Trust in Government

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Lauren Kriston Harding
August 2013

Copyright © 2013 by Lauren Kriston Harding
All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

To my beautiful daughters, Eva Kate and Lilly, who inspire me every day with their creativity and wonder. The sky is the limit for you!

To my loving husband, Jay, who is my rock. Thank you for all your loving support and encouragement. I could not have done this without you!

To my mom and dad, who have believed in me from day one, loved me unconditionally, supported me unwaveringly, and encouraged me unfailingly. All I am I owe to the example that you have lived to mold me and the sacrifices that you have made to educate me. I am forever grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have come to be without the help and dedication of Dr. David Houston. His capacity to care for his students is unparalleled, sharing his time and expertise selflessly in order to prepare us for a successful future. No student could ask for a better advisor, mentor or friend.

In addition, I am indebted to Dr. Hemant Sharma, who lent his time and energy to editing many drafts of this work. He has challenged me to rise to my highest potential through his commitment to excellence in all he does. Most of all, his friendship, loyalty and kindness will always be remembered.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to Freddie and Juanita Harding and Marilyn and Jim Ashley, lovingly known as Nana and Papa and Grandma Marilyn and Papa Jim, whose many hours caring for my children while I worked, studied, taught and commuted have made it possible for me to complete this dissertation. Their kindness, thoughtfulness and sacrificial love are unsurpassed.

Special thanks to the Campbell Public Affairs Institute of the Maxwell School of Public Affairs and Citizenship, Syracuse University, sponsor of the survey upon which this analysis was conducted. The Maxwell Poll data and documentation were accessed on-line at: http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/campbell/programs/The_Maxwell_Poll/

ABSTRACT

Examining the relationship among government performance, service satisfaction and trust in government advocated by the New Public Management, this research contributes to a better understanding of the performance-trust hypothesis and its assumptions. This study evaluates the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis, investigating influences on service satisfaction and how these translate into trust. In particular, two implicit assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis are explored. First, citizen experience with public services is examined as a measure of specific support for government. Second, the role of citizen interactions with the bureaucracy is assessed, specifically identifying the influence of citizen attitudes toward public administrators on general trust in government.

The performance-trust hypothesis poses that improved government performance leads to more satisfied citizens, thus resulting in higher levels of citizen trust in government. Although empirical research has supported the link between satisfaction with public services and trust in government, the implicit assumption that satisfaction is a function of specific support for government, impacted by citizen experiences with government services, requires further evaluation. Examining the relationship between using a particular government service and evaluations of the effectiveness of that service, these findings show that service users have significantly different evaluations of government services than non-service users. Personally experiencing the service delivery of a particular government program results in higher levels of service satisfaction compared to levels among those who have not personally used the program.

A second implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis is that evaluations of public administrators based on citizen interactions during service delivery influence trust in government. Although the performance-trust hypothesis assumes that citizen evaluations of bureaucrats are based on specific support for government, only one component is emphasized, output-based trust—or perceptions of bureaucratic competence—while the second dimension, process-based trust—or perceptions of the caring of public administrators—is overlooked. These findings indicate that attitudes toward bureaucrats do influence trust in government broadly. However, it is not only competence that influences trusting attitudes, as expected by the performance-trust hypothesis, but also caring. In fact, process-based trust may have a greater impact on citizen trust in government than output-based trust.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I Introduction	1
Research Questions	1
What Do We Know?	2
The Decline of Trust	2
The Importance of Political Trust	3
Reforms Geared to Increase Public Trust in Government	5
Plan of Research: Examining the Performance-Trust Hypothesis	7
Contribution to the Field	11
Importance of Evaluating the Performance-Trust Hypothesis	11
The Satisfaction Link	12
The Role of Citizen Experience with Government Services	14
Importance of Examining Attitudes toward Public Administrators	16
Importance of Trust in Public Administrators	18
Examining the Multi-dimensionality of Citizen Trust in Public Administrators	20
Conclusion	22
CHAPTER II On the Nature of Public Trust	24
Introduction	24
Explaining Trust	24
Trust: A Multi-dimensional Concept	26
The Cognitive Element of Trust: Competence	31
The Affective Element of Trust: Caring	33
The Importance of Trust	41
The Importance of Social Trust to Government Performance	41
The Importance of Political Trust for Governance	46
The Importance of Particularized Trust in Public Administrators	56
The State of Public Trust	59
Attitudes toward the Federal Government	60
Attitudes toward the Three Branches of Government	62
Attitudes toward State and Local Government	64
Attitudes toward Public Administrators and Federal Agencies	65
Conclusion	67
CHAPTER III Experience with the Public Bureaucracy and Trust in Government	69
Introduction	69
The New Public Management and the Performance-Trust Hypothesis	69
Examining the Satisfaction Link of the Performance-Trust Hypothesis	74
Examining the Implicit Assumptions of the Performance-Trust Hypothesis	79
The Role of Citizen Experiences with Public Services	80
The Role of Citizen Attitudes toward Public Administrators	88
Conclusion	101
CHAPTER IV Correlates of Trust	103
Introduction	103
Political-cultural Characteristics	103

Political Ideology	104
Partisanship	105
Diffuse Support for Government	106
Economic Performance	109
Political Efficacy	110
Civic Engagement	113
Interpersonal Trust	114
Socio-demographic Characteristics	116
Sex	117
Race	117
Age	118
Education	119
Income	120
Government Employment	120
Conclusion	121
CHAPTER V Data and Methods	122
Introduction	122
Data	122
Dependent Variables	123
Independent Variables	127
Methods	131
Chapter VI Experience with Public Services and Service Satisfaction	132
Introduction	132
Descriptive Analysis	133
Bivariate Relationships: Program Effectiveness and Utilization	134
Multivariate Analysis	137
Binary Logistic Regression Models	137
Negative Binomial Regression Model	148
Discussion of Multivariate Analysis	151
Chapter VII Evaluating Citizen Attitudes toward Public Administrators	153
Introduction	153
Descriptive Analysis	154
Multivariate Analysis	155
Discussion of Multivariate Analysis	164
Chapter VIII Trust in Government: Examining the Influence of Service Satisfaction, Competence and Caring	167
Introduction	167
Multivariate Analysis	168
Discussion of Multivariate Analysis	179
Chapter IX Conclusion	180
Overview	180
Examining the Satisfaction Link of the Performance-Trust Hypothesis	180
Who is Satisfied?	181
Service Satisfaction: Experience is the Key	183
The Satisfaction-Trust Link: The Role of Dissatisfied Citizens	186

Exploring Attitudes toward Public Administrators.....	187
Trust in Public Administrators: Perceptions of Competence and Caring	187
Attitudes toward Public Administrators and Trust in Government	191
Limitations of this Research	193
Toward a New Model of Trust: The ‘New Public Service’ and Implications for Reform	194
Conclusion	200
LIST OF REFERENCES	202
APPENDIX.....	225
Vita.....	242

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1. Percentage Distributions for Program Effectiveness	226
Table 2. Percentage Distributions for Program Utilization	227
Table 3. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Head Start Program	228
Table 4. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Medicaid Program	229
Table 5. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Food Stamps Program	230
Table 6. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of College Grants Program ..	231
Table 7. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Public Housing Program..	232
Table 8. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Welfare Program	233
Table 9. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness of Welfare, Utilization of WIC Program	234
Table 10. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Program Effectiveness	235
Table 11. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Program Effectiveness	236
Table 12. Negative Binomial Regression Model: Program Effectiveness	237
Table 13. Percentage Distributions: Trust in Public Officials and Federal Workers.....	238
Table 14. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Competence and Caring	239
Table 15. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Public officials can be trusted “to do the right thing”—“Agree”	240
Table 16. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Public officials can be trusted “to do the right thing”—“Agree”	241

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Research Questions

Although declining levels of trust in government have been well documented, further research is needed to examine what attributes of government administrators influence public trust in government. While past research on trust in government has defined the concept of trust narrowly, emphasizing the aspects of competence and performance highlighted by the New Public Management movement, process concerns have been overlooked. Furthermore, the performance-trust hypothesis assumed in the New Public Management reforms contends that trust in government is a function of the quality of public programs. Hence, improving the performance of public administrators and the delivery of public services are essential to enhancing public trust in government, with service satisfaction bridging the gap between performance and trust.

To date, little research has examined the influence of service satisfaction on trust in government or its role as a link in the performance-trust hypothesis. Even less research has examined the effect of perceptions about the competence and caring of government administrators on trust in government. In order to further understand the nature of public trust in government, I will examine survey data on public attitudes toward government. Using data from the Maxwell Poll conducted by Syracuse University annually from 2004 to 2007, I will explore the following research questions: 1) What factors influence citizen satisfaction with government services? 2) What factors influence citizen assessments of the competence of public administrators and their

treatment by public administrators? 3) How do citizen assessments of service satisfaction, the competence of government administrators and their treatment by government administrators influence attitudes of trust in government?

What Do We Know?

The Decline of Trust

The decline in political trust is well documented: whether the object is government in general, specific institutions, or the leaders of these institutions, Americans are less trusting than in the 1960s (Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2001; Citrin and Luks 2001), and the loss of faith means that government is blamed for most of what is wrong in the nation (Tolchin 1996). Citizen attitudes toward government in America are growing increasingly negative. According to Pew Research Center for The People and The Press (2010), “By almost every conceivable measure Americans are less positive and more critical of government these days” (1). Citizen trust in the federal government is currently at one of the lowest levels in a half century. Only 22% of Americans trust the government to do what is right—whether that be “just about always” (3%) or “most of the time” (19%). The contrast is stark in comparison to levels of trust in government in 1958, when 73% of Americans trusted the government to do what is right “just about always” or “most of the time.” Similarly, the 2008 American National Election Study (2010) reported only 30% of respondents “can trust the government in Washington to do what is right” either “most of the time” or “just about always,” the lowest figure since 1994. Further, looking at the branches of government, the 2012 Gallup poll found that only 34% of Americans have a great deal or fair amount of confidence in the legislative

branch, which is lower than the percentage who are confident in the executive (56%) or judicial (67%) branches, and represents a small increase over the all-time recorded low in 2011 (31%) (Newport 2012). Elsewhere, examining trust in individual government actors, The Council for Excellence in Government Survey (2006) found that confidence in public administrators is higher than that of other elected officials, but still quite low, showing that only 31% of respondents reported to have “a great deal” or “quite a lot of confidence” in “civil servants or people who work for government,” as compared to 25% for “the president and cabinet officials” and 16% for members of Congress.

The Importance of Political Trust

This wave of growing distrust of government has sparked alarm in political observers, due to the importance of political trust to representative governance. John Locke’s (1690) conception of the social contract emphasized the peoples’ acceptance of government with the expectation that those entrusted with power would act in the public interest. This public trust legitimates the role of government and allows the government to carry out its obligations without the use of coercion (Miller 1974a). Public trust increases citizens’ compliance with government regulations (Tyler 1998), based on the premise that trusting citizens are more likely to believe that the government will treat them fairly and that other citizens will also comply (Brehm and Rahn 1997). In addition, social capital theory suggests that high levels of public trust increase the effectiveness of government performance by increasing community collaboration and cooperation (Putnam 1993) and by enhancing the ease and efficiency of transactions (Ruscio 1996). Indeed, democratic governments have been found to perform better when the level of

social capital in a community is high (Knack 2000). Trust is especially important for the support of a policy when individuals contribute to paying the costs but do not directly receive its benefits (Hetherington and Globetti 2002). In these instances, it leads to the perception that government policies are fair ‘as eventually I will get what I need and deserve when the time comes.’

Trust in the public bureaucracy is especially important, “because the bureaucracy is the largest arm of modern government and the one that most regularly interacts with citizens in their ordinary lives. And if citizens do not trust the bureaucracy, they may be less likely to comply with administrative rules and procedures and to engage in the coproduction of vital public services” (Van Ryzin 2011, 11; see also Bovaird 2007; Brudney and England 1983; Whitaker 1980). For public administration specifically, trust affects programmatic performance, as it is associated with delegation of administrative authority (Marlowe 2004; Metlay 1999), excessive oversight and an over-reliance on formal rules and procedures (Ruscio 1996), and public cooperation and compliance with laws and regulations (Marien and Hooghe 2011; Scholz and Lubell 1998a; Scholz and Lubell 1998b; Taylor-Clark et al. 2005). In addition, public trust improves the morale and recruitment of public employees (Soni 2004) and decreases micromanagement that hinders performance (Behn 1995). The link between low levels of trust, excessive micromanagement, and reduced performance is at the core of bureaucratic reform efforts offered by the Winter Commission (National Commission on the State and Local Public Service 1993) and the National Partnership for Reinventing Government (National Performance Review 1993). Furthermore, Behn (1995) identifies trust as one of the “three big questions” facing public management.

The importance of trust is further heightened by uncertainty because citizens cannot assess the appropriateness of government decisions due to a lack of expertise, time, and/or capacity. This is when the trustor is most vulnerable because she is more reliant on another to act on her behalf. In fact, the perception of risk is related to the level of trust individuals have in managers of programs designed to protect the public (Poortinga and Pidgeon 2003; Quinn et al. 2009; Raithatha et al. 2003; Slovic, Flynn, and Layman 1991). For example, public trust has been linked to compliance with tax laws, adherence to public health guidelines (Shore 2003), such as participation in vaccination programs (Quinn et al. 2009), and obedience to evacuation orders during natural disasters (Cordasco et al. 2007).

Reforms Geared to Increase Public Trust in Government

The decline of citizen trust in government, which has been identified as “one of the dilemmas of modern governance,” has been at the center of much scholarly research and debate (Tolbert and Mossberger 2006, 354; Levi and Stoker 2000; Nye, Zelikow, and King 1997). Among the multitude of reform proposals geared to resolve this problem, those advocating market-based, entrepreneurial reforms focused on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government management and performance have taken hold most widely (National Performance Review 1993; Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Peters 2001). Dubbed the ‘New Public Management,’ this popular reform movement encourages the use of private sector techniques, market mechanisms and a customer service orientation, as well as a focus on outputs and performance measurement, in order to create results that inspire greater citizen trust in government (Bekke and van der Meer

2000; Kaboolian 1998). The underlying hypothesis of the New Public Management reforms is that a better performing government leads to greater levels of citizen trust in government. Termed the performance-trust hypothesis, the implicit assumption is that “better performing public services will lead to increased satisfaction among their users, and this, in turn, will lead to more trust in government” (Van de Wall and Bouckaert 2003, 892). Emphasizing customer service and managing for results, performance measurement in the New Public Management reform movement is often defined in terms of customer satisfaction, which forms the link between government performance outcomes and citizen trust (Van Ryzin 2007; Aberbach and Christensen 2005; Kettl 2000; Osborne and Gaebler 1992). These reform efforts based on the performance-trust linkage have been implemented internationally with examples including Reinventing Government in the United States, La Rélève in Canada, The Next Steps Program in the United Kingdom, and the Copernicus reform in Belgium (Barnes and Gill 2000; Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2003; Gelders and Van de Walle 2007).

Despite the widespread acceptance and implementation of the New Public Management reforms, the hoped for reversal of the downward trend in levels of citizen trust remains elusive. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004) note findings suggesting that, “...as yet, [there is] no indication of a widespread national or international shift of public opinion in favour of governments that make public sector reform a central part of their programmes” (131). In addition, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2007) state, “For a long time, attention in public sector reforms has been on productivity improvements. Despite considerable progress in government performance, policy-makers were to their dismay confronted with a decline in public trust” (1123). The failure of these reform efforts to

bring about greater trust in government leads to questions regarding the validity of the performance-trust linkage.

While poor government performance is often cited as the reason for declining levels of trust in government, Bok (2001) found that the evidence for declining performance is far from conclusive. Rather, his findings demonstrated mixed results, showing that performance was either difficult to measure or actually not in decline. This has led scholars to question the causal relationship between government performance and citizen trust. For example, Yang and Holzer (2006) ask, “Is the performance–trust link spurious, or have we merely failed to demonstrate it empirically?” (114). This emphasizes the importance of unraveling the links between government performance, service satisfaction and trust in order to better understand their relationship and to determine if the reforms of the New Public Management are indeed geared to reverse the decline of trust in government. Ultimately, millions of dollars have been spent by governments around the world in order to adopt the New Public Management reform proposals, while the underlying theories supporting these proposals have not been adequately tested. Further examination of the performance-trust hypothesis is thus essential in order to provide empirical evidence that informs future government reform efforts designed to increase public trust in government.

Plan of Research: Examining the Performance-Trust Hypothesis

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis, exploring thoroughly the relationships among government performance, service satisfaction and trust in government, in order to more fully

understand these linkages and evaluate their implications for government reform.

Although the relationship between service satisfaction and trust has been demonstrated empirically, further examination is needed in order to better understand what influences citizen satisfaction with government services. In addition, further analysis of how service satisfaction forms the bridge between government performance and trust is necessary. Specifically, this analysis will address the assumptions implicit in the performance-trust hypothesis, particularly as they concern the importance of citizen experiences with government services as a key factor in linking government performance and satisfaction, and will also assess the importance of citizen perceptions of bureaucrats formed during experiences with public services as an influence on overall trust in government.

Although the importance of citizen experience with public services is an implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis, few studies have examined the influence of being a service user on satisfaction with government services. Van de Walle, Kampen and Bouckaert (2005) question the relationship between satisfaction with public services and evaluations of service quality. They contend that a general measure such as satisfaction with public services captures something different than an assessment of service quality, noting that, “Experience matters more in the evaluation of service quality” (544). Moreover, Van de Walle et al. (2005) assert that “using general questions on satisfaction with the functioning of public services is not a valid way for eliciting a genuine evaluation of the functioning of public services” (545). Rather, they argue, “This method provided us with information on the general attitude toward public services that is not necessarily based on an evaluation of how specific public services function” (545).

Therefore, experience with public services may be the necessary link for evaluations of service quality to translate into higher levels of service satisfaction.

However, additional research is needed to evaluate whether citizen satisfaction influences trust in the way that the performance-trust hypothesis articulates. Does increased citizen satisfaction with public services lead to greater trust in government or are evaluations of satisfaction actually based on generalized attitudes towards government? Does being a service user influence service satisfaction? What is the relative impact of positive and negative evaluations of government services on trust? Does experiencing different types of government services influence trust? A better understanding of the answers to these questions will help to identify whether the links in the performance-trust hypothesis are supported empirically.

A second implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis is the idea that interactions with government administrators matter in the formation of citizen attitudes about government. Recent efforts to enhance trust based on the New Public Management reforms have focused on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the bureaucracy, in order to improve citizen evaluations of government performance. However, the New Public Management reforms overlook the multi-dimensional nature of trust, focusing only on one dimension, the cognitive element of trust, which is competence. This cognitive dimension of trust is based on an individual's calculation that trusting someone else will maximize his or her self-interest.

However, many empirical studies have shown that there are two distinct dimensions of trust, recognizing the cognitive element of trust, but also pointing to a second dimension, an affective element of trust, which is not addressed in the New Public

Management reforms. This affective dimension of trust emphasizes the importance of how citizens are treated in the process of providing public services, what I will refer to as ‘caring.’ This affective dimension of trust highlights a process of interaction with citizens based on democratic values and citizen perceptions of fairness, equity, respect and honesty in their dealings with public administrators (Van Ryzin 2011).

Research supports the multi-dimensionality of trust, showing that, “Attitudes about trustworthiness and competence are indeed distinct. Competence likely relates to whether citizens are getting what they want from government while trustworthiness likely reflects how citizens perceive they are treated” (Houston and Harding forthcoming). This observation suggests that efforts to reform the bureaucracy with an eye toward increasing trust require strategies to increase the competence *and* caring of the public service. However, current reforms focus only on the cognitive element of trust. Consequently, it is important to gain a better understanding of the influences on citizen attitudes about the competence and caring of public administrators in order to better understand what role attitudes toward bureaucrats play in overall trust in government.

Furthermore, if the performance-trust hypothesis is implicitly linked to perceptions of bureaucrats, additional research is needed to evaluate the relative importance of both the cognitive and affective dimensions of trust in order to better inform government reform efforts. Additional research is needed specifically to address the following questions: What influences citizen attitudes toward public administrators? Are attitudes about the competence and caring of public administrators influenced by a similar set of correlates? How do citizen attitudes about the competence and caring of public administrators influence overall trust in government? Answers to these questions

will contribute to a deeper understanding of the bureaucracy and the role that it plays in overall trust in government. Beyond that, the implications of these results will help to evaluate the performance-trust hypothesis and to inform future reform efforts.

Contribution to the Field

Importance of Evaluating the Performance-Trust Hypothesis

The first contribution of this research agenda to the field is to evaluate empirically the assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis, which is a key principle underlying the New Public Management reform movement. According to Van Ryzin (2007), “A better understanding of the links among government performance, citizen satisfaction, and trust will contribute a great deal to the field of public administration and public management” (522). The New Public Management movement has emphasized customer service and managing for results, which is often defined in terms of citizen satisfaction, as strategies geared to increase citizen trust in government (Aberbach and Christensen, 2005; Kettl, 2000; Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). The assumption of these performance-oriented reforms is “that government can restore public trust by delivering and demonstrating results—producing outcomes that matter to citizens” (Van Ryzin 2011, 2; see also Bouckaert 2008; Radin 2006).

However, the documented, gradual decline in trust over the past several decades leads to questions about how well the public sector is actually performing and also about shifts in citizen perceptions of, and relationships with, government (Yang and Holzer 2006). Van Ryzin (2007) notes, “For all these reasons, it becomes imperative to understand better, and with the support of empirical evidence, the pieces of this puzzle—

the links among government performance, citizen satisfaction, and trust” (522). While no one can be opposed to better government performance and achieving results that matter, Van Ryzin (2011) contends that, “The assumption that measuring and reporting on outcomes will convince a skeptical public to trust government once again deserves more careful scrutiny” (1). Others also share similar concerns (Van de Walle and Bouckaert 2003; Yang and Holzer 2006). In response to these concerns regarding the performance-trust hypothesis, this research agenda will help to illuminate the relationship between government performance, service satisfaction and trust by evaluating what influence attitudes of satisfaction with government services has on overall trust in government.

The Satisfaction Link

Second, this research agenda will contribute to building a better understanding of these relationships by examining who is satisfied with government services, controlling for a set of common socio-demographic, political-cultural and attitudinal variables. Investigating the causes or drivers of trust, Van de Walle confirms “that explanations of citizen trust based on government performance (in the delivery of services, and in other ways) are at best incomplete and need to take account of much wider social factors,” including controlling for generalized attitudes and cultural variables (Heintzman and Marson 2005, 565; see also Van de Walle and Bouckaert 2003; Van de Walle 2004). On this same note, Kampen, Van De Walle and Bouckaert (2006, 400-401) point out that:

When the quality of public service delivery is taken into account, many studies do not go beyond the administration-specific dimension. That is, these studies focus on the link between trust in government and specific administrations or institutions, primarily high-impact agencies such as the police or courts (Newton and Norris, 1999; Rothstein and Stolle, 2002) but contain no information about satisfaction with public service delivery or

personal value orientations (Bouckaert, Van de Wall and Kampen 2005). Obviously, a gap exists in the literature.

They further argue that, “The causal relation between satisfaction and trust cannot be fruitfully analyzed unless the measures are controlled for a shared component, which we identify as the predisposition toward government. That is, unless we account for this predisposition, associations between satisfaction and trust describe tautologies rather than causalities” (Kampen, et al. 2006, 389). Addressing this concern specifically, I will control for generalized attitudes toward government in order to better unpack the actual influence of satisfaction on trust.

Third, although research supports the positive influence of satisfaction with public services on trust in government, further study of this relationship is merited. Kampen et al. (2006) find, in their study of Flemish citizen attitudes, that positive assessments of government services have less impact on trust levels than negative experiences. This important finding bears further inquiry within the context of U.S. opinion data, as its application could be quite momentous. If, in fact, negative assessments of public services have a greater influence on trust levels than positive assessments, reform efforts to improve government performance may be focusing on the wrong things. If so, it may be more effective for government to identify and target the problems that most often cause negative evaluations, than to improve overall program performance levels. Currently, resources may be wasted aiming for high performance, when satisfaction, and thus trust, may be better influenced by just reducing the worst complaints.

The Role of Citizen Experience with Government Services

Fourth, this research agenda contributes to the literature and provides a better understanding of the performance-trust hypothesis by exploring the relationship between being a user of specific public services and having satisfaction with those services. Many studies have found a positive relationship between service satisfaction and trust (Fornell 2002; Van Ryzin 2007; Van Ryzin 2011). Fewer studies have distinguished the influence of being a service user on levels of satisfaction (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Kampen et al. 2006). The question of whether or not service use makes a difference in satisfaction is a very important consideration relevant to the performance-trust hypothesis. In order for government performance to have an impact on trust, through satisfaction with public service delivery as the hypothesis suggests, using services should directly affect satisfaction, and lead to changes in trust in government. However, if levels of service satisfaction do not change based on using a specific public service, it would suggest that satisfaction with a public agency may be of a general nature, and is not influenced by the performance of a particular agency or a particular citizen experience of this service.

If this is in fact the case, diffuse support of government may have more influence on citizen perceptions of public services and their attitudes of satisfaction than their particular experiences. The finding that satisfaction and trust are of a general nature and more influenced by diffuse support for government than particular experiences with service delivery would, in turn, undermine the performance-trust hypothesis by showing that performance does not really matter for trust. After all, if better performance does not lead to higher levels of satisfaction based on experiencing these services, then the

linkage between performance and satisfaction is either broken—or does not in fact function as hypothesized. This would be a blow to the New Public Management reform movement, which has inspired widespread reforms in governments across the globe in order to improve government performance, and thus increase trust.

On the other hand, finding that experiencing public services is related to levels of service satisfaction would be a corroboration of the performance-trust hypothesis, showing that the link between performance and satisfaction is indeed supported. This would demonstrate that satisfaction is based on specific support for government and that better government performance can drive increases in citizen satisfaction. Substantiating the performance-satisfaction link would show that the New Public Management reforms geared toward improving satisfaction with government services and trust are in fact a step in the right direction.

Another aspect of the importance of being a service user is whether or not experiencing a particular type of public service has implications for satisfaction. Studies of Scandinavian countries have shown that encounters with universal services have been linked to greater increases in levels of trust in government than experiences with selective benefits (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Rothstein 2003). On the other hand, experiencing selective, means-tested welfare programs has been found to reduce citizen trust in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005) and interpersonal trust (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005). This line of research, which has not been examined using U.S. opinion data, would help us to better understand what influences service satisfaction. If U.S. findings are similar to those of the Scandinavian countries, and experience of selective

services decreases citizen trust in government, this would undermine the performance-trust hypothesis in its application to selective services.

Despite improvements in performance, these programs may inherently detract from trust by nature of their structure. If true, this could help to explain, in part, why performance improvements have not impacted the decline in trust, especially given the higher ratio of selective to universal services in the U.S. as compared to the Scandinavian countries. Moreover, this finding would also demonstrate the need for structural reform of the selective services. A service structured in such a way as to undermine perceptions of procedural justice cannot be ideal, and if this is indeed the case, this would highlight the need for further examination in order to bring about positive reform. Conversely, if findings in the U.S. are the opposite, and the use of selective services is found to actually increase trust, this would illustrate support for the performance-trust hypothesis by further corroborating the satisfaction link.

Importance of Examining Attitudes toward Public Administrators

The fifth contribution to the literature to be made by this research agenda is to expand our understanding of citizen attitudes toward public administrators and the bureaucracy. In comparison with research conducted to analyze the institutions and actors of the legislature, the courts, and the presidency, much less attention has been paid to the bureaucracy and bureaucrats in particular. Bouckaert et al. (2005) state that, “Public administration and public services have always taken a marginal place in political scientists’ behavioural research” (238). Furthermore, Bouckaert et al. (2005) point out that even within the field of public administration, examination of citizen attitudes toward

the bureaucracy has been lacking. They contend that, “From the very beginning, the citizen has been neglected as an object of study in public administration, due to the discipline’s early focus on organization studies and political-administrative relations” (Bouckaert et al. 2005, 232). While many changes have been made since then, “examination of subjective data such as opinion data has always been, and still is, limited in comparison to the widespread use of performance indicators in public administration research” (Bouckaert et al. 2005, 232).

Although opinion data examining citizen attitudes toward the bureaucracy have been lacking in the past, Bouckaert et al. (2005) note that, “Recently, we have observed an increased use of opinion data in public administration” (232), including citizen evaluations of the Israeli public sector (Vigoda and Yuval 2001), analysis of citizen opinions of the public sector in Spain (del Pino 2002), citizen trust in the Finnish ministries (Harisalo and Stenvall 2002), citizen trust in government in Norway (Christensen and Lægreid 2005) and attitudes toward public administrators in the United States (Houston and Howard forthcoming), as well as a cross-national evaluation of attitudes toward the bureaucracy by Van Ryzin (2011). In addition, with the popularity of the New Public Management reform movement taking hold in administrations across the globe, many governments have begun efforts to monitor citizen attitudes towards government and public administration, especially focusing on indicators of trust and satisfaction. Internationally, these efforts include the People’s Panel (Donovan et al. 2001) and the MORI Social Research surveys (Audit Commission and MORI Social Research Institute 2003) in the UK, Citizens First and Listening to Canadians in Canada (Sims 2001), as well as other government initiatives in the Netherlands, Belgium,

Denmark, and Finland, among others. In the United States, several non-profit initiatives have focused attention on the measurement of citizen attitudes towards public services, including The Pew Research Center (The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 1998) and the Council for Excellence in Government's and Ford Foundation's Partnership for Trust in Government (Council for Excellence in Government 2006). Citing these recent initiatives, Bouckaert et al. (2005) note that both measurement of citizen opinion data and its integration into the policy process are increasing. Yet, they contend that, "In research, thorough *exploitation* of these data still has to take off" (236). While these studies and the availability of new opinion data open the door for further examination of citizen attitudes towards the bureaucracy, as of now, the surface has only been scratched and much is left to be discovered.

Importance of Trust in Public Administrators

Sixth, this research will contribute to the field by shedding light on citizen trust in public administrators. Although the majority of political trust research has been focused on declining trust in political institutions and elected officials, studies show that trust in the bureaucracy and government administrators is low, as well (King and Stivers 1998). In addition, levels of public approval of the federal bureaucracy have decreased (Yackee and Lowery 2005) and lack of trust in local government officials is also commonplace (Berman 1997). Street level bureaucrats often become the target of citizen distrust and anger, as the government officials who are most likely to interact directly with citizens (King and Stivers 1998). However, while political trust has received much attention, particularized trust in administrators has been the focus of little empirical research.

Houston and Harding (forthcoming) note that due to this lack of research, “not much is known about the individual-level correlates of public trust in bureaucratic actors. This exists despite the fact that a complete understanding of its nature and determinants is needed to craft strategies to enhance public trust.”

Research on trust in government administrators is characterized by two main limitations. First, empirical research examining trust in the bureaucracy often fails to consider a common group of respondent attitudes and attributes, which leads to concerns about model specification. Second, past research has not sorted fully the influences of generalized trust in government as distinct from particularized trust in the public service. Therefore, more research is needed to examine thoroughly the correlates of particularized trust in the public bureaucracy and to identify what factors influence trusting attitudes. Houston and Harding (forthcoming) note that future research, which would contribute “to develop[ing] a more complete understanding of particularized trust in public servants” includes further assessment of the correlates of trust in government administrators and evaluation of how trust in the civil service influences trust in government in general. They note that, “Answers to these questions will be useful for improving public trust in government administrators.” This research agenda will help to fill these gaps in the literature by furthering our understanding of what attitudes citizens hold toward public administrators, what correlates with these attitudes and how these attitudes influence general trust in government.

Examining the Multi-dimensionality of Citizen Trust in Public Administrators

The seventh way in which this research agenda contributes to the field of research is to examine how the dual dimensions of trust influence attitudes toward bureaucrats and through these, overall trust in government. According to Van Ryzin (2011), “The contemporary performance movement has tended to assume that a key to restoring public trust in civil servants lies in a focus on outcomes or results. But there is growing evidence from various fields that trust in people and institutions of authority often depends more on process (such as fairness and equity) than on outcomes” (1). The New Public Management reforms have addressed the importance of the bureaucracy by focusing on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public service delivery. Based on increasing citizen perceptions of the competence of public administrators, valuing bureaucrats for what they can do for the consumer of government services and how efficiently they can produce the outputs of government, these reforms have focused on the cognitive dimension of trust or, as Easton (1965) puts it, output-based trust. According to Easton (1965), output-based trust concerns the who gets what element of politics, in which people’s trust in government is based on how they benefit, without regard to the process, while the process dimension of trust deals with the organization of the decision-making process, including who participates, how problems are approached, and the rules that are followed. While the New Public Management reforms have focused on the output dimension of trust, process based trust has been neglected. Van Ryzin (2011) contends that, “This finding that process matters in the formation of trust judgments appears across a wide range of settings (police, courts, work places), yet it has

not been adequately recognized in the public administration literature and rhetoric on government performance—especially in an era of outcomes-based, results-driven government” (1).

On this point, my research agenda contributes to the field in two main ways. First, I will examine attitudes toward bureaucrats, comparing perceptions of the competence and caring of public administrators, which correspond to the output and process based dimensions of trust. Controlling for a shared set of socio-demographic and attitudinal variables, this will demonstrate whether or not the correlates of trust differ across its two dimensions, thus exploring whether attitudes based on output factors and process factors are influenced by different variables. Along these lines, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) find that “perceptions of competence and trustworthiness have somewhat different correlates,” with the result that “gains in competence may come at the cost of reduced trustworthiness.” And, according to Taylor-Gooby the reforms adopted in order to improve performance may actually decrease trust by undermining perceptions of process based trust and thus alienating service users (2008; Taylor-Gooby 2009). Therefore, it is important to better understand citizen attitudes toward bureaucrats, how these attitudes pertain to the dual nature of trust, and whether advances in one form of trust correspond to losses in another.

A second contribution to the field concerning this point lies in better understanding the relative influence of citizen attitudes of the competence and caring of bureaucrats on generalized trust in government. Van Ryzin’s (2011) examination of the relative influence of process versus outcomes on perceptions of the trustworthiness of bureaucrats shows that “bureaucratic process appears to matter to citizens as much as, if

not more than, outcomes of government” (13). As a result, it is important to understand whether or not these findings also extend to attitudes about government in general. Calling for further research on this point, Van Ryzin (2011) states, “Given the strong emphasis on outcomes, or results, in the performance movement over the past few decades, as well as a similar focus on outcomes in the public administration literature on trust, the findings of this study should encourage more theoretical and empirical attention to government process as a factor in explaining citizens’ trust of government organizations and their employees” (14).

In addition, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) also point out the importance of further study on this topic by stating, “To develop a more complete understanding of particularized trust in public servants, the following questions should be addressed. Which is more important to overall trust in bureaucrats—trustworthiness or competence?” Further, do these attitudes toward bureaucrats affect overall trust in government? In order to address this gap in the literature, I will examine how attitudes of the competence and caring of bureaucrats influence overall trust in government, and explore the implications of these results as they relate to the New Public Management reform movement and recommendations for future reform efforts.

Conclusion

Through a thorough examination of these points, I hope to contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between government performance, service satisfaction and trust in government, and thus evaluate empirically the assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis. In doing so, I will focus on the satisfaction link,

investigating the influences on satisfaction and how these translate into trust. In addition, I will explore the role of the bureaucracy implicit in the performance-trust hypothesis, particularly identifying the influence of citizen attitudes toward the bureaucracy on general trust in government and assessing how output and process based trust influence assessment of bureaucrats and citizen trust in government. Based on the findings of this research, I will analyze the implications for evaluating the reforms of the New Public Management and informing future practical application in government.

CHAPTER II ON THE NATURE OF PUBLIC TRUST

Introduction

In order to fully examine the relationship between service satisfaction, attitudes toward public administrators and overall trust in government, as linked in the performance-trust hypothesis, it is first necessary to delve into a deeper understanding of political trust. First, in order to form a foundation for the discussion of trust, the concept is defined and empirical research identifying the multi-dimensionality of trust is explored. Second, in order to demonstrate the relevance of this line of research, the importance of trust is examined, specifically addressing the importance of social trust, political trust and, particularly, trust in public administrators as they relate to facilitating better governance. Finally, the decline in political trust is analyzed, shedding light on the crisis of trust faced by this nation and highlighting the need to better understand the drivers of citizen attitudes toward government. A thorough exploration of these topics will build toward a model of political trust and will establish the basis for further examination of the influences on trust in government.

Explaining Trust

In order to conduct a meaningful analysis of trust, it is important to first define the term. According to Choudhury (2008), “Trust remains an elusive concept because it continues to be conveyed in a variety of cognate terms such as confidence, reliability, and trustworthiness” (589). Disagreements arise concerning the definition of trust “because it

is multifaceted, multidisciplinary, and manifested in different kinds of relationships” (Choudhury 2008, 589; see also Atkinson and Butcher 2003; Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Kramer 1999; Möllering 2005; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, and Camerer 1998; Thomas 1998; Yang 2005; Zucker 1986). Although research presents numerous results on the various meanings of trust, Choudhury (2008, 590) finds that systematic study suggests that a definition contains the following components: “Trust is a voluntary act that is based on a psychological state of positive expectation in the face of vulnerability and risk” (see also Gabarro 1978; Kramer 1999; Möllering 2005; Romano and Greguras 2003; Rousseau et al. 1998; Sorrentino, Holmes, Hanna, and Sharp 1995). Rousseau et al. (1998) come to a similar conclusion that trust, as conceptualized across multiple disciplines is defined as “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon the behavior of positive expectations of the intentions of or behavior of another” (395). Therefore, “based on these basic features, trust simply means that those who we relate to will meet our expectation and not hurt us” (Choudhury 2008, 590).¹

Other research articulates this concept of “positive expectation” in terms of “interest.” Cook, Hardin and Levi (2005) posit that “trust exists when one party to the relation believes the other party has incentive to act in his or her interest or to take his or her interests to heart” (2). According to LaPorte and Metlay (1996), “Trust is the belief that those with whom you interact will take your interests into account, even in situations

¹ For further research on definitions of trust: Das and Teng identify 28 definitions of trust (2004: 96; see also Taylor-Gooby 2006b, 131; Luhmann 1979, 10, 24; Rousseau et al. 1998, 395; compare Dasgupta 1988, 51; Gambetta 1988, 218; Craswell 1993, 104; Sztompka 1999, 25)

where you are not in a position to recognize, evaluate, and/or thwart a potentially negative course of action by ‘those trusted’” (342). Alternately, they define confidence, which is often measured as a proxy of trust, as existing “when the party trusted is able to empathize with (know of) your interests, is competent to act on that knowledge, and will go to considerable lengths to keep its word” (342). Their conception of overall trust then stems from a combination of these two concepts, in which a loss of public trust in an organization, for example, would be characterized as a belief that “the organization (and its contractors) neither intends to take their interests into account, nor would it have the competence/capability to act effectively even if it tried to do so” (LaPorte and Metlay 1996, 342; see also Keller and LaPorte 1994; LaPorte 1994). In general, trust refers to a willingness to rely on others to act on our behalf based on the belief that they possess the capacity to make effective decisions and take our interests into account.

Trust: A Multi-dimensional Concept

An analysis of empirical research demonstrates that trust is best understood as a multi-dimensional concept, with two distinct components. Psychometric studies show that trust is comprised of a cognitive component related to competence and an affective component related to caring or trustworthiness (Jungermann et al. 1996; Metlay 1999; Poortinga and Pidgeon 2003). Early research by psychologists Hovland, Janis, and Kelly (1953) identified two dimensions of trust as being competence and care (or trustworthiness). In their social psychological research program on communication and persuasion, they conducted a series of experiments in which characteristics of the communicator were varied in order to assess how this affected subjects’ acceptance of

information. They found that information is accepted more easily when subjects viewed the communicator as an expert, one who made valid assertions, and as trustworthy, impartially communicating the assertions he or she viewed as being most valid (Poortinga and Pidgeon 2003; Frewer and Miles 2003). Further evidence has shown that while perceptions of trustworthiness in an information source increase the persuasiveness of the argument they are advocating, expertise without trustworthiness decreases persuasion and is unlikely to result in an attitude change on the part of the subject (Frewer et al. 1998; Frewer and Miles 2003; McGinnies and Ward 1980). Therefore, it is not only the competence of the communicator, his or her ability or expertise, that influenced trust, but also the belief that he or she is trustworthy, or honest and acting with the subject's interests at heart.

Similarly, Jungermann et al. (1996) and Frewer and Miles (2003) find support for the dual dimensionality of trust based on affective and cognitive elements. In a study of five European countries, Jungermann et al. (1996) examine survey results measuring the credibility of information sources communicating the risks of hazardous chemical facilities. Results show that individual trust in the sources of information could be explained in a two-factor solution, based on the two components, honesty and competence. In a similar study on trust regarding communication about food risk, Frewer and Miles (2003) also observe that expertise, described as “the extent to which a speaker is perceived to be capable of making factual assertions,” and trustworthiness, which is “the degree to which an audience perceives the assertions made by a communicator are honest,” influence the persuasiveness of communication about food risks (260). Numerous similar studies identify trust as a multidimensional concept with affective and

cognitive components. Peters et al. (1997), for example, identify knowledge and expertise, openness and honesty, and concern and care as three categories of trust. Renn and Levine (1991) find that competence, objectivity, fairness, consistency and faith make up five components of trust. Finally, Johnson (1999) describes three groups of elements that explain reasons to trust, which are competence (i.e., credentials, experience, efficiency), care (i.e., openness and fairness, taking public interests into account), and consensual values (i.e., sharing the public's values) (Frewer and Miles 2003). In the end, although Peters et al. (1997), Renn and Levine (1991) and Johnson (1999) identify more than two categories of trust, each component that they identify falls within the scope of either the affective or cognitive dimensions of trust.

Further supporting the dual nature of trust identified by Hovland et al. (1953), Metlay (1999) examines the dimensionality of trust in risk regulation in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). In surveys administered to groups of those affected by DOE policies on the management of radioactive waste, Metlay includes eighteen items which tap empirically items identified in the field of research as the core elements of trust and confidence. The items tapped in the survey fell along two distinct dimensions: “the *affective elements*-openness, reliability, integrity, credibility, fairness, and caring-only fell along the first component,” whereas “the two items that spoke to *institutional competence* fell along the second” (106). Based on these results, Metlay concludes that trust is not complex and multifaceted, but “quite simple, depending on two distinctly different components or dimensions: (1) a tightly interconnected and intertwined set of affective beliefs about institutional behavior [called trustworthiness] and (2) how competent the institution appears to be” (101).

This characterization of trust consisting of both cognitive and affective elements continues to find empirical support. Taylor-Gooby (2006b) examines data on trust in the National Health Service (NHS) based on the British Social Attitudes Survey. Implementing factor analysis, two factors emerge: “Quality (concerned with objective aspects: level of staffing, condition of buildings, quality of care, etc.),” which identifies with the cognitive aspect of trust, and “Commitment (concerns more the way the service treated individuals: level of information, responsiveness to views and complaints, etc.);” which identifies with the affective dimension of trust (134). The results thus demonstrate that “these two aspects of NHS treatment are separate in the public mind, corresponding to the two dimensions in the work on trust” (134).

Also examining the need for trust in the field of health communication, Shore (2003) identifies trust as a multi-dimensional concept consisting of competence and conscience. Shore (2003, 13) notes:

At its most basic level, trust can be distilled down to perceived competence and conscience. Competence, or credibility, reflects how much one party believes that the other party has the required expertise to perform the agreed-upon duties effectively and reliably. Conscience refers to the extent to which one party believes that the other party intends to perform its agreed-upon activities and that those activities really benefit the first party.

Shore emphasizes the importance of trust in health care and public health situations, where information asymmetry between health care providers and the public increases the difficulty of judging the correctness of a public health recommendation. Therefore, it is essential for public health providers to build positive perceptions of competence, which have been eroded by the public airing of medical errors, as well as positive perceptions of

conscience, noting that “the public must believe that public officials have their best interests at heart” (Shore 2003, 14).

Other research similarly identifies components of trust along the same two dimensions (Frewer et al. 1996; Metlay 1999; Poortinga and Pidgeon 2003; Taylor-Gooby 2006b). According to Taylor-Gooby’s (2006b) assessment of the field of research, “almost all distinguish the capacity of the trustee to actually carry out the relevant task from the belief that the object of trust will actually provide for them, because, for example, she shares their values or is committed to them in some way” (131-132). This articulation of two dimensions similar to competence and trustworthiness is further echoed by other scholars. For instance, Calnan and Rowe (2006) define trust as “primarily consisting of a cognitive element (grounded on rational and instrumental judgments) and an affective dimension (grounded on relationships and affective bonds generated through interaction, empathy and identification with others)” (377). In addition, Carnevale (1995) distinguishes between “capacities” and “motivations,” Citrin and Luks (2001) refer to “the trustee’s competence and sense of fiduciary responsibility” (12-13), and Keele (2007) addresses the “capacity” and “integrity” of the trustee.

Studies of trust under conditions of risk or uncertainty also emphasize the affective dimensions of trust in addition to the cognitive. Taylor-Gooby (2008, 292) posits that:

Almost all the analyses distinguish the capacity of the trustee to perform the relevant task from the belief that she shares the trustor’s values, that she is, as it were, on the trustor’s side. The background assumption is that rational deliberation on track record may be a reasonable guide to competence, but trustworthiness – confidence that you are trusting someone who actually takes your interests to heart – requires an extrarational leap of faith supplied by affect or cultural factors. This ‘leap

of faith' is necessary to address uncertainty, where past record may not be a helpful guide.

Furthermore, the broader literature on decision-making under uncertainty articulates similar points, and “increasingly emphasizes the contribution of affective factors alongside deliberative factors, often formalized in ‘dual-process’ theory” (Taylor-Gooby 2008, 292; see also Epstein 1994; Finucane and Holup 2006; Schwarz 2000; Slovic 2000; Todd and Gigerenzer 2003). These findings are paralleled in sociological research. Barbalet (2002) posits that though rational procedures aid in the evaluation of risk, they do not apply in situations where trust is most important due to the existence of uncertainty, which limits the scope to apply reason (Taylor-Gooby 2008).

The Cognitive Element of Trust: Competence

Trust based on competence involves judgments of the trustee's ability to accomplish stated goals and to act consistently. It requires evidence of previous performance and information on service quality. Competence is a cognitive (or rational) element of trust that is “grounded on rational and instrumental judgments” (Calnan and Rowe 2006, 377). Ruscio (1996) refers to this as a calculative approach to trust that is based on an individual's calculation that their self-interest will be maximized by trusting another, or a “logic of consequences” (469).

According to Coleman (1990), rational determination of whether or not to trust is based on the expectation of gain or loss. Coleman argues that trust is a subcategory of risk, and requires a prediction about the actions of another individual. This prediction, expressed in terms of probability, is dependent on the situational circumstances and the information available to the trustor about the trustee, as well as the ratio of potential gains

and losses expected from trusting or choosing not to trust. The decision to trust is based on a formula including the following variables: “ p (the probability that the trustee is trustworthy); L (the potential loss if the trustee is untrustworthy); and G (the potential gain if the trustee is trustworthy). Trust will occur if the potential gain is worth the risk, or if: $p/1-p > L/G$ ” (Ruscio 1996, 466; see also Coleman 1990, 99). Coleman (1990) posits that, “This simple expression is based on the postulate of maximization of utility under risk”; further noting, “It is nothing more or less than the considerations a rational actor applies in deciding whether to place a bet” (99). Therefore, the decision to trust can be boiled down to whether it is in the interest of the trustor to grant trust based on the calculation of risk versus reward.

According to Taylor-Gooby (2008), “rational approaches have at their core the idea that trust is based on the deliberative consideration of evidence” (291). The rational approach, emphasizing risk and decisions based on self-interest, has dominated research in the field of economics (Dasgupta 2002), but has also played an influential role in political science research (Hardin 2002), as well as research in the fields of sociology and psychology (Coleman 1990; Gambetta 1988). The rational deliberative perspective emphasizes two main elements: future action and self-interest. In this perspective, “trust is based on judgments about whether the trusted person or institution is likely to act in the future in the appropriate way, and action is driven by interests” (Taylor-Gooby 2006b, 132). The rational approach suggests that, “trust results from rational, evidence-based judgment, taking into account such things as track record, monitoring arrangements, quality of staff and assumptions that the interests and likely future behaviour of the trusted body will be as predicted” (Taylor-Gooby 2008, 291).

The concept of encapsulated interest is one of the most theoretically well-developed examples of the rational approach to trust (Nannastad 2008). According to Hardin (1999), trust involves “reason to expect you to act, for your own reasons, *as my agent* with respect to the relevant matter. Your interest encapsulates my interests” (26). Hardin (2006) further fleshes out the theory of encapsulated interest, stating that, “[F]or us to trust you we must believe your motivations toward us are to serve our interests, broadly conceived, with respect to the issues at stake” (68). Therefore, the concept of encapsulated interest is based on “the incentive to make our interests part of your own” (Nannastad 2008, 414).

Levi and Stoker (2000) provide a similar definition of trust, in which trust is a function of our judgment of another’s incentive to pursue our interests, in addition to our assessment of their ability to do so (476). Kim (2005) further argues that, “Competency involves the knowledge and skills necessary for effective operations with the aim of maintaining or increasing organizational productivity” (626). When determining competence, it seems, an individual takes into account previous performance and service quality in order to make a rational judgment on whether or not to trust (Calnan and Rowe 2006). Furthermore, the importance of competency to citizen perceptions of trust in government has been identified by a number of scholars (Barns and Prior 1996; Berman 1997; Braithwaite 1998; Jennings 1998).

The Affective Element of Trust: Caring

In contrast, trust based on trustworthiness is the belief that the trustee will act in a manner that is not driven by the trustee’s self-interest, but instead takes into account the

interests of those on whose behalf they act when making decisions (Hardin 1998; LaPorte and Metlay 1996). Taylor-Gooby (2006a) describes this as the trustee “having the service-user’s interests at heart” (19). It is this dimension that Fukuyama (1995) refers to when explaining that trust implies the conviction to act for the common good.

Trustworthiness is thus an affective dimension that is “grounded on relationships and affective bonds generated through interaction, empathy and identification with others” (Calnan and Rowe 2006, 377). This noncalculative approach implies that a common ground exists among individuals that should be discovered and speaks to the importance of ethics and norms underlying behavior (or a “logic of appropriateness”) (Ruscio 1996, 469; see also March 1994, 100).

According to Ruscio (1996), rational behavior models of trust leave something “lacking or unspecified,” in that “the common understanding of trust suggests a suspension of calculation rather than an anticipation of benefits” (468). Ruscio (1996) points out that rational models of trust allude to two important points: “one of which is that trust is contextual and conditional rather than totally and absolutely granted or withdrawn. Another is that trust does indeed grant someone else the power to act. It has meaning only when the trustee is capable of violating the trust” (468). Therefore, flexibility and discretion must be included in a proper understanding of trust. While rational theories characterize trust as based on an “anticipation of benefits,” a “decision to grant power on the promise of a favorable return,” or a “gamble,” these concepts do not account for the potential of decisions involving a “suspension of calculation and granting of discretion based on some principle other than furthering of private interest” (Ruscio

1996, 468). This leads to the conclusion that rational theories of trust, which are not formulated to accept any nonrational explanation of behavior, are incomplete.

The nonrational approach to trust rejects the description of trust as an economic exchange based on self-interest or expected gain. Citing both the complexity and importance of trust in his refutation of rational models, political philosopher John Dunn (1993) argues, “[Trust] lies at the centre of all political processes; and it cannot be adequately modeled in terms of rational egoists pursuing clearly conceived individual interests” (1993, 641). Identifying similar concerns with rational models, March (1994) coined the term “logic of appropriateness” (100) explaining an alternative basis for trusting decisions. The logic of appropriateness takes into account institutional rules, norms and expectations in the decision-making process, factoring in decision-tools such as, “What is my role? What is the expectation? What rules apply to the situation?” (Ruscio 1996, 469). This is in contrast to the “logic of consequences,” grounded in the rational approach, that focuses on identifying objectives or alternatives and weighing the costs and benefits of achieving them (Ruscio 1996). March and Olsen (1989, 27-28) also reject the idea of trust as an economic exchange, and emphasize the importance of institutional rules as a decision-making factor:

The core idea of trust is that it is not based on an expectation of its justification. When trust is justified by expectations of positive reciprocal consequences, it is simply another version of economic exchange. . . . [Trust instead] is sustained by socialization into the structure of rules, and rarely considered as a deliberate willful action. Thus, trust can be undermined by persistent untrustworthiness, but it probably is more likely to be undermined by coming to see the granting of trust as part of a voluntary contractual agreement, rather than as one of the normal obligations of political life.

March and Olsen go so far as to argue that characterizing trust as a rational or contractual decision is counterproductive and likely to undermine perceptions of trustworthiness (Ruscio 1996).

According to Ruscio (1996), the noncalculative approach to trust does not reject the possibility that rational or strategic considerations will be taken into account in a decision to trust. Rather, this approach emphasizes the presence of ethical and moral obligations in the decision-process (Dunn 1993). Ruscio (1996) notes that, “Trust is more than an arrangement that promises benefits. It replaces the need for a calculation of benefits, and therefore it lies outside the analytical models of rational choice” (470). In other words, the rational models of trust are misspecified, and fail to account for additional components that influence the decision to trust.

Two weaknesses of calculative approaches to trust are failing to account for the influence of values and norms on behavior and failing to incorporate the possibility of a common public interest (Ruscio 1996). The calculative approach assumes that trust exists in a political environment that only allows for self-interested political action evidenced in the pluralistic struggle among competing interests, and provides no explanation for alternative motivations or the pursuit of a shared common good (Ruscio 1996). Rather, rational choice theorists base models of collective action on individually self-interested decisions that result in collectively acceptable outcomes. Rational models leave no room for pursuit of a common interest, only allowing for the aggregate pursuit of individual gain (Ruscio 1994; see also Downs 1967; Moe 1984; Niskanen 1971; Tullock 1965). Furthermore, the decision-making calculus of the rational model cannot account for decisions based on sacrifice for the good of others. According to Ruscio

(1996), due to these shortcomings, “the calculative approach based on rational choice explains trust far less satisfactorily than a noncalculative approach based on ethics and norms” (471).

Both normative and empirical critiques challenge the rational choice model. Ruscio (1996) states, “Normative critics question whether the self-interest axiom is correct, but even if it is correct they consider it wrong—that is, even if people do act on the basis of self-interest, they shouldn’t” (471). Critics of rational models of decision-making argue that these models “implicitly endorse, condone, even require a personal decision-making calculus that leaves little room for sacrifice for the good of others” (Ruscio 1996, 471). In addition, empirical studies question the validity of the rational model as a depiction of reality. Multiple studies have shown that the influence of other ethical and moral factors such as duty and love can be more powerful than self-interest (Mansbridge 1990; Mansbridge 1994).

For example, one strong empirical critique of rational choice theory’s assumption of self-interest as the overriding decision calculus arises in the research on public service motivation (PSM) in the bureaucracy. PSM indicates that those in the public sector are more likely to espouse values and engage in behaviors that are consistent with the image of a public steward rather than that of a self-interested utility-maximizer. Bureaucrats see themselves as “public servants” who receive internal satisfaction through making a contribution to society (Houston 2006; Perry 1996), and who are “characterized by an ethic built on benevolence, a life in service to others, and a desire to affect the community” (Houston 2006, 68). This research highlights the aspects of commitment to the public interest, community service and self-sacrifice that constitute PSM. This

assertion is supported by research finding different levels of PSM between public and private sector employees (Houston 2001; Houston 2011; Rainey 1982; Wittmer 1991). Houston (2011) finds that a comparison of those employed in public service occupations in both government and non-government sectors shows that the “locus” of an occupation is relevant in addition to its “focus.” He specifically states, “In an era of outsourcing and the provision of public services through networks of organizations, the public interest still is central to government organizations” (Houston 2011, 769). Further research supporting the existence of PSM shows that public employees place a higher value on intrinsic rewards, such as the importance of meaningful work and service to society (Crewson 1997; Frank and Lewis 2004; Houston 2000; Houston 2011), over extrinsic rewards, such as higher pay and promotion (Jurkiewicz, Massey, and Brown 1998).

Other studies conclude that public employees are more likely to possess altruistic attitudes than private employees (Rainey 1997), to possess a higher sense of civic duty (Conway 2000), and to more strongly support democratic values (Blair and Garand 1995). Furthermore, public employees are more likely to act in accordance with these attitudes than private employees. Public employees are more likely to perform civic activities than other citizens (Brewer 2003); they are more likely to take part in public service activities such as volunteering for charity and donating blood (Houston 2006); and they are more willing to engage in whistle-blowing to protect the public interest (Brewer and Selden 1998). Contrary to the rational choice literature, research has shown that the behavior and values of bureaucrats are not solely governed by self-interested, utility-maximizing behavior, but are influenced by a desire to serve the public.

Due to the relational context of trust, Choudhury (2008) notes that, “behaviors such as promise keeping, integrity, commitment, and authenticity contribute to trust” (592). These affective factors facilitate trust based on cultural norms and how these norms are enacted as stabilizing elements in relationships. Relational safety, based on both structural and situational factors is developed through mutual learning and reciprocal actions (Choudhury 2008). In many instances in the context of public administration, relationships are based on asymmetrical power and/or information, which affects perceptions of expectations inherent in a decision to grant trust. Overall, research demonstrates that both normative and strategic values lead to positive expectation. This could be based on belief in public employees’ commitment to the public interest, their competence, integrity, benevolence, or respect for citizens’ rights (Ruscio 1996). More specifically, the literature emphasizes the contribution of moral expectations over perceptions of competence (Hosmer 1995; MacLagan 1998; Ruppel and Harrington 2000; Uslaner 2002). For instance, in a study of trust at the local level of government Menzel (1995) finds that the perception of trust depends more on the public’s expectation of the benevolence and moral integrity of administrators. Additionally, a survey of employees by Mishra and Morrissey (1990) shows that ninety-three percent of respondents view trust as a belief in the integrity, character, and ability of others.

The affective dimension of trust emphasizes a commitment to the common good and serving the individual. According to Ruscio (1996), this aspect of trust is most important because “trust can be granted only when citizens seek a public interest and believe that public officials seek it with them” (474). In addition, Wang and Van Wart (2007) find that, “Public trust increases when public officials demonstrate integrity,

honesty, and moral leadership and when ethics are institutionalized in government through the process of participation” (276).

This noncalculative approach to trust can be referred to as caring, or “having the service-user’s interests at heart” (Taylor-Gooby 2006a, 19). This aspect of trust takes into account the ethical responsibilities of public administrators and denotes the conviction to act for the common good (Fukuyama 1995). Calnan and Rowe (2006) refer to this dimension of trust as being “grounded on relationships and affective bonds generated through interaction, empathy and identification with others” (377). According to Kim (2005), “citizens tend to trust in government when they feel that the government shows genuine care and concern for its citizens” (625), a hypothesis also supported by numerous authors (Berman 1997; Braithwaite 1998; Wicks, Berman, and Jones 1999). In this way, Tyler (1998) refers to trustworthiness as “the benevolence of motives of the authority” (270). Furthermore, recent research shows that citizens base evaluations of government on process considerations, such as the fairness, openness and responsiveness of government processes (Anderson et al. 2005; Donovan and Bowler 2004; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 1998; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2001; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002; Jiobu and Curry 2001; Miller and Borrelli 1991). Consequently, the caring aspect of trust can be discerned in how the government administrator treats the service-user, independent of whether or not the service-user receives benefits from the output of the public service.

The Importance of Trust

The trust of the people is essential to the proper functioning of government. As stated by Henry Clay in 1829, “Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people” (Hoyt 1922, np). This granting of power to the government, based on citizens’ trust that the government will act in the public interest, is at the foundation of democratic government. Therefore, maintaining that trust is essential to the continued legitimacy of government and to the execution of government powers. Barack Obama also stated in 2006, “If the people cannot trust their government to do the job for which it exists—to protect them and to promote their common welfare—all else is lost” (Obama 2006, np). Without the trust of the people, it appears, collaboration and compromise is obstructed, compliance with laws and regulations is diminished, and government action is impeded, thus rendering government ineffective. In order to better understand the role of trust in facilitating governance, then, it is necessary to explore how social trust, political trust, and particularized trust in public administrators make effective governance possible.

The Importance of Social Trust to Government Performance

Social capital theory suggests that trust between individuals, social or interpersonal trust, is necessary for the effective performance of democratic government. According to Putnam, “Social capital facilitates the kind of cooperation and collaboration needed to identify, adopt and implement effective policies for the community” (Putnam 1993, 182). Trust is an essential component of social capital that facilitates this cooperation because it “enables transactions to occur more easily and efficiently than if it

were not present” (Ruscio 1996, 463). Indeed, democratic governments have been found to perform better when the level of social capital in a community is high (Knack 2000; Rice 2001). According to Putnam (1993), interpersonal trust and other dimensions of social capital promote the efficiency and responsiveness of democratic government. Putnam (1993) finds that, “In the civic regions of Italy... social trust has long been a key ingredient in the ethos that has sustained economic dynamism and government performance” (170). Social trust supports better government performance by facilitating collective activity, improving government accountability, and enabling compromise between opposing interests.

First, social trust facilitates government performance by allowing citizens to better collaborate in collective activity. This enables citizens to express their preferences and voice their demands on government through civic engagement (Skocpol and Fiorina 1999). In addition, citizens can improve government accountability through collective activity by taking sanctioning action against government behavior that fails to comply with public expectations (Coleman 1990; Choudhury 2008; Pierce, Lovrich and Moon 2002; Scholz and Lubell 1998b). Social trust also increases the ability of the government to collaborate with citizens in the coproduction of public goods and services in areas such as health, safety, education, and environmental protection, thus establishing greater legitimacy for public policies (Schneider 1987).

In addition, social trust improves government performance in part by increasing accountability. Along these lines, Knack (2000) argues that “greater trust and more civic minded attitudes can improve governmental performance by affecting the level and character of political participation, reducing ‘rent-seeking’ and enhancing public-

interested behavior” (3). Higher levels of citizen information about public affairs and participation through such avenues as voting, letter writing, attending protest rallies, and gathering information about government actions serve as important checks on the ability of government officials to act in self-interested or unethical ways (Knack 2000). On the other hand, citizens who are less trusting and less civic minded “may find it rational not to vote, or to attend meetings or protest rallies, or even to acquire information about the performance of public officials,” contributing to collective action problems and decreasing government accountability (Knack 2000, 2). According to Putnam (2000), “Citizens in civic communities expect better government, and (in part through their own efforts) they get it... if decision makers expect citizens to hold them politically accountable, they are more inclined to temper their worst impulses rather than face public protests” (346). In contrast, citizens in less civically-minded regions are more likely to “assume the role of alienated and cynical supplicants” (Putnam 1993, 182), or to become ‘free riders’ who are “uninformed and unwilling to write letters or otherwise protest government malfeasance,” thus allowing public officials to “more easily indulge in patronage practices and other inefficient policies that serve narrow interests” (Knack 2000, 2).

High levels of social trust can also increase accountability by reducing the need for government monitoring. Mutual expectations of competence and probity between public officials, their subordinates and the public result in a cooperative equilibrium, “in which incompetent or dishonest behavior is more likely to be detected and less likely to be tolerated” (Knack 2000, 4). Putnam (1993) notes that attitudes toward government in less civic-minded regions of Italy identify government as a source of private goods, and

citizen initiated contacts with government “overwhelmingly involve requests for jobs and patronage” (101). However, in more civic-minded regions the attitude that government is a provider of needed and beneficial public goods is more widespread and citizen initiated contacts with government are more likely to concern public issues (Putnam 1993).

Furthermore, government officials from regions with higher levels of trust and civic mindedness may require less monitoring in the first place, assuming that government employees are representative of the greater population from which they derive (Knack 2000).

Finally, social trust also serves to improve government performance by decreasing inefficiencies caused by polarization and by improving the ability of government to respond to social challenges (Knack 2000). In fact, Putnam (1993) finds greater willingness to compromise between political opponents in Italian regions with more social trust. High levels of trust and strong norms of reciprocity facilitate compromise between opposing sides in adopting ground rules for debate and resolving disagreements (Putnam 2000, 339-344). The absence of trust, on the other hand, leads to more divisive and polarized politics, which can lessen flexibility in policymaking and make it “more difficult to agree on adoption and implementation of policies responding to new challenges or crises” (Knack 2000, 5). Lower levels of citizen information about, and participation in, public affairs contribute to polarization of the debate by allowing the extremes of the political spectrum to dominate the public agenda (Knack 2000). In addition, resistance to policy change by elites is more likely to occur when citizens are less civically-engaged. However, Putnam (1993) reports evidence that the more civically-engaged regions of Italy were much more successful than their counterparts in

dealing with new challenges arising in areas dealing with social welfare, economic development and environmental protection.

Consistent with these arguments, studies using regional, state-level and cross-national data support findings that greater levels of social trust promote better government performance. In a study of regional Italian governments, Putnam (1993) shows that the northern and central regions with higher levels of trust and civic mindedness provided more effective public services than the less trusting regions of the south. In addition, La Porta et al. (1997) and Knack and Keefer (1997), using cross-national World Values Survey data with samples from about 30 nations, find evidence consistent with that of Putnam, that countries with high levels of social trust had better measures of government performance than other countries. Knack and Keefer (1997) based measures of government performance on an index of confidence in government variables from citizen surveys and measures of bureaucratic efficiency, property rights and contract enforceability from index data created by firms evaluating risks to foreign investors, finding that each of these performance measures showed a significant positive correlation with social trust (Knack and Keefer 1997). Furthermore, Knack's (2000) study of the United States shows that states with higher levels of social capital, which is measured by an index of interpersonal trust, volunteering and census mail-in response, demonstrated higher levels of government performance, even when correcting for potential reverse causation from government performance to social capital levels. In this study, government performance was measured based on ratings by the Government Performance Project of *Governing* magazine and the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University (Barrett and Greene 1999; Knack 2000). These

findings were consistent with evidence reported by Rice and Sumberg's (1997) study of U.S. states, although very different measures of government performance and social capital were used, with performance measures reflecting policy liberalism and creativity and civic culture measured by public sector outcomes, such as library books per capita and crime rates (Knack 2000). These empirical studies highlight the significant positive impact of trust on government performance.

The Importance of Political Trust for Governance

Political trust, which is an evaluative orientation of "how well the government is operating according to people's normative expectations" (Hetherington 1998, 791), has been closely linked to social trust. According to social capital theory, political trust is a consequence of high levels of civic engagement and interpersonal trust (Putnam 2000). Research bears out these conclusions. Keele (2007) finds that social capital exerts a strong positive influence on the long-term changes in trust in government at the aggregate level. In addition, evaluating the influences of social capital at the individual level, Brehm and Rahn (1997) find that interpersonal trust has a very strong positive influence on political trust. Studies show that in addition to trusting one another, having confidence in the government is also essential to government performance and political leadership. Keele (2007) states that, "Without trust, leaders are unable to obtain citizen compliance without coercion, make lasting decisions, or commit resources needed for collective action" (242; see also Barber 1983; Levi 1997, Levi 1998; Scholz and Lubell 1998b; Scholz and Pinney 1995; Tufte 1990). In short, political trust creates the environment necessary for government to succeed (Hetherington 1998; Keele 2007).

Overall, political trust contributes to government legitimacy, facilitates government action, enables domestic policy liberalism, and encourages compliance with laws and regulations, especially under conditions of risk or uncertainty.

First, political trust is important to the legitimacy of democratic government. According to Cook, Jacobs and Kim (2010), “Trust in government is often identified as essential for compliance to the basic political order” (397; see also Barber 1983; Miller 1974a; Miller 1974b). Trust facilitates acceptance of, and compliance with, the rule of law and encourages cooperation with government officials, in that trusting citizens are more likely to think that they will be treated fairly under the law (Brehm and Rahn 1997; Tyler 1990). Trust increases the expectation that others also will follow the rules and comply with authorities, reducing the fear of being taken advantage of and facilitating acceptance of government decisions (Brehm and Rahn 1997). Empirical evidence supports findings that greater expectations of others’ compliance is positively correlated with confidence in authorities, as demonstrated in studies of support for criminal justice (Tyler 1990), taxpayer compliance (Levi 1988; Scholz and Pinney 1995), and willingness to comply with government-sponsored water bans (Tyler and Degoe 1995).

In addition, public trust makes government’s job easier by generating approval for public policies and facilitating government action. High levels of trust facilitate public support for political officials to increase taxation, spending and authority (Chanley, Rudolph and Rahn 2000). For instance, examining the management of radioactive waste, Metlay (1999) suggests that, “Trust and confidence legitimates institutions’ activities. The more the DOE was trusted, for example, the more an individual believed that the agency should retain its radioactive management functions” (110). Trust is especially

important in generating support for government policies when individuals do not receive benefits from a policy but contribute to paying the costs (Hetherington and Globetti 2002). Trust leads to a sense that such policies are fair, as those that carry the cost now also will benefit from having their needs met by government when the time comes.

Recent scholarship also identifies the influences of political trust in shaping public support for domestic policy liberalism (Chanley et al. 2000; Hetherington 2004; Hetherington and Globetti 2002). Until recently, political trust has been viewed as a reflection of citizen satisfaction with public policy. However, in an aggregate level time series analysis, Chanley et al. (2000) locate evidence of a causal link between political trust and policy mood, as measured by Stimson (1999). Hetherington (2004) outlines the causal connection between trust and policy attitudes, putting forth a theory in which political trust serves as a heuristic that helps citizens decide whether to support or oppose government spending in a particular policy area. He argues that citizens are more likely to support expanded services and increased spending when levels of trust in government, as the system delivering those services, are high. However, the utility of trust as a heuristic varies according to situational contexts and is activated when a particular policy carries the perception of risk or sacrifice (Rudolph and Evans 2005).

Specifically, trust works as a heuristic when “individuals are asked to sacrifice their own material interests for the advancement of political minorities” (Rudolph and Evans 2005, 662). Accordingly, redistributive policies, defined as “those in which costs may be widely distributed but benefits are narrowly concentrated” (Rudolph and Evans 2005, 661; see also Wilson 1973)—such as Medicaid, food stamps and other programs designed to alleviate the effects of poverty—rely on the use of tax money to provide

benefits to a small portion of the population, and thus are expected to be more greatly influenced by trust than distributive policies, those “in which both costs and benefits are universally distributed” (Rudolph and Evans 2005, 661; see also Hetherington 2004; Wilson 1973). Empirical findings support Hetherington’s sacrifice-based theory of political trust, evincing no relationship between political trust and support for distributive spending in areas such as “Social Security, crime prevention, environmental protection, and national defense” (Rudolph and Evans 2005, 661; see also Hetherington 2001, Hetherington 2004). However, empirical evidence shows that political trust is an important influence on support for “redistributive spending on policies concerning welfare, food stamps, childcare, public schools, health care, foreign aid, and the poor,” in addition to “race-targeted initiatives such as affirmative action, education quotas, and government aid to blacks” (Rudolph and Evans 2005, 662; see also Chanley et al. 2000; Hetherington 2004; Hetherington and Globetti 2002). Although, these effects “are attenuated among those who are not required to sacrifice, namely, members of beneficiary groups” (Rudolph and Evans 2005, 662; see also Hetherington 2004).

Finally, compliance facilitates program implementation and reduces the need to employ costly coercive tools. High levels of trust decrease the need for “heavy-handed enforcement and politically expensive coercion to control citizens’ behavior” (Brehm and Rahn 1997, 1003). Under conditions of low trust, program officials allocate more time and effort dealing with citizen complaints, time and effort that could otherwise be used to improve program implementation (Berman 1997). While coercion and threat are options for achieving compliance with public rules and programs, in addition to being expensive, it can be ineffective at gaining compliance (Murphy 2004). Compliance based on

internalized norms of interpersonal trust is more efficient than that based on the fear of authorities. Less trusting citizens rely on the government to protect them from the lawlessness of others, whereas those who are more trusting use government more efficiently to achieve collective purposes (Brehm and Rahn 1997; Gamson 1968; Putnam 1993; Uslaner 1994).

The importance of political trust for citizen compliance with government directives is most evident under conditions of uncertainty. Under these conditions, the public cannot assess the appropriateness of government decisions due to a lack of expertise, time, and/or capacity, all of which are further compromised via risk and uncertainty. This is when the trustor is most vulnerable because she is more reliant on another to act on her behalf. In fact, the public perception of risk is related to the level of trust individuals have in managers of programs designed to protect the public. For example, public trust has been linked with adherence to public health guidelines, such as participation in vaccination programs, as well as with compliance to evacuation orders during natural disasters. In addition, the importance of public trust has been highlighted in studies of risk management, especially related to management of technological hazards, such as nuclear waste.

Trust is an especially essential factor in public health, due to the likely inability of the general public to determine the rightness of a public health directive (Shore 2003). According to Alaszewski, “Trust is particularly important in health care given the uncertainties and major consequences of failing to manage risk” (2003, 235). In order to facilitate compliance with public health recommendations, Shore (2003) asserts that, “The public must believe that public health officials have their best interests at heart.

Indeed, it could be argued that we are not in the health care business—we are in the trust business” (14). Alaszewski (2003) argues, “The more willing the public are to trust the government, the more willing they will be to accept and act on the risk information which the government provides (Cabinet Office 2002)” (238). For example, research on public attitudes toward mandatory state health powers reveals that, “If the public does not trust government officials to supply relevant information and to take appropriate action, then public health agencies can expect higher degrees of conflict and noncompliance with government policies” (Taylor-Clark et al. 2005, 138). According to Taylor-Clark et al. (2005), high levels of uncertainty associated with attacks of bioterrorism necessitate the importance of gaining the public’s trust before an attack in order to facilitate effective response policies. In fact, this research shows “that several elements of distrust in government and other factors will likely play a significant role in shaping public attitudes toward emergency state health powers during times of crisis” (145), specifically regarding attitudes of public compliance with mandatory vaccination and quarantine measures (Taylor-Clark et al. 2005).

Many examples from research studies support the conclusion that trust is essential to facilitate compliance with public health directives, especially under conditions of uncertainty. According to research by Quinn et al. (2009) on the vaccination of postal workers during a recent anthrax attack, “those who chose to be vaccinated had a higher level of trust in public health professionals than did those who refused” (277). In addition, upon examining willingness to take a new vaccine in the context of the swine flu outbreak, Quinn et al. (2009) discover that “respondents who would accept the drug for themselves had a higher level of trust in the government than did those who refused,

as did those who accepted the drug for their children” (285). Furthermore, “during the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) epidemic in China in 2003, ... attitudes toward the government’s SARS prevention measures, including confidence in the government’s ability to control the spread of SARS, were linked to engagement in preventive health behaviors” (Quinn et al. 2009, 287). Larson and Heymann’s (2010) research on compliance with government vaccination efforts also shows that “lack of trust can cause health programs to fail with harmful consequences” (272). Looking at the MMR vaccine in the UK, they conclude that “historic levels of distrust...played a role in contributing to lower vaccine coverage and consequent disease outbreaks” (Larson and Heymann 2010, 271). Similarly, they find that “the loss of public confidence and vaccination boycott led to a resurgence of polio cases in Nigeria” (Larson and Heymann 2010, 271).

In addition, research on evacuation decisions of residents during hurricane Katrina poses another example of the role of trust in facilitating compliance with government directives under situations of uncertainty and risk. Research by Cordasco et al. (2007) examining the distrust of authorities among hurricane Katrina evacuees finds that “distrust of authorities, among numerous other factors, seems likely to have played a role in New Orleans residents’ reactions to evacuation warnings and public health authorities’ advice” (277). Although the government issued strong evacuation warnings that were followed by a mandatory evacuation order, “over 100,000 greater New Orleans residents failed to evacuate prior to the hurricane’s landfall” (277). According to Cordasco et. al. (2007), “the salience of trust and distrust was vividly demonstrated in interviews we performed” with Louisiana residents taking refuge in Houston evacuation

shelters (278), a topic that arose with frequency and depth of feeling from residents although interview questions did not include specific queries on this subject. Among respondents, “competency...was the category of distrust that was mentioned most frequently by interviewees” (278). In addition, other elements of trust were highlighted, such as perceived inequity, which were related to a belief “that the preparations or response were performed ineffectively or slowly because of the race or socioeconomic composition or their neighborhood” (278). Interviews also emphasized the fiduciary element of trust, in which people can trust others to act in their best interest, as being associated with many evacuees’ distrust, which was generally linked to “the common belief that the rich are privileged over the poor in disaster response...” (279). Overall, the loss of life, stemming in part from failure to comply with government evacuation orders in hurricane Katrina, highlights the importance of trust in facilitating citizen compliance with government policies. Accordingly, Cordasco et. al. (2007) state, “Faced with the knowledge that distrust hampers the success of recommended evacuations and other disaster responses, disaster and public health officials must learn how to build trust, a complex multidimensional phenomenon” (277-278).

Furthermore, trust has also been recognized as an important influence on risk perception, and is essential to facilitate citizen acceptance of government policies in risk management, especially in the case of nuclear waste management (Slovic 1999). Metlay (1999) argues that, “...when power is distributed unevenly, the trust relationship is more essential for the more dependent and less influential party” (114), which corresponds to the position of the public when deciding whether to trust government policies in risk management. According to Slovic (1999), “It is now evident that public perceptions and

acceptance of risk from nuclear and chemical technologies are not much influenced by technical risk assessments” (44), increasing the necessity for trust in government agencies undertaking risk management ventures. According to Raithatha et. al. (2003), “risk perception of a hazard depends as much upon the trust in the competence of risk managers...as it does on the risk characteristics of the hazard” (161). Scientific studies cannot allay public fears of low probability catastrophes without trust in the system, and without trust, risk assessment studies tend to increase the perception of risk by uncovering bad news (Slovic 1999). Larson and Heymann (2010) point out that “times of uncertainty and risk are times when public trust is most needed. But trust is built long before the time that trust matters most” (271).

Numerous studies emphasize lack of trust as a significant factor underlying the controversy surrounding management of technological hazards (Flynn, Bums, Mertz, and Slovic 1992; Jenkins-Smith 1992; Pijawka and Mushkatel 1992; Slovic 1999). In addition, many studies also indicate that government and industry officials who oversee the management of nuclear power and nonmedical chemicals are not highly trusted (Mertz et al. 1992; Pijawka and Mushkatel 1992; Slovic 1999; Slovic, Flynn, and Layman 1991). Citizen opposition to nuclear waste management plans have been identified as “a ‘crisis in confidence,’ a profound breakdown of trust in the scientific, governmental, and industrial managers of nuclear technologies” (Slovic 1999, 44). Additionally, trust in public organizations (DOE, NRC) responsible for protecting the public from the hazards of nuclear waste generated by commercial reactors and the production of nuclear weapons has been found to be low (Pijawka and Mushkatel 1992). Furthermore, low levels of trust have been identified as a key determinant in opposition

to the siting of waste management facilities (Pijawka and Mushkatel 1992). This lack of trust has been a significant barrier to the Department of Energy's program to establish a national nuclear waste repository, which has been thwarted by strong public opposition based on perceptions of immense and unacceptable risk (Slovic et al. 1991). Risk communication efforts have not been effective in reducing perceptions of risk which "can be attributed to the lack of trust....Thus trust is more fundamental to conflict resolution than is risk communication" (Slovic 1999, 45).

In order to increase public acceptance of government risk management strategies, government agencies must facilitate greater public trust. According to Slovic's assessment of risk perception and trust in democracy, a heavier reliance on science and technocrats to make decisions for the public in situations of risk management, effective in France, will be unworkable in the United States due to a lower threshold of trust in experts. Therefore, a more feasible solution for "restoration of trust may require a degree of openness and involvement with the public that goes far beyond public relations, and 'two-way communication' to encompass levels of power sharing and public participation in a decision-making that have rarely been attempted...." (Slovic 1999, 51). Metlay's (1999) studies of trust and risk management highlight similar themes. His research shows that it is not only competence that is related to trust in government institutions, but also affective elements of trust, including, "openness, reliability, integrity, credibility, fairness and caring" (106) that correlate with higher levels of trust. He specifically says, "Trust and confidence legitimates institutions' activities. The more the DOE was trusted, for example, the more an individual believed that the agency should retain its radioactive management functions" (Metlay 1999, 110).

The Importance of Particularized Trust in Public Administrators

Political trust, and specifically trust in the bureaucracy and its administrators, has been identified by scholars and practitioners alike as an essential component of effective administration. In fact, Robert Behn (1995) argues that trust is one of the “three big questions” of public management. Scholars of public administration have long identified “trust as an important condition of legitimacy, effectiveness, and integrity of public agencies” (Choudhury 2008, 587; see also Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2003; Carnevale 1995; Carnevale and Wechsler 1992; Denhardt 2002; Dilulio, Garvey, and Kettl 1993; Goodsell 2006; Kim 2005; La Porte and Metlay 1996; Marlowe 2004; Mitchell and Scott 1987; Nyhan 2000; Ruscio 1999; Thomas 1998; Yang and Holzer 2006). According to Charles Goodsell (2006), “administration’s highest purpose is to build the public trust that makes democracy possible” (623). Trust in public administrators is so essential because “bureaucracy is the largest arm of modern government and the one that most regularly interacts with citizens in their ordinary lives” (Van Ryzin 2011, 10). In sum, bureaucracy is the intersection of government and the people. If bureaucrats do not have the faith and confidence of the public, citizens may be less likely to comply with regulations and to participate in the coproduction of public services that are vital to society (Bovaird 2007; Brudney and England 1983; Van Ryzin 2011; Whitaker 1980). In order to facilitate this trust in administration that is so important to a well-functioning civil society, Goodsell (2006) points out that “legality, integrity, efficiency, effectiveness, involvement, dependability, transparency, and fairness” must be strengthened (633). High levels of trust in the public bureaucracy decrease the need for excessive oversight, reduce calls for bureaucratic reform, and improve employee morale and recruitment.

First, trust in the bureaucracy decreases the need for excessive mechanisms of control, thus reducing obtrusive monitoring, lessening sanctions and facilitating organizational adaptability (Choudhury 2008; Spreitzer and Mishra 1999). On the other hand, a lack of trust leads to excessive micromanagement of bureaucratic operations by legislatures and political appointees, leading to a reduction in flexibility and discretion. A low level of trust “hinders informal relationships and leads to an excessive dependence on rules, formal procedures, regulations, and legalism” (Ruscio 1996, 463). In this way, excessive micromanagement compromises the performance of the public bureaucracy (Austin and Larkey 1992; Behn 1995).

As citizen trust in the bureaucracy increases, excessive oversight decreases and public administrators are entrusted with more discretion and flexibility in carrying out their roles. High levels of trust in the bureaucracy contribute to the increased value of employee participation (Choudhury 2008; Cook et al. 2005; Dyer and Chu 2003; Kramer 1999). This incorporates “greater employee involvement in decision making, giving timely and accurate feedback, listening to and accepting criticisms non-defensively, and creating a climate for experimentation and group problem solving” (Choudhury 2008, 587; see also Dyer and Chu 2003; Kramer 1999; Mishra and Morrissey 1990; Perry 2004; Zand 1972; Zand 1997). In turn, increased employee participation leads to higher levels of employee commitment and satisfaction, as well as increased competency and improved performance (Heintzman and Marson 2005). Subsequently, the more that citizens and elected officials trust government administration, the greater the amount of discretion that is entrusted to administrators (Marlowe 2004).

In addition, this link between low trust, excessive micromanagement, and reduced bureaucratic performance is at the base of bureaucratic reform efforts offered by the Winter Commission (National Commission on the State and Local Public Service 1993) and the National Performance Review (1993). The Winter Commission worked to “move us away from an encrusted and outmoded system of command and control and its rule-bound management that emphasizes constraints and process” (National Commission on the State and Local Public Service 1993, 2). Likewise, the National Performance Review (1993) aimed to eliminate “the structures of over control and micromanagement that bind the federal government” (iii). Identifying lack of trust between government units and micromanagement as sources of inefficiency, the National Performance Review (1993) concluded, “We cannot expect employees to give us their best work unless we eliminate much of the red tape that now prevents it” (14). According to Ruscio (1996) distrust “exists between citizens and their government, between the separate institutions within government, between the branches of government, and between political appointees and career civil servants,” hindering the effective functioning and performance of public administration (463).

Finally, these low levels of trust harm morale, recruitment, and retention of public employees (Soni 2004). The existence of a “quiet crisis” in public service has been linked to declining confidence in government and persistent “bureaucrat bashing” that has become a constant in political campaigns (Light 2002; Garrett et al. 2006). According to Light (2008), “ordinary citizens are not the only ones who have come to distrust government. Federal employees themselves show little trust in their own organizations” (416). Beyond lowering employee morale, the negative image of public

service has resulted in government becoming a less attractive career path for those entering the workforce than it was for previous generations (Chetkovich 2003). Furthermore, a 2002 and 2003 survey among college seniors suggests that few would want a federal job, even if they could get one (Light 2008).

The State of Public Trust

Social scientists have long observed declining public trust in government in the United States (Alford 2001; Orren 1997; Van Ryzin 2011). This “crisis” observed by James Sundquist in 1980 followed a period of dramatic political and economic turmoil. According to Ruscio (1996, 462):

Torn by the military and political failure in Vietnam, political assassinations of revered and charismatic leaders, the scandal of Watergate, and the energy shortages imposed on a country now apparently dependent on other countries, American citizens lost faith in the ability of the country to solve its problems.

Yet, over the past thirty years the level of American discontent has only worsened, leading to a dismal conclusion: “If 1980 was a crisis, no words appear to be left to describe today's situation” (Ruscio 1996, 462).

Reviewing the extensive literature on trust, Levi and Stoker (2000) contend that “variations in political trust reflect more than incumbent-specific satisfactions or dissatisfactions” or specific events in history such as the Vietnam War and Watergate (483). Examining the multiple and interrelated hypotheses proposed to explain declining trust in government, which include perceptions of government performance (Orren 1997), economic change (Bok 1997), declining social capital (Mansbridge 1997), postmaterialist values (Inglehart 1997), and party polarization (King 1997), Nye (1997)

points out that each, at best, provides only a partial explanation of complex causes (Tolbert and Mossberger 2006). In addition, Hetherington (1998) notes that, “While decisive leadership and economic success may have occasionally increased political trust (Citrin and Green 1986), such increases have proved fleeting” (791), failing to explain or reverse the overall declining trend in trust.

While a multitude of factors have been examined in the search for the underlying causes of trust, surveys show that government inefficiency and waste are most commonly given as reasons for low trust in government. In addition, “politics are increasingly characterized by ‘critical citizens’ who have heightened expectations of government and low evaluations of the performance of both government agencies and representative institutions” (Tolbert and Mossberger 2006, 356). In response to performance concerns, an entire reform movement has developed to restore the public’s trust (Nye et al. 1997) by seeking to improve the operation and performance of government programs through increased efficiency and decreased waste and corruption (Cook, Jacobs, and Kim 2010; Chanley et al. 2000; Hetherington 1998). Despite a new focus on better government performance (Bok 1997), “nowhere does the long-term trend in trust of government appear to be rising” (Van Ryzin 2011, 1).

Attitudes toward the Federal Government

Citizen attitudes toward government in America are growing increasingly negative. According to the Pew Research Center for The People and The Press (2010), “by almost every conceivable measure Americans are less positive and more critical of government these days” (1). Citizen trust in the federal government is currently at one of

the lowest levels in a half century. Only 22% of Americans trust the government to do what is right, a figure further distilled with 3% invoking such trust “just about always” and 19% doing so “most of the time.” The contrast is stark in comparison to levels of trust in government in 1958 (the year this question was first asked by the National Election Study), when 73% of Americans trusted the government to do what is right just about always or most of the time (ANES 2010). Current low levels of trust have not been experienced since 1994, when trust levels reached a low of 17%, and 1980, when levels bottomed out at 25% (Pew 2010). Similarly, the 2008 American National Election Study (2010) reported only 30% of respondents “can trust the government in Washington to do what is right” either “most of the time” or “just about always,” the lowest figure since 1994.

Other measures of attitudes toward the federal government show similar levels of dissatisfaction. According to a 2011 Gallup Poll, “a record-high 81% of Americans are dissatisfied with the way the country is being governed, adding to negativity that has been building over the past 10 years” (Saad 2011a). In addition, according to a 2011 Gallup Poll, “at 43%, fewer Americans today than at any time in the past four decades say they have a great deal or fair amount of trust in the federal government to handle domestic problems,” which is lower than the 58% average since 1972. Americans’ faith in Washington to handle international problems (57%) is also lower than the 65% average since 1972 (Saad 2011a). The majority of Americans consistently express feelings of frustration with the federal government, with smaller numbers saying they are “basically content” or greater numbers saying they are “angry.” Fewer Americans today (19%) are “basically content” with the federal government than in 1997 (29%), while the

number of Americans with feelings of anger toward the federal government has risen by 9 percentage points to 21% (Pew 2010). As in 1997, only about a quarter of Americans today say that the federal government does an “excellent” or “good job” running its programs. However, those saying that the federal government does a “poor job” have increased from 21% in 1997 to 28% today (Pew 2010).

In addition, 70% of Americans identify waste and inefficiency as a major problem and more than six-in-ten (62%) view government policies benefiting some groups unfairly to be a major problem. Concerning wastefulness, “Americans, on average, think the federal government in Washington wastes 51 cents of every tax dollar, the highest estimated proportion of waste Gallup has found on this measure in trends dating to 1979” (Saad 2011a). Beyond that, 50% of Americans say that although the federal government has the right priorities, the bigger problem is running its programs inefficiently. However, 38% of Americans say the government has the wrong priorities, up sharply from 29% in 1997 (Pew 2010). Further demonstrating American dissatisfaction with government, the percentage of Americans that say the federal government needs “very major” reform has increased drastically from 37% in 1997 to 53% today (Pew 2010).

Attitudes toward the Three Branches of Government

In addition to negative views of the federal government in general, American opinions of Congress are also decidedly low. Measuring trust and confidence in Congress, the 2012 Gallup poll found that only 34% of Americans have a great deal or fair amount of confidence in the legislative branch, which is lower than the percentage who are confident in the executive (56%) or judicial (67%) branch, and represents a small

increase over the all-time low recorded in 2011 (31%) (Newport 2012). Only 25% of Americans hold a favorable opinion of Congress, which “is the lowest favorable rating for Congress in a quarter century of Pew Research Center surveys” (Pew 2010, 2). Further, “close to two-thirds (65%) say they have an unfavorable opinion of Congress; 30% of those say *very* unfavorable,” making these numbers the most negative recorded since the survey began in 1985 (Pew 2010, 45). Although Congress’ job approval rating rallied briefly after the 9/11 attacks, the trend has been declining since about 2000, with only 15% of Americans approving of Congress in September of 2011, which is two points above the all-time low reached twice in the preceding year (Saad 2011a).

Americans find the members of Congress themselves, as opposed to the system, at fault. The majority of Americans (52%) believe that the political system can work fine, but it is the members of Congress themselves that are the problem, while some (38%) contend that the members are well-intentioned, and it is the political system that is broken (Pew 2010). Responses to questions measuring aspects of congressional performance are overwhelmingly negative, much lower than 2005 levels (the last time this series of questions was asked). While 29% of Americans gave Congress a rating of poor for acting ethically and honestly five years ago, 50% of Americans now rate Congressional ethics as poor (31% say only fair, and 13% say excellent or good). Similarly, 55% of Americans (up from 38% in 2005) rate Congress as poor when it comes to understanding the needs of the people, with only 12% rating Congress as excellent or good (Pew 2010). In addition, “nearly two-thirds of Americans (65%) say that Congress is having a negative effect on the way things are going in this country today” (Pew 2010, 53).

Looking at the presidency, “four-in-ten say that the Obama administration does an excellent (10%) or good (30%) job.” However, “a majority (58%) says it does only fair or poor” (Pew 2010, 58). This evaluation of the Obama administration is lower than the President’s job approval rating, which is 48% approval. Yet, “more than twice as many people give the Obama administration positive job marks as rate the job performance of Congress positively; just 17% say Congress is doing an excellent (2%) or good job (15%) while 80% say it has done only fair (40%) or poor (40%)” (Pew 2011, 58).

Of the three branches of government, Americans trust the judicial branch most with 67% having a great deal or fair amount of confidence in 2012. Trust in the courts has been high over time, having maintained confidence levels between 63% and 80% since 1972, reaching its peak in the late 1990’s. In addition, except for 1972, the judicial branch has always demonstrated higher levels of trust than the other two branches of government, although at several points by a slim margin (Newport 2012). However, in 2011 trust levels fell to match the lowest point previously recorded in 1976, at 63%. Low approval ratings for the Supreme Court further illustrate more negative attitudes. At the beginning of the 2011-2012 term, the approval rating of the Supreme Court was 46%, which represented a drop of 5 percentage points from the previous year and 15 points from 2009 (Jones 2011).

Attitudes toward State and Local Government

In contrast to low favorability ratings for Congress, the Obama administration, and the federal government generally, attitudes toward state and local governments are more positive. According to Gallup, when asked about the ability of state and local

governments to handle problems, two-thirds of Americans have a great deal or fair amount of confidence in their local government (68%), and a clear majority feel the same way about their state government (57%) (Saad 2011b). This is compared to the 47% of respondents who had a “great deal” or a “fair amount” of confidence in the federal executive to handle problems and only 31% for Congress (Saad 2011b). Looking at changes in confidence in the different levels of government over the last decade, only local governments retained the same levels of trust over the years. In comparison to 1997, trust in state government has fallen 11 percentage points and trust in the executive and legislative branches of the federal government has decreased by 15 points or more (Saad 2011b). When asked about the impact of government on their day-to-day life, respondents were similarly more critical of the federal government, with 38% of respondents indicating that the federal government has a positive impact on their day-to-day life today, down from 50% in 1997. However, despite more positive responses to state (42%) and local government (51%), these numbers also were down in comparison to 1974 (62% and 64%, respectively) (Pew 2010).

Attitudes toward Public Administrators and Federal Agencies

Looking at specific government actors, American attitudes toward public administrators are more positive than attitudes toward elected officials. According to the 2011 Gallup Poll, American confidence in elected officials is at a new low, recently declining from 66% in 2008 to 49% in 2009 to 45% in 2011. While Americans have traditionally had more positive views of those holding public office, since 2009 American opinion has been more negative than positive on this matter (Saad 2011a). No single

criticism dominates when describing the ills of elected officials, but majorities across party lines identify problems of elected officials being wasteful with government dollars (83%), unduly influenced by special interests (82%), excessively concerned with their own careers (81%), out of touch with “main street” Americans (76%), and unwilling to compromise (78%) (Pew 2011). However, Americans are more trusting of non-elected government officials (Pew 1998). For instance, a Harris Poll (2006) asked, “Would you generally trust each of the following types of people to tell the truth or not?” Sixty-two percent of respondents indicated that they would trust civil servants to tell the truth, while 48% would trust the president and only 35% would trust members of Congress. A similar pattern was found by the Council for Excellence in Government Survey (2006), as 31% of respondents reported to have “a great deal” or “quite a lot of confidence” in “civil servants or people who work for government,” as compared to 25% for “the president and cabinet officials” and 16% for members of Congress.

Also, in terms of institutions, federal agencies are more highly regarded by Americans than is Congress. Even so, in 2010 only 31% of respondents to a Pew poll indicated that federal agencies and departments were responsible for a positive “effect on way things are going in the country” and 54% indicated that the effect was negative (Pew 2010). While critical in the abstract, opinions of specific agencies or bureaucratic interactions are more positive (Goodsell 2004). In 2010, a majority of respondents gave a favorable rating to 10 of 13 federal departments or agencies presented. However, these favorable ratings were down for most departments or agencies when compared to responses from a 1998 poll (Pew 2010). Of the 13 federal agencies evaluated, favorability ratings for six have fallen by double digits since 1998, including the

Department of Education (21 points), the Food and Drug Administration, (17 points), the Social Security Administration (13 points), the Environmental Protection Agency, (12 points), the Centers for Disease Control, (12 points), and the National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA) (12 points). General evaluations of the performance of federal agencies are mixed. Clear majorities give excellent or good job ratings to six of fifteen federal agencies including, the military (80%), the Postal Service (70%), the CDC (62%), the Defense Department (60%), NASA (57%) and the FBI (58%). Other agencies receive especially low ratings, with only a third (33%) of Americans saying the Department of Education does an excellent or good job, joined in low standing by the Social Security Administration (36%), Justice Department (38%) and IRS (40%) (Pew 2010). Both favorability ratings and performance ratings, however, are higher for even the most lowly-esteemed federal agencies than they are for Congress.

Conclusion

In sum, the American public has become more critical and distrusting of government institutions and actors. However, in comparison to general attitudes toward the federal government, elected officials, and Congress in particular, attitudes toward federal agencies and public administrators are more positive. A considerable amount of scholarly research has been devoted to studying general attitudes toward government and to several specific institutions (i.e., the President, the Congress, and the Supreme Court). On the other hand, much less is known about attitudes toward government administrators and how citizen evaluations of administrators influence overall attitudes toward government. Further research is needed in order to more fully examine citizen attitudes

toward public administrators and their relationship to general assessments of trust in government.

CHAPTER III

EXPERIENCE WITH THE PUBLIC BUREAUCRACY AND TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

Introduction

In response to declining trust in government, the reforms of the New Public Management have taken hold in governments around the world. Based on the performance-trust hypothesis, which emphasizes better government performance as the key to enhanced citizen satisfaction with public services, and as a result, higher levels of citizen trust in government, the New Public Management has made performance, efficiency, and getting results that matter the core values of bureaucratic reform. Despite widespread implementation of the New Public Management reforms, thorough empirical assessment of the assumptions implicit in the performance-trust hypothesis has been lacking. In addition, the gains in trust anticipated by reformers have yet to be seen. Therefore, it is necessary to further evaluate the performance-trust hypothesis in order to form a better understanding of the relationship between performance, service satisfaction and trust in government, and to explore the role of citizen experiences with government services and citizen perceptions of government administrators implicit in this hypothesis.

The New Public Management and the Performance-Trust Hypothesis

The decline of citizen trust in government, which has been identified as “one of the dilemmas of modern governance,” has been at the center of much scholarly research and debate (Tolbert and Mossberger 2006, 354; see also Levi and Stoker 2000; Nye et al. 1997). Among the multitude of reform proposals geared to resolve this problem, those

advocating market-based, entrepreneurial reforms focusing on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government management and performance have taken hold most widely (National Performance Review 1993; Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Peters 2001). Dubbed the 'New Public Management,' this popular reform movement encourages the use of private sector techniques, market mechanisms and a customer service orientation, as well as a focus on outputs and performance measurement, in order to create results that inspire greater citizen trust in government (Bekke and van der Meer 2000; Kaboolian 1998). These reform efforts based on the principles of New Public Management have been implemented internationally, with examples including Reinventing Government in the United States, La Rélève in Canada, The Next Steps Program in the United Kingdom, and the Copernicus reform in Belgium (Barnes and Gill 2000; Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2003; Gelders and Van de Walle 2007).

New Public Management is rooted in the premises of public choice theory. According to this theory, which is based on the assumptions of neoclassical economics and rational choice theory, individuals are characterized as rational, self-interested utility maximizers. Applied to collective decision-making, public choice theory holds that the same market mechanisms of supply and demand that govern the private marketplace can also be used for public institutions. Therefore, collective choices can be made through the aggregation of individual preferences, and public institutions should be designed in order to reflect these preferences (Ostrom and Ostrom 1971). Using the market as a model for political and administrative relationships, the roles of participants in the political administrative process, such as voter, bureaucrat, elected representative and interest groups are based on market analogies (Kaboolian 1998; Self 1993). In addition,

systems of policy-making, implementation and service delivery are explained as economic transactions, and concerns of principal-agent theory—such as information asymmetry, capture, rent seeking, compliance monitoring, and moral hazard—govern models of bureaucratic behavior (Kaboolian 1998; Lane 1993). New Public Management applies private sector market-based principles of efficiency, cost-benefit analysis, and productivity to the public sector (Jennings 1991).

According to Kaboolian (1998), the overarching goal of the New Public Management is to “maximize productive and allocative efficiencies that are hampered by ‘bureau-pathology,’” which is described as “public agencies unresponsive to the demands of citizens, led by bureaucrats with the power and incentives to expand their administrative empires and policy spaces” (190). Further critiquing traditional bureaucracy, the National Performance Review characterizes government as “filled with good people trapped in bad systems: budget systems, personnel systems, procurement systems, financial management systems, information systems” (National Performance Review 1993, 2). Eschewing the hierarchy and centralization of traditional bureaucracy as inefficient and monopolistic, New Public Management emphasizes deregulation as the recommended course of action, promoting increased discretion for managers, decentralized authority, and less ‘red tape’ (Horner 1994; Kettl 1997).

The New Public Management exemplifies the principles of public choice theory applied in the administration of the bureaucracy, representing a global reform movement based on improving productivity, leveraging market competition, increasing customer satisfaction, decentralizing decision-making, developing better policy implementation, and enhancing government accountability (Kettl 2000). New Public Management

focuses on shifting power from traditional policy actors to entrepreneurs in diverse policy networks (Peters and Pierre 1998), and emphasizes the importance of making government more responsive to citizens and drawing on the tools of market-like competition to decrease inefficiencies and improve responsiveness (Peters and Pierre 2000). This reform movement is results-oriented, focusing on outputs and ensuring that government's product satisfies the consumer (Frederickson and Smith 2003). Also, New Public Management envisions the role of government as steering rather than rowing, where government administrators set policy objectives and leave the actions geared toward achieving those objectives to relevant policy networks (Osborne and Gaebler 1993). The New Public Management argues that by increasing competition in the production of government services, government production and consumer preferences are best matched, maximizing consumer choice and government efficiency. Thus, according to New Public Management, market forces create responsiveness to the people's interests and form an articulation of democratic accountability.

The launch of the National Performance Review by the Clinton Administration and the passage of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) by Congress marked the inception of the New Public Management movement in the United States. Based on the influential book, *Reinventing Government* by Osborne and Gaebler (1992), the New Public Management movement "sought to establish performance measurement systems to track outcomes and to design incentives to focus the federal bureaucracy on achieving and demonstrating results" (Van Ryzin 2011, 2). This focus on performance outcomes in the *Reinventing Government* reforms was explicitly based on the rationale of restoring American people's trust in government (Van Ryzin 2011). The importance of

improving trust levels is evidenced in the preamble of the GPRA legislation, in which the first purpose stated is to “improve the confidence of the American people in the capability of the Federal Government, by systematically holding Federal agencies accountable for achieving program results” (GPRA Sec. 2(b)(1)). Vice President Gore (1993, i) further reinforced trust as the focus of government reform in the preface to the Report of the National Performance Review, in which he stated:

The National Performance Review can reduce the deficit further, but it is not just about cutting spending. It is also about closing the trust deficit: proving to the American people that their tax dollars will be treated with respect for the hard work that earned them. We are taking action to put America’s house in order.

The assumption that a better performing, results-oriented government would spark a response in citizen trust was part of the “core rationale” of the New Public Management reform movement that swept across the United States, Europe and the world (Van Ryzin 2011, 2; see also Kettl 2005).

The underlying hypothesis of the New Public Management reforms is that a better performing government leads to greater levels of citizen trust in government. Termed the performance-trust hypothesis, the implicit assumption is that “better performing public services will lead to increased satisfaction among their users, and this, in turn, will lead to more trust in government” (Van de Wall and Bouckaert 2003, 892). Emphasizing customer service and managing for results, performance measurement in the New Public Management reform movement is often defined in terms of customer satisfaction, which forms the link between government performance outcomes and citizen trust (Aberbach and Christensen 2005; Kettl 2000; Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Van Ryzin 2007).

Examining the Satisfaction Link of the Performance-Trust Hypothesis

In order to better understand the links of the performance-trust hypothesis, it is necessary to evaluate empirical research exploring the relationship between service satisfaction and trust in government. Research at the local, federal, and national levels, in addition to studies of particular public agencies, support this link in the performance-trust hypothesis, demonstrating a positive relationship between satisfaction and trust.

First, empirical research has shown that satisfaction with local government services is positively correlated with trust in government officials. Lyons, Lowery, and DeHoog (1992) find, in a study of the cities of Louisville and Lexington, Kentucky, that trust is a major response to citizen evaluations of satisfaction with local government performance. Also exploring the link between government performance and citizen satisfaction, Van Ryzin, et al. (2004) applied the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) model to survey data on residents of New York City. They determine that citizen satisfaction with government performance is positively correlated with trust in government. Further examining behavioral consequences of citizen satisfaction with government, Van Ryzin's (2004) online study of a national panel of U.S. residents reflects that citizen satisfaction with local government services was positively correlated with both increased trust and increased confidence in local government officials. These empirical studies support the theoretical model of the relationship between government performance, citizen satisfaction and trust examined by Van Ryzin (2007).

Examining the relationship between satisfaction and trust at the federal level, the American Customer Satisfaction Index, conducted by Claes Fornell (2002) of the

University of Michigan, has provided a measure of public satisfaction with federal government services since 1999. Fornell's (2002) assessment of data from 1999 to 2002 suggests that service satisfaction is causally connected to increased trust in government. Additionally, he determines that increased ACSI scores are also related to a rise in trust over time, which is measured as "public confidence that agencies will do a good job in the future" (Heintzman and Marson 2005, 556; see also Fornell 2002).

In addition, a growing international literature explores linkages among performance, citizen satisfaction and trust (Bouckaert and Van de Wall 2003; Bouckaert et al. 2005; Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Heintzman and Marson 2005; Van de Wall and Bouckaert 2003; Vigoda-Gadot and Yuval 2003). Employing structural equation modeling, Vigoda-Gadot and Yuval's (2003) study of citizen satisfaction with government performance in Israel finds a positive relationship between citizen perceptions of government performance and trust in government. Studies examining the link between service quality and trust have also been conducted in Canada. A Canadian national study titled, *Citizens First 3* (2003), has explored the relationship between service quality and confidence in government. The study "provide[s] empirical evidence for a causal linkage between service performance and confidence in government," concluding that "the linkage only operates in one direction—service performance impacts confidence in government, but not vice versa" (Heintzman and Marson 2005, 559). Although this study was not able to control for socio-demographic or cultural variables, the service variables included in the model did account for sixty-seven percent of variance in the dependent variable, which consisted of four questions pertaining to general confidence and performance. Despite this high explanatory power, Heintzman

and Marson (2005) acknowledge that “it is also possible that the proxy variable for confidence in government needs additional elements, including a direct question on trust and confidence” (559).

Examining citizen evaluations of particular public institutions such as police, hospitals and local councils, the MORI study in the United Kingdom shows a strong relationship between evaluations of service quality and trust in specific public institutions (Heintzman and Marson 2005). This distinction between trust in particular institutions, as opposed to the bureaucracy as a whole or government in general, is important—as research on service satisfaction shows that citizens are likely to rate recent experiences with particular government services more highly than they rate government as a whole (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2003). Explaining this phenomenon, Goodsell (1994) points out that abstract questions concerning government or the bureaucracy as a whole are more likely to measure general attitudes, whereas specific questions pertaining to service delivery of a particular agency are likely to tap evaluations of personal experiences, and thus generally render more positive responses (Goodsell 1994).

In addition, in their study of citizen evaluations of government in Flanders, Kampen, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2003) show that citizens make a distinction between trust in public agencies and trust in political bodies. They find that “satisfaction with the federal government and the working of democracy have an impact on the level of trust, but . . . the largest effect comes from satisfaction with the public administrations and services” (Kampen et al. 2003, 2). Therefore, overall trust in government is impacted by both evaluations of the political branches and the performance of the bureaucracy,

with public service delivery having the greater impact on overall trust in government (Heintzman and Marson 2005).

In order to better understand and evaluate the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, I seek to empirically examine the relationship among performance, citizen satisfaction and trust. The analysis above shows that many studies have found a positive relationship between citizen satisfaction with government services and trust (Bouckaert and Van de Wall 2001; Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Rose and Petterson 2000; Vigoda-Gadot and Yuval 2003). Therefore, I hypothesize that individuals who are satisfied with government services are likely to be more trusting of government.

However, examining the relationship between satisfaction and trust, the literature also points to another hypothesis. A study of Flemish citizen satisfaction with public services conducted in 2002 by the Ministry of the Flemish Community was used by Kampen et al. (2006) to examine the relationship between citizen satisfaction with the delivery of public services and trust in government. Based on a two stage random sample of 1,250 citizens stratified at the individual and municipality level, citizens were asked questions pertaining to levels of satisfaction and trust in specific public agencies, including the police, primary education, garbage collection, transportation by buses and trams, and the Belgian Post. Consistent with other studies finding a linear relationship between satisfaction and trust, their results revealed that the effects of disappointment in a public agency were significant for all five agencies, showing that higher levels of disappointment lead to lower trust in the public agency. In addition, four agencies demonstrated significant values for satisfaction, showing that greater satisfaction with a public agency's services leads to higher levels of trust. Nevertheless, noting a correlation

between satisfaction and trust that could not be interpreted as a causal effect, Kampen et al. (2006) controlled for a component measuring predisposition toward government. Accounting for this predisposition, the linear relationship between satisfaction and trust disappeared.

When comparing the group of citizens who were either well pleased with the public service or neutral and those who were dissatisfied with the public service, Kampen et al. (2006) find a different relationship between satisfaction and trust. They argue that a citizen's degree of disappointment with a public service almost exclusively explains the variance of trust between the groups. These findings suggest that it is easier to breakdown trust than it is to build it up. According to Kampen et al. (2006), "The impact of a negative experience with a public agency is much more pronounced than the effect of a positive one. Therefore, decreasing the number of disappointed clients will therefore have a much stronger effect on increasing trust in the public institutions, and ultimately in government, than increasing the number of well-pleased clients" (399).

This finding is supported by psychology research on prospect theory (Tversky and Kahneman 1986), which suggests that individuals view the potential outcome of a choice as a decision between a possible gain or loss. In this decision structure, potential loss has a greater influence on willingness to choose an action than potential gain of the same magnitude. Therefore, negative information is more salient in decision-making, is given greater weight, and results in a stronger behavioral response than positive information. Cho (2006) finds support for this theory in his evaluation of the effects of trust and distrust on the willingness of a customer to disclose personal information during a retail Internet transaction. He notes that, "Loss looms larger than gain," in the decision to trust,

with trust and distrust exhibiting asymmetrical effects on customer behavior (Cho 2006, 28). Thus, I hypothesize that citizen dissatisfaction with public services will have a stronger negative impact on attitudes of trust in federal workers, and public officials in general, than will the positive impact of citizen satisfaction with public services.

Examining the Implicit Assumptions of the Performance-Trust Hypothesis

The above evaluation of empirical research on service satisfaction shows that a positive relationship has been found between service satisfaction and trust. However, less is known regarding how satisfaction forms the link between government performance and trust. Two implicit assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis merit further examination. First, is the assumption that citizen evaluations of service satisfaction are based on direct experience with government service delivery. The underlying idea behind this assumption is that personally using public services forms the basis for citizens to positively experience government performance. Second, is the assumption that attitudes about bureaucrats formed during citizen experiences with public services influence their overall trust in government. Thus, it is not just what citizens get from government services that matters to trust, but also perceptions of bureaucrats, based on citizen interactions. Additional explanation of these implicit assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis will lead to a better understanding of the relationship between government performance, service satisfaction, and trust in government, especially shedding light on the role of citizen experiences with the bureaucracy.

The Role of Citizen Experiences with Public Services

Further examining the link between performance and satisfaction, the first implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis is that citizen experience with government services is key to improvements in levels of service satisfaction. Thus, as service users, citizens can get the output that they want or need from government service delivery, and as a result of this intersection between government performance and citizen experience, citizen satisfaction can be influenced. Supporting this theory, the performance-trust hypothesis is based on the premise that service satisfaction is a measure of specific support for government, or an evaluation of government performance and outputs. However, Van de Walle, Kampen and Bouckaert (2005) argue that service satisfaction, as it has been measured in the majority of empirical research, is only a general evaluation of services, reflecting diffuse support for government or generalized attitudes toward the system, and not specific evaluations of service quality or government performance. Therefore, further empirical examination of service satisfaction is needed in order to evaluate the importance of experiencing service delivery as a key link between government performance and citizen satisfaction.

In order to better understand the role of specific support in the performance-trust hypothesis, it is important to explore Easton's (1965) analysis of diffuse and specific support for the political system. The two broad categories of support for the political system identified by Easton (1965) align with many authors' definitions of trust in government. First, diffuse support for the political system, which encompasses general trust in government, is based on a number of interrelated components (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001). Diffuse support for government is based on support for the

structural legitimacy of the institutions of government, which include the way the system is organized and acceptance of the roles and rules established for the execution of government power. In addition, diffuse support for government encompasses ideological principles (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001) and belief in the collective aims of government or the common interest (March and Olsen 1989). Therefore, support for “the political community,” or the nation as a whole; “regime principles,” which are the values inherent in the system; “regime performance,” or the functioning of the political system; and “regime institutions,” which are the branches of government through which power is exercised, are all components of diffuse support for government (Norris 1999).

Specific support for government, on the other hand, “is a direct consequence of satisfaction with system outputs (output=transaction between system and environment)” (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001, 7). Specific support then, is based on government meeting the demands of citizens, and is a direct evaluation of government performance. According to Bouckaert and Van de Walle (2001), “Easton himself relates specific support to the satisfaction of members of a system with the perceived output and performance of the political authorities, even though the knowledge of these political authorities can be very limited” (7). Therefore, “specific support in Eastonian sense assumes that people are or can become aware of the political authorities” (7), and therefore it is a response to evaluations of government performance or the outputs generated by political authorities. Easton notes that continued increases in specific support may result in an eventual rise in diffuse support for government. However, low levels of specific support may be masked by diffuse support for government, in that “diffuse support forms a reservoir of positive attitudes or goodwill” (Bouckaert and Van

de Walle 2001, 7). Or, on the other hand, positive evaluations of specific support may be clouded by overall low levels of diffuse support, in which “disaffection may occur not because of what each succeeding set of authorities is supposed to have done but simply because they are perceived to be authorities—and authorities are no longer thought worthy of trust” (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001, 7; see also Easton 1975). Therefore, Easton acknowledges that specific and diffuse support for government may each spill over and influence support in the other category.

In order to evaluate the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, it is necessary to distinguish whether citizen evaluations of satisfaction are based on specific support for government, thus evaluating government performance, or diffuse support for government, thus being influenced by general attitudes towards the system and not specific evaluations of government services. The performance-trust hypothesis poses that better service delivery will result in increased service satisfaction, and thus increase citizen trust in government. However, Van de Walle et al. (2005) question the relationship between satisfaction with public services and evaluations of service quality. They contend that a general measure such as satisfaction with public services measures something different than an assessment of service quality, noting that, “Experience matters more in the evaluation of service quality” (544). Van de Walle et al. (2005) pose that “using general questions on satisfaction with the functioning of public services is not a valid way for eliciting a genuine evaluation of the functioning of public services” (545). Rather, they argue, “This method provided us with information on the general attitude toward public services that is not necessarily based on an evaluation of how specific public services function” (545). Bouckaert and Van de Walle (2003) also point out that,

“Levels of satisfaction may just as much reflect a certain *mood* as a clear evaluation of the quality of a specific service” (333). Therefore, experience with public services may be the necessary link for evaluations of service quality to translate into higher levels of service satisfaction.

Based on studies of the relational nature of process based trust, experience does matter. According to Choudhury (2008), “Relational trust [which includes the affective dimension of trust] is based on familiarity” (592). It is context-based and characterized by the interaction of cognitive, affective and moral factors in the relationship. Consequently, “relational trust thus rests on repeated exchanges in a specific domain that gradually lead to the formation of trust” (Choudhury 2008, 593; see also Whitener et al. 1998). Emphasizing the importance of experience, Choudhury (2008) notes that, “Positive expectation in the case of trust or negative expectation in the case of distrust arises from the familiarity gained through repeated interactions and communication in role relationships” (Choudhury 2008, 593; see also Becerra and Gupta 1999). This is evidenced in studies comparing views of the federal government held by government employees and other U.S. citizens, which show that government employees trusted the federal government more than those without government ties (Brewer and Sigelman 2002). U.S. Army training practices arise as another example of building relational trust. Recognizing the importance of interaction to the formation of relational trust, the U.S. Army relies on “face time,” or the amount of time unit members spend together, as a core component of trust building within groups (Cross and Prusak 2003, 462). Based on this theory, citizen experiences with government service delivery and interactions with civil servants should influence attitudes of trust in government. Each interaction should either

build trust or undermine trust depending on whether the experience reinforces positive or negative expectations.

However, Goodsell's research sheds more light on citizen interactions with bureaucrats. Goodsell (1994) finds that people's evaluations of specific encounters with bureaucrats tend to be more positive than general evaluations of government as a whole. When asked about government in general, citizens are likely to be more skeptical, while expressing higher levels of relative satisfaction with more specific services (Christensen and Lægreid 2005). According to Frederickson (1997), this attitude can be described as the "paradox of distance," in which people trust government officials who are nearby, but those who are far away are deemed lazy, dishonest, and incompetent (187). In support of this theory, Dinsdale and Marson (1999) find that citizens rate their recent service experiences with government higher than the general service quality of a particular government institution. This evidence is reinforced by Van de Walle, et al. (2005) who note that, "Our findings confirm Goodsell's (1994) claim that the more specific the object of evaluation, the more positive citizens become toward public services. A general evaluation produces negative results, precisely because citizens can identify with a broader array of negative reference objects" (546). Therefore, if interaction is a key component of building trust, and citizen evaluations of specific encounters with bureaucrats tend to be positive, I hypothesize that citizens who have personally used and experienced a particular government service will have a more positive assessment of that service than those who have not used the service.

However, in examining satisfaction with public services in Norway, Christensen and Lægreid (2005) find that "there are no significant differences in levels of trust

between people with and without experience of the health service, the employment service, and the social service” (504). Rather, “the important question concerning trust is whether citizens with experience of these institutions are satisfied with the treatment they received” (504). The citizens who were most satisfied with the services they used were likely to have the highest levels of trust in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005). In addition, whether or not a person used a particular public service was less important to their level of trust in government than their degree of satisfaction with those services, thus reiterating the importance of satisfaction with specific service delivery as an important influence on trust (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001; Christensen and Lægreid 2005).

Examining another component of citizen experience with public services, research shows that citizen experiences with different types of government services are also related to trust. Encounters with universal services have been linked to increases in levels of trust in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Rothstein 2003), whereas experiencing selective, means-tested welfare programs is likely to reduce citizen trust in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Kumlin and Rothstein 2005). Research points to the idea that people are not only interested in the end results of government interactions, but also want to know that the process that led to the final outcome was fair (Thibaut and Walker 1975; Tyler 1998). According to Kumlin and Rothstein (2005), this concept of procedural justice involves questions of “whether an individual was received with respect and dignity; whether he or she was able to communicate opinions to civil servants; ...whether there are signs of discrimination, corruption, and/or cheating,...[and] being treated with equal concern and respect by government institutions” (347). Studies

show that positive perceptions of procedural justice in interactions with welfare states are likely to increase levels of trust in government (Kumlin 2004; Soss 1999).

Selective benefits are services that are provided to citizens on the basis of needs-testing, in which an individual must meet a set of specific conditions in order to qualify for benefits or to receive services. The conditions that must be met are often of an economic nature, as in social or housing allowances, or may be related to other factors such as health or ability to care for themselves, as in disability benefits or elder care (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005). In contrast, universal programs are not specifically for the poor, but are designed to provide for the entire population or specific segments of the population, without taking into account citizens' ability to pay for themselves (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005).

Selective, needs-tested programs are less likely to generate perceptions of fair and equal treatment than are universal programs, as a result of program structures that place heightened demands on both bureaucrats and citizens seeking public assistance. When dealing with means-tested programs, bureaucrats have greater levels of discretion in deciding who qualifies, due to the necessity of interpreting ambiguous regulations and applying them on a case-by-case basis (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005). In his book, *Street Level Bureaucracy*, Lipsky (1980) explains how "grassroots bureaucrats" must use their own interpretations of the regulations in order to deal with this problem, relying on informal and less explicit practices to make decisions. As a result, bureaucracies administering needs-tested programs are often suspected of employing "prejudice, stereotype, and ignorance as a basis for determination" (69).

In addition, selective services require individuals to demonstrate their need to qualify and the level of their need to determine how much of the service they are entitled to, which creates a dynamic between the citizen and the bureaucrat that undermines perceived procedural justice. Not only do the administrators possess more discretion in the implementation of needs-tested programs, it is in the citizen's interest to withhold information or to try to persuade the program official that they indeed do qualify for the service, which generates a sense of skepticism in the administrator's mind (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005; Rothstein 1998). In addition, on the part of the client, the case-by-case decision process used in selective services often gives rise to greater suspicion of bureaucratic "cheating, arbitrariness, and discrimination," in comparison with universal public agencies (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005, 349). Poor perceptions of procedural justice on the part of the client lead to higher levels of distrust and increased control from the bureaucracy, which fuels a spiral of distrust (Hermansson 2003). Thus, selective, "needs-tested public services may more readily give rise to suspicions concerning poor procedural justice and arbitrary treatment than do universal agencies, and this may influence citizens' views on the reliability of both public employees and other people" (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005, 349).

Kumlin and Rothstein (2005) report empirical support for this argument. Examining the impact of using means-tested programs on levels of citizen trust in government, they use a 1999 survey conducted in Western Sweden which includes information on personal contact with different types of public services involving bureaucratic discretion in deciding whether or not a client qualifies for a specific service. The selective services include "housing allowances, social assistance, transportation

allowances for disabled persons, disability, pensions, disability care, active labor-market measures, and elder care” (350). The authors then created a variable based on the number of means-tested institutions with which a respondent had contact. In addition, the survey included information about personal use of universal services including, “public transportation, municipal child care, libraries, sports facilities, child health care centers, health care centers, hospitals, cultural activities, recreational activities, and the national dental service” (350), which they employed to create a variable based on the number of universal services a respondent had personally used. Ordinary least squares regression showed that contact with means-based welfare programs significantly decreased trust in government, whereas use of universal services demonstrated a positive relationship with trust. According to Kumlin and Rothstein (2005), “for each additional contact with a selective welfare institution, average interpersonal trust drops by 0.26 along the 11-point trust scale. Conversely, trust rises for each additional contact with a universal institution (0.07)” (350). Based on this research, I hypothesize that personal experience with means-tested welfare programs will negatively influence trust in government.

The Role of Citizen Attitudes toward Public Administrators

A second implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis is that attitudes about bureaucrats formed during citizen experiences with public services influence their overall trust in government. The importance of citizen perceptions of bureaucrats, implicit in the performance-trust hypothesis, explains the strong focus on customer service in New Public Management reform efforts. It is not just what citizens get from government

services that matters to trust, but also perceptions of bureaucrats formed during their interaction with citizens. This evaluation of citizen experiences or interactions with bureaucrats during service delivery is based on specific support for government, as advanced by the performance-trust hypothesis. However, Easton identifies two components of specific support for government, output and process-based support, which correspond to the cognitive and affective dimensions of trust discussed earlier. The performance-trust hypothesis assumes that only output-based trust or perceptions of bureaucratic competence will influence attitudes of trust in government. However, the other component, process-based trust or perceptions of the caring of public administrators, which is neglected in New Public Management reforms, is also important in citizen evaluations of administrators. Therefore, in experiences with government, both process and output factors influence attitudes toward public administrators, and these two dimensions of trust, in turn, influence general attitudes of trust in government.

Implicit in the performance-trust hypothesis, the notion of improving citizen evaluations of civil servants is at the core of the New Public Management reforms. In this regard, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2003) point out that, “Most administrative reform projects put citizens’ image of specific public services and agencies at the center of efforts to improve citizens’ general image of government” (533). As part of the service satisfaction link to trust in government, “citizens who make a positive assessment of their encounters with public services and the public administration are said to have a generally positive image of the public sector and government, which is commonly, correctly or not, described as ‘trust’” (Van de Walle and Bouckaert 2003, 533). In a study of citizen evaluation of government in Flanders, Kampen et al. (2003) find that

citizens differentiate between trust in the institutions of the bureaucracy and trust in the political bodies, noting that “satisfaction with the federal government and the working of democracy have impact on the level of trust, but . . . the largest effect comes from satisfaction with the public administrations and services” (2). Similarly, Van de Walle et al. (2005) also find that in addition to images of politicians, images of civil servants also contributed significantly to models of citizen satisfaction with public services and overall trust in government. Therefore, noting the centrality of satisfaction with public service delivery to the New Public Management reforms and the importance of evaluations of civil servants to satisfaction and trust in government, it is important to better understand what influences attitudes about public administrators and how these attitudes impact trust in government.

The role of public administrator, as conceptualized in the New Public Management reforms takes on an instrumental character. Emphasizing efficient service delivery as the core of its mission, employee evaluations are based on productivity and meeting performance targets. Encapsulating this viewpoint, the section of the FY 2004 federal budget introducing the Bush administration’s take on performance management, called the Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART), states:

Taken seriously, rigorous performance assessment will boost the quality of federal programs, and taxpayers will see more of the results they were promised. What works is what matters, and achievement should determine which programs survive, and which do not. The public must finally be able to hold managers and policymakers accountable for results (Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, 2008, 53).

As this statement illustrates, under New Public Management public administrators are valued for what they can do for the consumer of government services, or how efficiently

they can produce the outputs of government. The entire premise of the performance-trust hypothesis, then, is that citizens will trust government more if government does more for them, more efficiently. Therefore, under this model of trust, citizen evaluations of public administrators should be based on what Easton (1965) refers to as output-based trust.

Easton's (1965) identification of process and output-based support for the political system cuts to the heart of the trust issue. While the process dimension of trust deals with the organization of the decision-making process, including who participates, how problems are approached, and the rules that are followed, the output dimension of trust concerns the who gets what element of politics, in which people's trust in government is based on how they benefit, without regard for the process. Therefore, process-based trust may be high even when the outcome is unfavorable, due to a positive perception toward and acceptance of the process, whereas output-based trust necessarily depends on the perception of gain (Christensen and Lægreid 2005).

New Public Management reforms have focused exclusively on Easton's concept of output-based trust. This idea is encapsulated in the performance-trust hypothesis, which assumes that improvements in government performance will lead to higher levels of citizen trust in government. The New Public Management argues that reforms geared toward improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public services will increase public trust. Techniques such as using market mechanisms to increase competition and introducing performance management to improve accountability are aimed at improving government output. The National Performance Review (1993) advocates these approaches to improve government performance, asserting that inefficiency,

ineffectiveness, and wastefulness in government have significantly influenced the decline of public trust.

The New Public Management's focus on output and performance as the most important influences on trust highlights the calculative dimension of trust, which is competence. Competence, according to Ruscio (1996), depends on a "logic of consequences," or an individual's calculation that trusting someone else will maximize his or her self-interest (469). When determining competence, an individual takes into account previous performance and service quality in order to make a rational judgment on whether or not to trust (Calnan and Rowe 2006). Trust based on competence involves judgments of the trustee's ability to accomplish stated goals and to act consistently. Therefore, an evaluation of competence involves assessing whether or not the public administrator is capable of effectively performing his job in order to produce the service or benefit expected by the citizen. Trust is based on an expectation of what the citizen will receive from government.

Kim (2005) argues that, "Competency involves the knowledge and skills necessary for effective operations with the aim of maintaining or increasing organizational productivity" (626). Furthermore, the importance of competency to citizen perceptions of government trustworthiness has been identified by a number of scholars (Barns and Prior 1996; Berman 1997; Braithwaite 1998; Jennings 1998). Therefore, I hypothesize that the more competent an individual perceives a public servant to be, the more that individual will trust government (Calnan and Rowe 2006).

However, despite the widespread acceptance and implementation of New Public Management reforms, the hoped for reversal of the downward trend in levels of citizen trust remains elusive. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004) note findings that, "...as yet, [there is] no indication of a widespread national or international shift of public opinion in favour of governments that make public sector reform a central part of their programmes" (131). In addition, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2007) state, "For a long time, attention in public sector reforms has been on productivity improvements. Despite considerable progress in government performance, policy-makers were to their dismay confronted with a decline in public trust" (1123). The failure of these reform efforts to bring about greater trust in government leads to questions regarding the validity of the performance-trust linkage.

While poor government performance is often cited as the reason for declining levels of trust in government, Bok (2001) found that the evidence for declining performance is far from conclusive. Rather, his findings demonstrated mixed results, showing that performance was either difficult to measure or not actually in decline. In addition, Bok (1997) also suggests that poor government performance is not the problem, but rather that "many citizens are in error about the facts" and are not "well enough informed to make reliable judgments about the government's performance" (56). Further examining the performance-trust hypothesis, Cook, Jacobs and Kim (2010) point out that surveys show fluctuations in political trust are similar across many institutions that have very different performance records (Bok 1997; McClosky and Zaller 1984; Orren 1997), which leads to questions as to whether public trust and government performance are indeed closely related (McAllister 1999).

This has led scholars to question the causal relationship between government performance and citizen trust. For instance, Yang and Holzer (2006) ask, “Is the performance–trust link spurious, or have we merely failed to demonstrate it empirically?”

(114). Van Ryzin (2011, 3) also questions the truth of the performance-trust hypothesis:

The unchallenged assumption that demonstrating results is the most important means of gaining public trust has, it is clear, remained a core rationale for the performance movement in government. But is this assumption really true? Do citizens really form their trust judgments regarding government mostly on the basis of outcomes?

In response to the performance-trust linkage, Christensen and Lægreid (2005) argue “that such a one-factor explanation is too simplistic” (507). While performance-based reforms are addressing output, the calculative dimension of trust, trust has been treated as a single-dimensional concept in most studies. This misspecification has failed to account for the multi-dimensional nature of trust, and specifically the affective dimension of trust that is unrepresented in the New Public Management reforms.

Scholars have begun to examine the second dimension of trust that has been left out of New Public Management models of trust based on the performance-trust hypothesis. Research on the multi-dimensional nature of trust points to the importance of the affective side of trust in addition to the calculative dimension. This is also reaffirmed by Easton’s distinction between output-based trust and process-based trust. In examining what influences citizen trust in government, empirical work has begun to focus on process-based factors in addition to output-based factors.

Overall, the New Public Management movement focuses on measuring outcomes, and assumes that better performance outcomes will improve citizen trust in government. In the race for performance, process concerns have been sidelined as bureaucratic ‘red

tape,’ onerous rules and regulations that impede efficiency and distract public administrators from concentrating on achieving agency goals (Van Ryzin 2011). New Public Management conceives bureaucratic processes to be at odds with its basic premises, unnecessarily slowing performance and delaying production of public services. Eliminating ‘red tape’ and processes deemed nonessential became a goal of the National Performance Review (1993). This philosophy is highlighted in a report published by the IBM Center for the Business of Government, which states, “One of the major factors behind many reform initiatives is a concern that government too often is preoccupied with process and following rules, and it is not clear what benefits are actually arising from public sector expenditures and activities” (20). While the New Public Management views process in a negative light and promotes anti-process rhetoric and reforms geared to reduce waste and inefficiency created by ‘red tape,’ critics argue that this reform movement overlooks the beneficial aspects of process, lumping them all together under the ‘red tape’ label.

Identifying weaknesses of the performance-trust hypothesis, one might submit that undervaluing process concerns that are important to citizens undermines the positive effects of improving performance. Van Ryzin (2011, 3) points out a list of beneficial aspects of process, which include:

- Fairness (including the lack of bias or favoritism)
- Equity (in the sense of distributing public benefits evenly or according to true needs)
- Respect (including courtesy and responsiveness to citizens)
- Honesty (in the sense of an open, truthful process and a lack of corruption)

While the rhetoric of New Public Management villainizes process as ‘red tape’ to be cut, these positive aspects of process matter to people, in addition to outcomes. Furthermore,

what initially appears to be ‘red tape’ or inefficiency may, on closer inspection, prove to be a fair and just process (Van Ryzin 2011), as Mashaw (1983) finds in his observations of the Social Security Administration.

Research in legal studies and political psychology specifically demonstrate that citizens are concerned with process. Examining citizen experiences with police and the courts, psychologist Tom Tyler (2006) finds evidence supporting the importance of procedural justice, or, a process characterized by “neutrality, lack of bias, honesty, efforts to be fair, politeness, and respect for citizens’ rights” (7). Known for original survey research that measures both the effects of process and outcome, Tyler (2006) has shown that in forming perceptions of the legitimacy of legal authorities, citizens care just as much about process concerns as they do about outcomes, even when outcomes are unfavorable to them, such as getting a traffic ticket or losing a court case (Lind and Tyler 1988; Van Ryzin 2011). Summarizing his research, Tyler (2001, 242-3) states:

People’s evaluations of government are clearly tied to ethical judgments. They are not primarily a response to feeling that one has gained or lost when dealing with government or that government policies are desired or not desired. Instead, people engage in a much broader ethical evaluation of how government functions by evaluating the actions of political leaders and institutions against criteria of justice that are distinct from personal gain/loss or personal judgments about the desirability of government decisions and policies.

These findings are consistent with Easton’s (1965) discussion of process-based trust.

Tyler further notes that experiencing consistently fair dealings with government increases government legitimacy and facilitates government functions of maintaining order, promoting cooperation, and requesting sacrifice, especially during crises (Tyler 2006; Van Ryzin 2011).

Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002) also find evidence illuminating the importance of process. Using the U.S. Gallup Poll, they demonstrate that approval of the federal government is based not only on outcome based performance measures, but also on citizen perceptions of the political processes followed by public agencies. Accordingly, Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002, 71) state:

Process matters. Even with all the other controls included, particularly those for policy outcomes and policy outputs, a close match between a person's process preferences and the perceived workings of government increases the approval of government...People's approval of government is driven by more than just policy concerns. It is also driven by perceptions of the extent to which processes match what people desire processes to be.

These findings stress the importance of process concerns to citizens, even in comparison to the value placed on outcomes or what citizens get from government. In citizen evaluations of the policy process, Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002) observe that elements undermining perceptions of fairness and serving the public interest are most troubling, namely, self-interested politicians, partisanship, and the influence of special interests (Van Ryzin 2011).

With the emphasis on outcomes and performance as the driving force behind public trust in government in both government reforms and academic public administration literature, few studies have focused on the influence of administrative processes on citizen trust (Van Ryzin 2007; Van Ryzin 2011; Van Ryzin et al. 2004). One element of process that has been addressed in the public administration literature is the relationship between citizen participation and trust in government. Several studies have identified an empirical link between citizen participation and trust (Berman 1997; Vigoda-Gadot and Mizrahi 2007; Wang and Wart 2007). Furthermore, theoretical

models of trust created by Thomas (1998) and Kim (2005), which are based on reviews of trust literature, identify process concerns such as fairness and honesty as influences on trust in government agencies and public administrators.

Van Ryzin (2011) examines the relative impact of process versus outcomes on trust in the civil service across 33 nations. Based on an analysis of individual-level and country-level data from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP), the UN Human Development Index (HDI) and the World Bank Governance Indicators, Van Ryzin (2011) examines the performance movement assumption that better government performance “producing outcomes that matter to citizens” can restore public trust (2). The 2006 ISSP data is based on a random sample of nearly 50,000 people in 33 participating nations, and uses as the dependent variable a specific question about trust of the civil service. Van Ryzin (2011) includes individual-level models for the entire sample of all 33 countries as well as for the U.S. sample alone. Then, using the 2006 World Wide Governance Indicators from the World Bank to represent process and the UN HDI 2006 to represent outcomes and aggregated ISSP data, he estimates a second country level model. In order to measure indicators of government process, Van Ryzin (2011) used three questions concerning, “how often government officials treat people fairly, whether the treatment people get from government officials depends on connections, and how many public officials are involved in corruption” (7). These questions were chosen to represent the extent to which administrators were seen to be fair, equitable and professional in their dealings with citizens. Measuring outcomes, the survey included questions which asked about citizen evaluations of the success of government in five areas: “providing care for

the sick, providing a descent standard of living for the old, dealing with threats to security, controlling crime, fighting unemployment, and protecting the environment” (7).

The results of both the 33 country and the U.S. individual-level analyses show that, “public perceptions of the trustworthiness of civil servants depend—not just on the extent to which government succeeds at delivering outcomes to citizens—but on getting the process right by treating people fairly, avoiding favoritism, and containing corruption” (Van Ryzin 2011, 11). Furthermore, “in all but one of the models reported...[both individual level and country level], the effect of process on trust appears larger—in some cases several times larger—than the effect of outcomes on trust” (Van Ryzin 2011, 11). Consistently demonstrating a substantively large process effect across the different models, and across levels of analysis, “process appears to be a very important factor in the formation of trust judgments and not just outcomes, as often assumed by the performance movement and the related public administration literature” (Van Ryzin 2011, 13). Yet, more empirical research is needed to better understand the importance of process and its influence, in relationship to outcomes, on citizen evaluations of public administrators (Van Ryzin 2011).

In general, these studies focus on the influence of process on trust. This highlights the affective dimension of trust, which includes a commitment to the common good and serving the individual. According to Ruscio (1996), this aspect of trust is most important because “trust can be granted only when citizens seek a public interest and believe that public officials seek it with them” (474). In addition, Wang and Van Wart (2007) find that “public trust increases when public officials demonstrate integrity,

honesty, and moral leadership and when ethics are institutionalized in government through the process of participation” (276).

Thus, the process-based aspect of trust focuses on serving the individual and seeking the public interest. This non-calculative approach to trust can be referred to as caring, or “having the service-user’s interests at heart” (Taylor-Gooby 2006a, 19). This aspect of trust takes into account the ethical responsibilities of public administrators and denotes the conviction to act for the common good (Fukuyama 1995). Calnan and Rowe (2006) refer to this dimension of trust as being “grounded on relationships and affective bonds generated through interaction, empathy and identification with others” (377). According to Kim (2005), “citizens tend to trust in government when they feel that the government shows genuine care and concern for its citizens” (625), a hypothesis also supported by numerous authors (see Berman 1997; Braithwaite 1998; Wicks, Berman, and Jones 1999). In this regard, Tyler (1998) refers to trustworthiness as “the benevolence of motives of the authority” (270). Furthermore, recent research shows that citizens base evaluations of government on process considerations, such as the fairness, openness and responsiveness of government processes (Anderson et al. 2005; Donovan and Bowler 2004; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 1998; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2001; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002; Jiobu and Curry 2001; Miller and Borrelli 1991). Consequently, the caring aspect of trust can be found in how the government administrator treats the service user, independent of whether or not the service-user receives benefits from the output of the public service. Therefore, I hypothesize that individuals who feel that they have been treated with respect by public servants are likely to be more trusting of government (Wang and Van Wart 2007).

Conclusion

Although New Public Management reforms, based on the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, have spanned the globe, further research is needed to empirically evaluate the assumptions implicit in this theory. The performance-trust hypothesis emphasizes the importance of improving government performance, which leads to more satisfied citizens, thus resulting in higher levels of citizen trust in government. However, although empirical research has supported the link between satisfaction with public services and trust in government, studies have not clearly distinguished between specific and diffuse support for government in citizen evaluations of services. Moreover, the implicit assumption that satisfaction is a function of specific support for government, impacted by citizen experiences with government services, requires further examination. Citizen experiences with public services may be the key to measuring specific support for government in particular, and to evaluating whether the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis are truly supported empirically.

A second implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis is that evaluations of public administrators based on citizen interactions during service delivery influence trust in government. Although the performance-trust hypothesis assumes that citizen evaluations of bureaucrats are based on specific support for government, only one component is emphasized, which is output-based trust—or perceptions of bureaucratic competence—while the second dimension, process-based trust—or perceptions of the caring of public administrators—is overlooked. However, empirical research has supported the importance of process factors in citizen evaluations of public

administrators. Consequently, further examination is needed in order to assess how citizen interactions with public administrators influence perceptions of competence and caring, and how these attitudes impact overall trust in government.

Therefore, this research will evaluate the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis and contribute to a better understanding of the multi-dimensional nature of trust in public administrators, specifically examining the role of citizen experience with the bureaucracy. As a result, the implications of this study will help to establish a new model of trust, thus forming a foundation for future government reforms geared toward increasing trust in government.

CHAPTER IV CORRELATES OF TRUST

Introduction

In comparison to the research conducted to analyze trust in Congress, the Supreme Court and the President, or attitudes toward government generally, much less attention has been paid to citizen attitudes toward the bureaucracy and bureaucrats in particular (Bouckaert et al. 2005). Therefore, in order to examine research on the correlates of trust, it is necessary to borrow from the political trust literature. In examining citizen attitudes of trust in government, its institutions, and public officials, these general categories tend to be utilized: political-cultural factors and socio-demographic characteristics. Investigating the correlates of public trust will contribute to a better understanding of citizen trust in public administrators and general trust in government, thus building a foundation for further analysis.

Political-cultural Characteristics

Political-cultural characteristics reflecting personal outlooks and orientations are likely to influence attitudes toward government. In particular, political attitudes and identities, such as political ideology, partisanship, diffuse support for government, and evaluations of the national economy are likely to impact an individual's willingness to trust (King 1997; Owen and Dennis 2001; Peterson and Wrighton 1998). In addition, other personal attributes such as evaluations of one's personal financial situation, feelings of political efficacy, civic engagement, and interpersonal trust have been linked to trust in government (Owen and Dennis 2001; Uslaner 2001). Therefore, further examination of

these influences on trust in government is warranted in order to shed light on attitudes of trust in public administrators and general trust in government.

Political Ideology

Research has shown that political ideology influences trust in government. An individual's position on the left-right ideological spectrum has consistently arisen as a significant factor in explaining attitudes toward public institutions (Aardal and Valen 1989; Baldersheim et al. 1990; Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Huseby 1995; Newton 2001). Scholars often hypothesize that those on the left end of the spectrum are more likely to be trusting of government than those on the right, as a result of the left's traditional support for the public sector and strong government institutions (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Huseby 1995; Lægreid 1993). However, some studies report the opposite pattern, finding that those on the far left believe that political institutions are unrepresentative of mass interests, while those on the far right have developed a commitment to political institutions that preserve the status quo (Listhuag and Wilberg 1995; Newton and Norris 2000). In an examination of 17 industrialized democracies, Newton and Norris (2000) find that "the respondent's position on the left-right self-placement scale proved to be the strongest predictor of institutional confidence, with those people reporting themselves to be furthest to the left reporting the least trust" (9). In addition, examining trust in 20 U.S. cities, Rahn and Rudolph (2005) state that, "Ideology also shapes local political trust, as liberals are less trusting of local government than conservatives" (546).

Partisanship

In addition, partisanship impacts attitudes of trust in government (Citrin 1974; Keele 2005). Building on the early work of Citrin (1974), Keele (2005) finds that partisans' trust increase when their party controls the government. This is because people are trusting of the party with which they affiliate, and therefore are more trusting of government when their party is in control (Citrin and Green 1986; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 1995; Richardson et al. 2001). In support of this theory, Donovan and Bowler (2004) find that those who identify with the party controlling Congress or the Presidency tend to be more trusting of the federal government. An alternative theory poses that it is the ideological leanings of the political party that influence trust. According to this theory, Democrats may be more trusting of the political-administrative system that has developed than are others (Keele 2005) because the Democratic party has consistently represented an ideology that espouses a positive role of government in society.

However, King (1997) finds that strong partisanship is correlated with trust in government, regardless of which party is in power, which may be attributed to feelings of political efficacy and identification with the political process. Recognizing the important role that parties play in the political system, membership in a political party denotes participation in, and acceptance of, the workings of the system. Thus, partisanship has been found to result in increased trust in government institutions (Christensen and Lægreid 2005) and to influence individual evaluations of the public sector (Huseby 1995; Miller and Listhuang 1990). According to Miller and Listhaug (1990), "Party identification is far more widespread in most democracies than is membership of party

organizations or involvement in campaign-related events” (372). Consequently, it is not only membership in a political party that engenders positive attitudes toward the political system, but also the psychological sense of partisan identification that political parties foster. Therefore, “attachment to a political party, providing it is not a revolutionary party, should promote positive sentiment towards the party system and, indirectly, trust in the political regime” (Miller and Listhaug 1990, 372).

Partisans should be more trusting of government than non-partisans because the latter are less likely to be tied to the political system (Keele 2005) and may be more turned off by the polarizing trend in party politics (Craig 1996; King 1997). Miller and Listhaug (1990) find that “rating both political parties negatively was consistently and strongly associated with distrust of government, even after controlling for ideological and affective assessments of the incumbents” (382). Therefore, Republicans and Democrats may both hold more trusting attitudes towards government than Independents. In contrast, it has been hypothesized that political extremists are less likely to trust government because public policy is either going in the wrong direction or does not go far enough in the correct direction (Richardson et al. 2001). If this hypothesis is correct, strong partisans will exhibit less trust in government than do others.

Diffuse Support for Government

Individuals’ attitudes of trust in government also may be influenced by diffuse support for government. In a survey of the trust literature, Levi and Stoker (2000) conclude that “variations in political trust reflect more than incumbent-specific satisfactions or dissatisfactions” (483) or “specific historical events such as the Vietnam

War and Watergate” (Tolbert and Mossberger 2006, 355). Rather, Tolbert and Mossberger (2006) argue that “hypothesized causes of decreased confidence in government are multiple and interrelated, involving many actors and many institutions in society” (355-356). This points to Easton’s (1965) claim that evaluations of citizen confidence may be based on diffuse evaluations about government, rather than assessments of a specific administration or set of political actors or events. Research also shows that trust in one institution is likely to influence attitudes of trust in other institutions (Hetherington 1998; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2001). According to Christensen and Lægreid (2005), “people’s trust in government is of a general character: A high level of trust in one institution tends to extend to other institutions” (487). This could be explained by the tendency of citizens to view government as one amorphous whole with difficulty distinguishing between different actors and institutions (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001; Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Dinsdale and Marson 1999).

Empirical research suggests a “spill-over” effect in which trust in the President (Feldman 1983) or Congress (Chanley et al. 2000; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2001) accounts for a great deal of variation in attitudes toward other government institutions. Marlowe (2004) states, “In essence, the performance of the most visible institutions sets the tone for the rest of the incumbent regime” (14). Keele (2007) also points out that, “The actions of incumbent leaders and evaluations of government institutions are also thought to be critical to levels of trust. In particular, the actions of Congress and the president appear to have a formative influence on how trusting the public is of government” (242; see also Chanley et al. 2000; Citrin and Green 1986; Citrin and Luks 1998; Craig 1993; Erber and Lau 1990; Feldman 1983; Hetherington 1998; Miller 1991;

Williams 1985). Keele additionally states that, “The performance of Congress and the President and how well they manage the economy, control crime, and avoid scandal are a large part of what causes the public to trust or distrust the government” (Keele 2007, 242).

Other research specifically shows that evaluations of the president’s job approval and personal characteristics influence political trust (Citrin 1974; Citrin and Green 1986; Hetherington 1998). These findings could be rooted in the fact that the president is viewed by the public as the central figure of government, to be held personally responsible for his administration’s successes and failures. In addition, the portrayal of the president in the media promotes this view with news coverage focusing closely on presidential action (Iyengar and Kinder 1987; Kinder and Fiske 1986). Referring to the power of citizen evaluations of the president to influence overall perceptions of government, Hetherington (1998) observes that “parts of an organization should, in general, inform feelings about the organization itself” (Hetherington 1998, 793). Beyond that, perceptions of the trustworthiness of government administrators have been linked to confidence in the president and Congress (Marlowe 2004) and Houston and Harding (forthcoming) find that attitudes about public administrators reflect general attitudes towards government. Thus, positive assessments of the workings of government generally should enhance attitudes of trust towards government and its employees.

Furthermore, overall government performance is linked to trust. Looking at government performance as an aggregate measure, Newton and Norris (2000) state, “Government institutions that perform well are likely to elicit the confidence of citizens; those that perform badly or ineffectively generate feelings of distrust and low

confidence” (7). Examining aggregate data on 17 industrialized democracies, Newton and Norris note that, “our research provides substantial support for theories that focus on the performance of governments and political institutions to explain citizens’ declining confidence in them” (12). Evaluating influences on trust over time, Keele (2007) also finds support for government performance as a correlate of trust. Measuring performance-based on the index of consumer sentiment, crime and scandal as well as political measures of confidence in Congress and the President, he recognizes that, “The effect of government performance is both subtle and blunt. First, trust quickly updates when performance changes, but the memory of that change lingers to ensure that trust is more than ‘What have you done for me lately?’” (250). Additionally, Christensen and Lægreid (2005) observe that satisfaction with democracy, as a measure of general regime performance, is the most important indicator of trust in government, stating that, “Diffuse support for the political system is more important than specific support for particular aspects of public sector reform” and “is relatively more important than political involvement, engagement, and political ideology” (500).

Economic Performance

According to Keele (2007), “trust is an evaluation of politicians and their management of the economy and responds immediately to any changes in government performance” (251). Studies show that citizens assess the performance of government based on their individual financial status and the health of the national economy (Espinal, Hartlyn, and Kelly 2006; Fiorina 1978; Kelly 2003; MacKuen, Erikson, and Stimson 1992). An abundance of literature demonstrates a link between public evaluations of the

economy and the rise and fall of levels of trust (Citrin and Green 1986; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 1995; Lawrence 1997; Parent, Vandebeek and Geminio 2005). In short, when citizens are discontented with government economic performance, trust declines, but prosperity results in higher trust levels (Chanley et al. 2000; Citrin and Luks 1998; Hetherington 1998; Lawrence 1997; Miller 1991). Noting the importance of measures of personal financial status, Richardson et al. (2001) state that “‘pocketbook voting’ clearly affects confidence in leaders of the executive branch... the president is rewarded with confidence when economic conditions are strong and targeted for blame when the economy struggles” (93). However, Marlowe (2004) finds that satisfaction with one’s own financial situation is not correlated with trust in public administrators.

Political Efficacy

In addition, political efficacy has been linked to trust in government (Parent, Vandebeek, and Geminio 2005; Tolbert and Mossberger 2006). Those who believe in their own ability to participate effectively in the political system and think that the political system is responsive to citizen demands are likely to have greater levels of trust in government (Morrell 2003; Niemi, Craig, and Mattei 1991). Campbell, Gurin, and Miller (1954) define efficacy as the “feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process, i.e., that it is worthwhile to perform one’s civic duties” (187). Political efficacy, simply stated, is “citizens’ perceptions of powerfulness (or powerlessness) in the political realm” (Morrell 2003, 589). Political efficacy is generally understood to have two dimensions. Internal efficacy is the feeling that one is competent to understand and participate effectively in the political process,

while external efficacy is the perception that political decision makers and institutions are responsive to citizen demands (Morrell 2003; Niemi et al. 1991). Individuals who are confident in their knowledge and abilities, and who have a sense that they can be effective working within the system, are likely to have more trusting attitudes.

Looking at internal political efficacy, studies of voting turnout and political participation have found a positive relationship between participation and perceptions of government efficacy and responsiveness (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995; Rosenstone and Hanson 1993). On the other hand, citizens who are not politically-engaged are likely to feel a lack of political influence, which fuels feelings of powerlessness, cynicism and distrust of government (Miller 1974). Christensen and Lægreid (2005) find that measures of internal political efficacy such as being interested in politics and following politics in the media are positively correlated with trust in government institutions. Houston and Harding (forthcoming) similarly find that understanding politics and being informed about politics are positively correlated with perceptions of the trustworthiness and competence of public administrators. Conversely, Uslaner (2001) submits that those who are more knowledgeable about politics have less faith in the federal government. In contrast to these findings, Marlowe (2004) demonstrates that being interested in politics is not a significant indicator of trust in the bureaucracy.

Evaluating the influence of external political efficacy on trust in government, Donovan and Bowler (2004) argue that underlying Americans' general distrust of government is a perception that government is no longer responsive to citizens. Evidence pointing to declining political efficacy as an influence on low levels of trust has led to

solutions aimed at increasing public participation in decision-making (Welch and Hinnant 2003). Strategies geared toward rebuilding citizen perceptions of political efficacy by encouraging them to exercise their “voice” aim to increase trust in the democracy (Parent et al. 2005). Rahn and Rudolph (2005) show that those who feel they can have an impact on making their city a better place to live are more likely to trust their local government. Houston and Harding (forthcoming) also find that those who feel they have a say in what the government does are more likely to perceive public administrators to be both competent and trustworthy. Furthermore, Owen and Dennis (2001) and Uslaner (2001) demonstrate that believing public officials to be responsive to citizens is correlated with trust in the federal government.

In addition, advocates of e-government hypothesize that it may be a solution to the parallel decreases in trust and external efficacy demonstrated in the last 40 years, essentially by improving access to information and services citizens want and by enhancing the speed and ease of citizen interactions with government. In their examination of the effects of e-government on trust, Tolbert and Mossberger (2006) state that “external efficacy, the judgment that government cares about citizens like oneself... is clearly related to process-based trust” (357). On a similar note, in an Internet survey of Canadian voters examining of the effects of e-government on trust, Parent, Vandebeek and Gemino (2005) discover that “using the Internet to transact with government has a significantly positive impact on trust and external political efficacy” (1).

Civic Engagement

Social capital theorists pose that it is not personality traits that influence trusting attitudes, but rather social experiences and socialization—most notably involvement in civic organizations—that generate greater trust in government (Newton and Norris 2000). Social capital consists of two elements: “the first is the level of civic engagement in a community, state or nation, and the second is interpersonal trust, or the willingness to ascribe benign intentions to others” (Keele 2007, 243-244). According to social capital theory, participation in civic organizations brings people into greater contact with one another while working toward common goals, thus creating greater levels of interpersonal trust through interaction (Keele 2007). The premises of social capital theory date back to the early writings of Alexis de Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill, who emphasized the importance of voluntary associations and civic engagement to the proper functioning of democracy (Newton and Norris 2000). Many modern scholars also subscribe to this theory, pointing out the importance of civil society in facilitating cooperative social relations (Coleman 1990; Inglehart and Abramson 1994) and supporting the performance of stable and peaceful democracy (Almond and Verba 1963; Inglehart 1990; Inglehart 1997a; Mischler and Rose 1997; Newton 1997; Ostrom 1990; Rose 1994; Rose, et al. 1998).

Involvement in a community with a cooperative culture and participation in voluntary associations have been found to create social trust, cooperation, and civic mindedness (Putnam 2000). This in turn leads to stronger social organizations, including political groups and government institutions in which people can invest confidence, and a

reciprocating relationship between trusting individuals and effective institutions (Newton and Norris 2000). It is for this reason that civic engagement is thought to lead to greater trust in government and its leaders (Cook and Gronke 2005). Therefore, people who are more involved in voluntary associations and cooperative social activities should be more trusting of others and should express greater levels of confidence in government. Many studies have supported the individual level relationship between social capital and trust in government (Brehm and Rahn 1997; Putnam 1993; Putnam1995a; Putnam 1995b; Putnam 2000). Newton and Norris (2000) however, locate no support for this relationship at the micro-level in their examination of industrial democracies (Newton and Norris 2000). On the other hand, macro-level studies have supported the relationship between social capital and trust in government in the United States and in other industrialized democracies (Keele 2007; Newton and Norris 2000). Furthermore, Keele (2007) finds that decreasing social capital in the United States explains the loss of trust in government over time since the 1960's.

Interpersonal Trust

In contrast to the social capital literature on interpersonal trust, psychological research shows that the propensity to trust others is a basic personality trait that influences many aspects of behavior, independent of experience with the external political world (Cattell 1965; Newton and Norris 2000). According to social psychologist Morris Rosenberg (1956), feelings of alienation, trust in others, and beliefs that people are fundamentally cooperative join together to form a “trust in people” scale. Based on their personality type, psychological make-up, and early life experiences some

people are more likely to be trusting, cooperative toward others and generally optimistic, whereas others are more likely to be distrustful, misanthropic and have generally pessimistic views of others. In this regard, Easton (1965) argues that “the presence of trust would mean that members would feel that their own interests would be attended to even if the authorities were exposed to little supervision or scrutiny” (447). The reverse side of this theory holds that, “An environment in which a majority of Americans believe that most people can’t be trusted breeds attitudes that hold all politicians as corrupt, venal, and self-serving, and government action as doomed to fail” (Morris and Balz (1996, A6-A7). Supporting this premise, Uslaner (2001) finds that those who trust others are more likely to trust the federal government.

In sum, Newton and Norris (2000) note that “there are trusters and there are cynics who carry their political perceptions around with them without much reference to the performance of the political system or its leaders” (6). Consequently, attitudes toward public officials are reflective of generalized trust in others (Brehm and Rahn 1997; Orren 1997; Richardson et al. 2001). Based on these assumptions of the social-psychology view, an individual-level correlation is expected between social trust and trust in government. However, Newton and Norris (2000) point out that, “Any suggestion that there are different types of trust and confidence, that they can vary independently of one another, or that the same person can express one type but not another, challenges the theory” (6). Furthermore, their research shows little evidence that trust is indeed a character trait. They find that social trust is not strongly correlated with confidence in government at the individual level, and that social trust does not necessarily spill over into political trust, or vice versa (Newton 1999; Newton and Norris 2000).

Socio-demographic Characteristics

Socio-demographic characteristics of individuals are also included in many studies of trust in institutions to capture differing experiences with government that correlate with socio-demographic characteristics. While some studies do find these individual characteristics correlate with attitudes toward government (Rose 1999), the results are generally inconsistent (Levi and Stoker 2000). In addition, many studies have found demographic variables to be insignificant in determining political trust (Listhaug 1998; Rose and Pettersen 2000). For example, examining trust in the Belgian government's high impact agencies, Van de Walle, Kampen, and Bouckaert (2005) note that, "We learned from previous research on trust that these socio-demographics in most cases do not make a large contribution to the explanatory value of the models, but we included them to control for possible effects" (538; see also Elchardus and Smits 2002; Kampen and Molenberghs 2002). In their aggregate level examination of confidence in government in industrialized democracies, Newton and Norris (2000) also find that confidence in public institutions is not well-explained by the social and economic variables usually associated with behavior and attitudes, stating that, "Life satisfaction, education, income, gender, age, and membership in voluntary associations explain little of the variance in confidence in parliament, the civil service, or the police" (72). However, findings on the importance of socio-demographic characteristics as useful explanations of trust in government are mixed (Levi and Stoker 2000), and the following are commonly included as correlates: sex, race, age, education, income and government employment.

Sex

It is hypothesized that women will hold more trusting attitudes towards public administrators because they are disproportionately employed in public-oriented professions (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Marlowe 2004) and are more supportive of an activist role of government (Seltzer, Newman, and Leighton 1997). However, some research fails to find a correlation between gender and political trust (Marlowe 2004; Richardson et al. 2001), or finds men more trusting of government (Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Houston and Harding, forthcoming; Keele 2005). These studies pose that men are likely to be more trusting of government actors and institutions than women because the former hold more prominent positions in government and are less likely to experience inequity in social institutions (Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Keele 2005). The latter finding may reflect the perception among women that they are disadvantaged in society, and thus they are less likely to trust societal institutions. In examining public attitudes about the competence and corruption of public administrators, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) say that, “When sex is significant it indicates that men are more trusting of administrators than are women. This may reflect a discontent over inequality as exemplified by persistent ‘glass ceilings’ and ‘glass walls’ in government organizations.”

Race

In terms of race, it has been consistently found that whites are more trusting of the political system and its leaders than are nonwhites (Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Keele 2005). Studies show that political trust is lower among black people than among whites (Beck et al. 1990; Bobo and Gilliam 1990; Herreros and Criado 2008; Richardson et al.

2001). Political cynicism is also higher among Hispanics than whites in the United States (Buzan 1980; Michelson 2001; Tolbert and Mossberger 2006). These correlations likely reflect the demographics of government officials and a sense that the political-administrative system does not properly represent minority interests. Being a member of a minority group leads to more experiences with discrimination, which in turn precipitates less confidence that one will be treated fairly by societal institutions and leaders (Brehm and Rahn 1997). However, Marlowe (2004) hypothesizes minorities will be more trusting of administrators because of the latter's role in implementing programs designed to increase equality, although he does not find evidence for this hypothesis.

Age

Studies also hypothesize age to be positively related to trust in government, reflecting a sense of social connectedness in that older individuals have more experience with political institutions and thereby feel more closely tied into the political system, and thus more trusting (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Huseby 2000; Lipset and Schneider 1987). Furthermore, Inglehart's (1999) postmaterialism thesis poses that recent generations are characterized by an increasing lack of respect for authority (Dalton 2005; Van de Walle 2007). In contrast with this finding, several studies have demonstrated that trust in government decreases with age (Keele 2005; King 1997; Richardson, et al. 2001; Welch, Hinnant, and Moon 2005), likely a result of older generations witnessing many examples of the fallibility of leaders. Examining attitudes about the competence and corruption of public administrators, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) find an inverse relationship, noting that, "While it is often assumed that younger people are less trusting,

it appears in this context that trusting attitudes decline with age. This relationship is more appropriately characterized as a reflection of disappointing experiences with the public service that accumulate over time.”

Education

Similarly, competing hypotheses have been offered about the impact of education on trusting attitudes. Most commonly, education is assumed to have a positive effect on trust (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001; Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Listhaug and Wiberg 1995) because higher levels of education translate to a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, the political-administrative process (Marlowe 2004; Tolbert and Mossberger 2006). Christensen and Lægreid (2005) find that those with higher levels of education are generally more trusting than the less-educated, but notes that this relationship is not significant when experience of public services is taken into account.

Dalton (2005) points out a reversal in trust levels since the 1950’s among Americans of different education levels, in which the better-educated have become less trusting of government than the lesser-educated. Similarly, Roth, Bozinoff, and MacIntosh (1990) report those with higher levels of education to be less-trusting of government institutions, likely the result of greater expectations and less tolerance for governmental ineffectiveness. According to Doring (1992), this finding holds true for confidence in institutions except for those whose purpose is to safeguard liberal democracy, for which more education leads to higher confidence. On the other hand, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) find that education is negatively correlated with

perceptions of corruption in the public service, noting that, “In terms of education’s influence, one explanation is that those who are highly educated are more likely to be aware of the workings of the public bureaucracy and checks on bureaucratic power” (see also Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001).

Income

Individuals with higher incomes are more likely to be supportive of government and its leaders, perhaps because they benefit more from the status quo and feel that they have greater access to government officials (Lipset and Schneider 1987). In particular, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) discern that those with higher income levels are more likely to believe that government administrators are committed to serve the public and are less likely to see them as corrupt. In contrast, Dalton (2005) finds that while family income and other measures of social status were traditionally associated with higher levels of trust in government, today, better-off Americans are less trusting of government. Concerning this trend, Dalton (2005) states, “We appear to be witnessing a new pattern of ‘dissatisfied democrats’ or ‘critical citizens’ who are committed to democratic ideals, but critical of how contemporary democracies fulfill their own ideals” (149; see also Klingemann 1999).

Government Employment

Attitudes toward government also are generally regarded to be more positive among those employed in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Dunleavy, 1980; Lægreid, 1993). Possible explanations for this effect are: individuals positively predisposed toward government are more likely to seek public employment; public

employees have personal contact with other government workers and are thus less likely to cling to general negative stereotypes while seeking to maintain a positive image of the group of which they are a part (Brewer and Sigelman 2002). According to Tolbert and Mossberger (2006), “Government workers are more likely to trust government, perhaps because their attitudes toward government encouraged them to enter public employment in the first place” (361; see also Brewer and Sigelman 2002). However, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) find that government employment is not a significant influence on perceptions of the trustworthiness or competence of public administrators.

Conclusion

Although socio-demographic factors have not been found to be consistently linked with attitudes of trust in government, they are traditionally included as control variables. On the other hand, more empirical support has been found for the influence of political-cultural characteristics on trust. A thorough examination of these factors lends itself to further exploration of trust in government. These correlates of trust, indicated in the political trust literature, are utilized as control variables for empirical analysis of citizen attitudes of trust in public administrators and trust in government broadly. Controlling for these political-cultural and socio-demographic characteristics will shed light on explanations of how trust in government is shaped.

CHAPTER V DATA AND METHODS

Introduction

In order to begin an empirical evaluation of the performance-trust hypothesis, and thus, the hypothesized relationships among service satisfaction, experience with the public bureaucracy and trust in government, it is first necessary to fully examine the data that will be analyzed. First, the survey data used in this analysis will be discussed, examining their origin and the sampling procedures utilized in their collection. Furthermore, the dependent and independent variables that will be included in the multivariate analyses will be described. Finally, the methods employed in the statistical analysis of data will be explained. This examination of data and methods depicts the building blocks that will form the foundation of this research.

Data

The source of data for this study is the Maxwell Poll conducted annually between 2004 and 2007 by the Campbell Public Affairs Institute of the Maxwell School of Public Affairs and Citizenship, Syracuse University. This survey measuring individuals' attitudes of trust in government consists of responses from 2,430 individuals, with data pooled from each of the four years the survey was conducted. The survey is geographically balanced and representative of households within the continental United States.

Based on a sample of telephone numbers from Survey Sampling, Inc., these telephone surveys were conducted between September and October of each year, with

more than 600 respondents participating in the survey annually. Calls were made during weekends in order to avoid any bias toward those working nights, and otherwise were made during evening hours. Each number was called three times, unless the call received a refusal to participate, went to an invalid number, or reached a residence where no one was over 18 (and thus eligible to participate in the survey).

Dependent Variables

The first dependent variables in this analysis measure respondents' satisfaction with public services. The following question is asked for seven government programs: "I'd like to ask you about some specific programs that are intended to respond to specific social problems or needs. For each could you indicate if you think the program is generally effective, only somewhat effective, or not very effective?" The programs that this question addresses are: Head Start, Medicaid, food stamps, college grants and loans, welfare/public assistance, public housing/housing subsidies, and aid to lower income school districts. Responses concerning the effectiveness of each program individually serve as the dependent variables for the first multivariate analyses. These variables are dichotomized due to the skewed nature of the responses for many of these items—in order to generate categories that have appropriate sample sizes, and further, to offer a parsimonious representation of the concepts that this study wishes to explore; ultimately, this study seeks to explain the implications of favorable and unfavorable perceptions of government services, thereby lending itself to a dichotomous characterization of citizen

perception of such services.² Accordingly, the “generally effective” response is coded ‘1,’ and the “somewhat effective,” and “not very effective” responses are coded ‘0.’

The dependent variable of the next multivariate analysis also is based on responses to the above question regarding evaluations of the effectiveness of public programs. This variable is a count of the total number of government programs that a respondent judges to be “generally effective.”

The dependent variables for the third set of multivariate analyses, representing citizen perceptions of government administrators, are tapped with two questions. First, to assess perceptions of the competence of administrators, responses to the following item are used: “Would you agree or disagree with this: The people working for the Federal government are competent?” Perceptions of the other dimension of trust, caring, are tapped by responses to the item: “In my own interactions with the people working for the federal government I have been treated with respect.” The response categories for these two questions are: “agree,” “disagree,” and “neither agree nor disagree.” Due to the skewed nature of the frequency distributions of these responses, a binary variable is created for both questions representing “agree” responses. These questions pertaining to the competence and caring of federal workers were only asked in the 2006 survey, which included responses from 601 individuals.

The dependent variable for the final multivariate analysis, trust in government officials, is based on responses to the following survey question: “Do you agree or

² Looking at the response frequencies for the seven program effectiveness variables, “generally effective” responses ranged from 72% to 27%, with “not very effective” responses ranging from 24% to 6%.

disagree with this statement: You can generally trust public officials to try to do the right thing.” The response categories for these two questions are: “agree,” “disagree,” and “neither agree nor disagree.” The variable is dichotomized based on the skewness of the response frequency distribution, and a binary variable is created representing “agree” responses.

For interpreting the meaning of references to “people who work for the federal government” and “public officials” in the survey questions above, cues are taken from the survey itself. In this survey, references to “public officials” are interpreted to include elected officials, or politicians. Additionally, prior to the introduction of the survey item regarding trust in “public officials,” a battery of questions aimed at measuring a respondent’s level of political activity are asked. Of the fifteen questions preceding this survey item, only five of these questions do not specifically refer to political activity in some manner, targeting such activity as: working for or donating to political campaigns, groups or candidates; attending political rallies; voting; influencing political decisions; personal political activity; or belonging to a political organization. Also included in this battery of questions pertaining to political activity previous to this survey item, the following question that uses the wording “public officials” is asked: “During the last year, did you do any of the following? Contact a public official via phone, letter or email about an issue?” In this context, the use of “public official” in the question also can be interpreted to mean elected official, as it implies the relationship between constituent and elected representative, in which a citizen voices her concerns to an elected official in order to influence the outcome of a policy decision.

Therefore, leading up to the survey item regarding trust in “public officials,” the general focus of the majority of questions is political in nature, and the terminology “public officials” already has been used once previously in reference to political activity. Thus, this focus on political activity in the preceding questions supports the interpretation of “public officials” as elected officials. Additionally, the question directly following the survey item regarding trust in “public officials” specifically refers to “public officials” in relationship to elections: “Elections are a good way of making public officials pay attention to what people think. Agree / disagree?” This further supports this interpretation of “public officials” as ‘elected officials’ or ‘politicians’ within the scope of this survey.

Noting the context of the terms “public officials” and “people who work for the federal government” as used in this survey, the contrast in their meaning is marked. While “public officials” is used in a specifically political context, preceded by a battery of questions concerning political activity and linked in particular with elections, the term “people who work for the federal government” is used in the context of questions regarding government programs. Each of the thirty questions that precede the two survey items concerning “people who work for the federal government” directly refer to “government programs” generally or specific government programs by name. None of these questions include any reference to political activity or elected officials. Therefore, when taking into account the context of the term “people who work for the federal government,” an interpretation of this term to mean federal workers is supported. In addition, the contrast between this term and the term “public officials,” as used in a political context earlier in the survey, further demonstrates the distinction between federal

workers as administrators of government programs and “public officials” as politically elected officials.

Recognizing “public officials” to include politically elected officials, this study uses the item referring to trust in “public officials” as a measure of general trust in government. This item, used in a political context and specifically referring to elections, is used generally, and not in particular reference to any branch or level of government. Therefore, this term may be interpreted to encompass broad trust in elected officials across different branches and levels of government, such as members of Congress and the President, as well as elected officials at the state and local levels. Consequently, both the political nature and broad usage of this term support its utilization as a measure of general trust in government.

However, even if the term “public officials” is interpreted more broadly to also include both elected officials and public administrators, the survey context is clear in the contrast between “public officials” and federal workers, in that “public officials” cannot be construed to refer only to public administrators. Therefore, even a broader reading of the term “public officials” to include both elected officials and public administrators across branches and levels of government may be interpreted as a general measure of trust in government.

Independent Variables

Assessing program utilization, respondents were asked about usage of seven means-tested welfare programs: Medicaid, welfare/public assistance, earned income tax credits, public housing, Head Start, food stamps, and the WIC Program (Special

Supplemental Program for Women, Infants, and Children). Two variables are created based on these responses. One variable is the number of these means-tested welfare programs that the respondent has used, and another is the number of means-tested welfare programs that have been used by members of the respondent's family, but not by the respondent personally.

Including the means-tested welfare programs listed above, respondents were asked about usage of a total of nineteen government programs. The additional programs include: the mortgage interest deduction, Social Security, unemployment compensation, student loan programs, Medicare, college grants, veteran's benefits, workman's compensation, the GI Bill, disability benefits, government pension programs, and small business loan programs. Based on responses to usage of these nineteen programs, two program utilization variables were created. The first measures the number of programs used by the respondent personally, and the second measures the number of programs used by members of the respondent's family, but not by the respondent personally.

Based on the same question providing respondent evaluations of the effectiveness of government programs above, this question also is used to create a variable measuring dissatisfaction with government services. The following question is asked for seven programs intended to address specific social problems or needs: "I'd like to ask you about some specific programs that are intended to respond to specific social problems or needs. For each could you indicate if you think the program is generally effective, only somewhat effective, or not very effective?" The programs that this question addresses are: Head Start, Medicaid, food stamps, college grants and loans, welfare/public assistance, public housing/housing subsidies, and aid to lower income school districts.

The binary variable created based on these responses is a count of the number of programs rated as “not very effective.” The “not very effective” response is coded ‘1,’ and the “somewhat effective” and “generally effective” responses are coded ‘0.’

Political-cultural and socio-demographic factors are also identified in the political trust literature and are controlled for in the estimated models. Political efficacy is a binary variable representing an “agree” response to the following question: “Do you agree or disagree with this statement? People like me don’t have much say about what government does.” A dichotomous variable is created due to skewness in the frequency distribution of responses, with very few responses in the “neither” category.

Representing political partisanship, responses to the following question are used: “Do you generally regard yourself as a Democrat, an Independent, a Republican, or something else?” Individuals who report to be Democrats or Republicans are coded ‘1,’ while Independents and those responding “other” are coded ‘0.’ The dichotomous variable better represents the influence of partisanship in contrast to those who are not affiliated with one of the main two political parties.

In addition, political ideology is measured by the following question: “Politically, do you generally regard yourself as liberal, moderate, or conservative, or do none of those apply?” Two binary variables are created based on question responses, representing individuals that are political liberals and those that are political conservatives. For the variable conservative, the response “conservative” is coded ‘1,’ and the responses “liberal,” “moderate,” and “none” are coded ‘0.’ For the variable liberal, the response “liberal” is coded ‘1,’ and the responses “conservative,” “moderate,” and “none” are coded ‘0.’ Two dichotomous variables best represent the contrast

between liberals and conservatives in comparison to moderates or those without an ideological affiliation.

Two additional variables are used to control for attitudes toward other institutions and general government performance. The first variable is based on responses to the question: “Do you approve or disapprove of the job George Bush is doing as President?” “Agree” responses to this question are coded ‘1’ and “Disagree” responses are coded ‘0.’ The other variable is measured by the question: “Over the last several years, has your economic situation improved, stayed the same, or gotten worse?” The “improved” response to this question is coded ‘1,’ and the “same” and “worse” responses are coded 0. This variable is dichotomized due to the skewed nature of the frequency distribution of responses.

Finally, binary variables are included for being male, being white, having incomes \$75,000 and above, and having earned a college degree or more. The variable male is based on responses to the question: “What is your sex?” The response “male” is coded ‘1’ and the response “female” is coded ‘0.’ The following variables are dichotomized based on responses that are heavily skewed with several categories that have few responses. The variable white is based on the following question: “Do you regard yourself as Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, or as something else? (*If Hispanic, ask if that is Hispanic white or Hispanic non-white.*)” The response “white” is coded ‘1’ and other responses are coded ‘0.’ The income variable, representing those having incomes of \$75,000 and above, is based on the question: “Into which of the following categories does your annual family income fall?” The responses “\$75-99,000,” “\$100-125,000,” “\$125-150,000” and “\$150,000 or more” are coded ‘1’ and the responses “under \$25,000,”

“\$25-49,000,” and “\$50-74,000” are coded ‘0.’ The variable education, representing having earned a college degree or more, is based on the question: “Could you tell me the highest education level you achieved?” The responses “college degree” and “graduate work/degree are coded ‘1,’ and the responses “high school or less” and “some college” are coded ‘0.’

Although the socio-demographic variables age and government employment are often included as control variables in political trust research, this survey does not permit analysis of these factors, as no question pertaining to government employment is included, and age is only included in the 2007 survey year. In addition, although data are available pertaining to civic engagement, the social capital literature indicates that civic engagement influences trust in combination with interpersonal trust, with both of these variables exerting a reciprocal influence on each other and on political trust (Brehm and Rahn 1997). Noting the complexity of these relationships and the absence of data pertaining to interpersonal trust in the survey, civic engagement was excluded as a control variable.

Methods

First, frequency and percentage distributions will be provided to report the distribution of responses to specific items. To further analyze the relationships between some variables, bivariate crosstabs will be used. In order to more fully examine these relationships, logistic regression will be used for multivariate analysis of dichotomous dependent variables. Finally, negative binomial regression will be used for a multivariate model for which the dependent variable is a count.

CHAPTER VI

EXPERIENCE WITH PUBLIC SERVICES AND SERVICE SATISFACTION

Introduction

Examining the link between performance and satisfaction, the first implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis is that citizen experience with government services is a key to improvements in levels of service satisfaction. Thus, as service-users, citizens can get the output that they want or need from government service delivery, and as a result of this intersection between government performance and citizen experience, citizen satisfaction can be influenced. Supporting this theory, the performance-trust hypothesis is based on the premise that service satisfaction is a measure of specific support for government, or an evaluation of government performance and outputs. On the other hand, Van de Walle, Kampen and Bouckaert (2005) argue that service satisfaction, as it has been measured in the majority of empirical research, is only a general evaluation of services, reflecting diffuse support for government or generalized attitudes toward the system, and not specific evaluations of service quality or government performance. Therefore, experience with public services may be the necessary link for evaluations of service quality to translate into higher levels of service satisfaction. However, further examination is needed to evaluate if citizen satisfaction influences trust in the way the performance-trust hypothesis articulates. Consequently, this analysis will address the following research question: What factors influence citizen satisfaction with government services? Specifically, the influence of being a service user on satisfaction with government programs will be assessed.

Descriptive Analysis

Looking at citizen evaluations of the effectiveness of government programs as presented in Table 1, located in the appendix,³ attitudes are generally more positive than may be expected based on statistics highlighting the decline in trusting attitudes. The modal response for five of the seven programs evaluated was “generally effective.” The college grant program and the Head Start program were rated most positively by respondents, with evaluations of “generally effective” at 72% and 67%, respectively. One program, public housing, had almost equal numbers of those who rated the program “generally effective” and “only somewhat effective. In addition, the welfare program was rated most negatively of all the programs, with 24% of respondents indicating it to be “not very effective” and 44% indicating that it is “only somewhat effective.”

The frequency distributions for the utilization of government programs, shown in Table 2, present information on who has used these programs, distinguishing between personal use of each program by the respondent and a separate category which indicates use by a family member of the respondent, but not the respondent personally. The distributions also show those who indicated that neither the respondent nor a family member have used each program and those who responded ‘no opinion.’

The mortgage interest deduction is the most highly-utilized program included in the survey, with 44% of respondents indicating that they have benefitted personally from this program. Social security is the next most highly-utilized program, with 32% of respondents responding that they have personally used the program. Unemployment

³ All Tables are located in the Appendix.

compensation also stands out as being highly-utilized, with 27% of respondents having benefitted personally from this government service.

Social Security is the program most highly-utilized by respondents' family members, with 40% of respondents reporting family use. In addition to Social Security, other programs highly-used by family members of the respondent, but not by the respondent personally, are Medicare (38%), student loans (31%), and veteran's benefits (27%). Additionally, college grants and Medicaid are highly used by respondents' family members with 21% of respondents reporting family use of college grants and 23% responding that a family member has used Medicaid.

Personal use of student loans, the Earned Income Tax Credit, Medicare, and college grants range between 27% and 23%. In contrast, personal use of Veteran's benefits, Workman's Compensation, the GI Bill and Food Stamps range between 10% and 12%, and the programs used by the fewest respondents, small business loans, public housing, and Head Start, range between 3% and 4% of respondents. In addition, only 7% to 8% of respondents have personally used Medicaid, disability benefits, the Special Supplemental Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), government pension, and welfare.

Bivariate Relationships: Program Effectiveness and Utilization

For six programs, the survey includes questions as to both a respondent's evaluation of program effectiveness and his utilization of each program, both personally or by a family member. These six programs are as follows: Head Start, Medicaid, Food Stamps, college grants, public housing and welfare. It is also possible to include the

utilization of the WIC program in this assessment, using evaluations of the effectiveness of Welfare and public assistance programs as the dependent variable. Presented in Tables 3 through 9, cross-tabulations report the bivariate relationships between program effectiveness, the dependent variable, and program utilization. This permits preliminary analysis of whether program evaluations between service-users and non-service users are significantly different from one another.

Looking at the six programs for which program effectiveness and utilization are evaluated, five of these programs show that service-users rate the program more positively than non-service users. For example, users of the Head Start program are likely to have more positive assessments of the program's effectiveness than non-users. Of those who have personally used the Head Start program, 88% rate the program to be "generally effective" as compared to 67% of non-users. Similarly, those who have used Medicaid are more likely to have positive evaluations of the program than non-users, with 67% rating the program as "generally effective" as compared to 53% of those with no experience of the program. Furthermore, those who have not received benefits from the Food Stamps program are likely to have less positive evaluations of the program. Only 43% of those who have never used food stamps rate the program to be "generally effective," as compared to 62% of service users. In addition, those who have used public housing programs are more likely to see them as "generally effective," with 60% of service-users positively evaluating the program, and only 36% of non-users finding the program to be "generally effective."

The difference in attitudes about the effectiveness of college grant programs between service users and non-users appears to be slight. Both groups rate the

effectiveness of the college grant program highly, with 71% of those without experience of the program rating it to be “generally effective” and 77% of service users sharing this opinion. Finally, examining the WIC program utilization responses in combination with evaluations of the effectiveness of welfare, there appears to be little variation in attitudes concerning the effectiveness of welfare programs and public assistance between those who have received WIC benefits and those who have not used the program.

An analysis of these cross-tabulations shows that there appears to be a relationship between being a service user and having positive evaluations of government programs. Interpreting the Chi-squared statistic for Tables 3 through 8, significant values show that the relationship between experience with public services and service satisfaction is significantly different than that which would be expected if there were no association between the variables. The Chi-squared statistic ranges in value from a low of 8.97 for college grants to a high of 25.37 for the welfare program, and is statistically significant at the 99% or 95% confidence level for each cross tabulation. However, looking at the Chi-squared statistic for Table 9, which presents the relationship between welfare program evaluations and use of the WIC program, the Chi-Square value of 0.56 is not statistically significant, showing that the relationship between these variables is not significantly different than that which would be expected if there were no association. Further analysis is needed to better understand the relationship between experience with public services and service satisfaction.

Multivariate Analysis

Binary Logistic Regression Models

In order to better assess the impact of being a service-user on evaluations of service satisfaction, logistic regression models will be examined, regressing program effectiveness on program utilization, controlling for socio-demographic⁴ and political variables. This will allow a deeper examination of the satisfaction link in the performance-trust hypothesis, and will address the following questions: What influence does being a service-user have on attitudes of service satisfaction? Are service evaluations by service-users and non-service users significantly different? The performance-trust hypothesis implicitly assumes that positive experiences with government services create a service satisfaction link between performance and trust. Therefore, in order to test this hypothesis it is necessary to examine the influence of having used a particular government program on assessments of that program's effectiveness. Binary logistic regression models are presented in Tables 10 and 11.

First, Model 1, will examine evaluations of the effectiveness of the Head Start program. The dependent variable measures the “generally effective” response to evaluations of the Head Start program. Looking at the impact of socio-demographic variables on evaluations of the effectiveness of the Head Start program, the variables male, white, college education and income have no significant correlation. However, the

⁴ The political-cultural variables political efficacy and presidential approval were not used as control variables in these models as their inclusion significantly reduced the sample size of the models, as a result of missing data from years in which the questions were not asked in the survey.

political variables conservative and partisan each exert a significant influence on attitudes of program effectiveness. Identifying oneself as a conservative exerts a negative influence on evaluations of the effectiveness of the Head Start program. This finding is expected, in that conservatives are traditionally less supportive of a large public sector or government spending on means-tested programs. Specifically, an individual who identifies himself as a conservative is 55% less likely than moderates or others to evaluate the Head Start program to be “generally effective.” On the other hand, partisanship has a positive influence on satisfaction. An individual who identifies herself as either a Republican or a Democrat is 1.6 times as likely as independents or others to rate the Head Start program as “generally effective.” Those who identify with a political party may feel that their interests are better represented in government policy outcomes, and thus may be more supportive of government programs.

Finally, examination of the influence of service utilization on evaluations of program effectiveness illustrates that having personally used the Head Start program is positively correlated with evaluations of the effectiveness of the program. Head Start service users are 3.6 times as likely as those who have not used the program personally to rate it as “generally effective.” This supports the premise of the performance-trust hypothesis that experiencing government services is a key link in generating increases in service satisfaction based on evaluations of government performance.

In addition, having a family member who has used the Head Start program is also positively correlated with satisfaction with the program. Those who indicate that they have not used Head Start themselves, but have a family member who has benefitted from the program, are 2.6 times as likely as others who have no experience with the program

either personally or through a family member to rate the program “generally effective.” While the performance-trust hypothesis posits that those who have positive experiences with government will be more satisfied with government services, this also supports the performance-trust hypothesis somewhat, in that having some experience of the program and its benefits, even second-hand through a family member, results in program evaluations that are more positive than those of others without any experience with the program at all.

Model 2 examines the impact of being a service-user on evaluations of the effectiveness of the Medicaid program. Similar to the Head Start program, the socio-demographic control variables are not significantly correlated with evaluations of Medicaid’s effectiveness. Although, in a model examining just socio-demographic correlates of service satisfaction— without political and utilization variables—being white did exert a significant negative influence on evaluations of service effectiveness. In addition, political variables continue to exert an influence on service evaluations. Although partisanship is not significant in Model 2 as it was in Model 1, identifying oneself as a conservative is negatively correlated with evaluations of program effectiveness in both models. An individual who identifies himself as conservative is 28% less likely than others to indicate that the Medicaid program is “generally effective.” Looking at the influence of program utilization on evaluations of effectiveness, personally experiencing the services of the Medicaid program is positively correlated with satisfaction with the Medicaid program. An individual who has experienced Medicaid services herself is 2.2 times as likely as those without personal experience of the Medicaid program to indicate the program to be “generally effective.” However,

examining the influence of family use of the Medicaid program, Model 2 shows that having a family member who has used the program but not having used it oneself is not significantly correlated with positive evaluations of the program. This finding supports the premise of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis that personal experience influences attitudes of service satisfaction. Therefore, according to this theory, personal experiences with government programs should be more powerful influences on satisfaction than second-hand information about family use of government programs.

Model 3 looks at the influence of program utilization on evaluations of the effectiveness of the Food Stamps program. In contrast to Head Start and Medicaid, service evaluations of the Food Stamps program are influenced by socio-demographic variables. The variable white is negatively correlated with positive evaluations of the Food Stamps program. A white individual is 30% less likely than others to rate the Food Stamps program to be “generally effective.” One explanation for the influence of race on these attitudes may be that whites are less likely than African Americans to live below the poverty level and thus to qualify for means-tested social welfare programs (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). In addition, the variable income is also negatively correlated with satisfaction with the Food Stamps program. An individual with an income of \$75,000 or higher is 20% less likely than those with lower income levels to rate the Food Stamps program as “generally effective.” One clear explanation for this may be that those with higher income levels are less likely to qualify for benefits from the Food Stamps program or to have needed these benefits, but are more likely to be in higher tax brackets and to pay a greater share of the tax burden that helps to fund means-tested programs.

Examining the influence of political attitudes on evaluations of the Food Stamps program, the variables liberal and conservative each demonstrate a significant effect on program satisfaction, with liberals more likely to have positive evaluations and conservatives less likely to do so. An individual who identifies himself as a liberal is 42% more likely than political moderates to evaluate the Food Stamps program as “generally effective.” On the other hand, an individual who identifies himself as a conservative is 30% less likely than moderates or others to view Food Stamps as “generally effective.” This may be explained by the fact that liberals are generally more supportive of government programs and spending geared to alleviate the effects of poverty than are conservatives.

Looking at the effects of service utilization on evaluations of the effectiveness of the Food Stamps program, having personally used Food Stamps is positively correlated with program satisfaction. An individual who has personally benefitted from the Food Stamps program is twice as likely as others to rate the program as “generally effective.” However, looking at service utilization by a family member, there is no significant correlation with evaluations of the effectiveness of the Food Stamps program. As theorized in the performance-trust hypothesis, personal experience of government services positively influences program evaluations, more so than second-hand evaluations of service effectiveness through family members, or not having used the service at all.

Model 4 examines the influence of program utilization on evaluations of the effectiveness of the public housing program, controlling for the effects of socio-demographic and political variables. Looking at the influence of socio-demographic variables on evaluations of the public housing program, both being white and having an

annual income of \$75,000 or more are negatively correlated with attitudes of effectiveness. A white individual is 44% less likely than others to rate the public housing program to be “generally effective.” In addition, an individual who makes \$75,000 a year or more is 24% less likely than others to believe the public housing program is “generally effective.” Also, before controlling for political attitudes and program utilization variables, the variable male was also statistically significant, exerting a negative influence on evaluations of effectiveness, which disappeared in the later model. Of the political attitudes examined in Model 4, only being a conservative is significantly correlated with evaluations of the public housing program. An individual who identifies herself as a conservative is 36% less likely than liberals, moderates or others to rate the public housing program as “generally effective.”

Examining the relationship between service utilization and evaluations of the effectiveness of the public housing program, both personal use of the program and use by a family member but not oneself, impact program satisfaction. An individual who has personally used the public housing program is 2.3 times as likely as others who have no personal experience with the program to rate it as “generally effective.” This is consistent with the assumptions of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis that it is the influence of citizen experience with public service quality on service satisfaction that will enable improved performance to impact trust in government.

In addition, use of the public housing program by a family member also is positively correlated with positive evaluations. An individual who has not personally used the public housing program, but has a family member who has, is 1.6 times as likely as others to rate the program to be “generally effective.” This finding also supports the

performance-trust hypothesis satisfaction link in that those with some experience of government programs, even second hand experience, have more positive evaluations than others. This supports the premise that experience matters, although, as expected, personal experience has a greater impact on evaluations than does family experience with the public housing program.

Moving now to Table 11, Model 5 examines the relationship between service utilization and evaluations of the effectiveness of the college grant program. Looking at the influence of socio-demographic variables, being white is negatively correlated with evaluations of the college grant program. Whites are 38% less likely than others to rate the college grant program to be “generally effective.” In addition, of the political variables, conservatism and partisanship are also significantly correlated with service satisfaction. Identifying oneself as a conservative is negatively correlated with evaluations of the performance of the college grant program. Conservatives are 24% less likely than moderates and others to indicate that the college grant program is “generally effective.” However, partisanship increases positive evaluations of college grant programs. Those who identify themselves as either Republican or Democrat are 1.3 times as likely as others to rate the college grants program as “generally effective.”

Looking at the influence of service utilization on evaluations of the effectiveness of the college grant program, Model 5 shows that being a service-user is not significantly correlated with attitudes of satisfaction with the program. Those who have personally received benefits from the college grant program do not have significantly different evaluations of the program than others with no experience of the program. In addition,

having a family member who has used the college grant program is not correlated with service evaluations.

Program evaluations between those having a family member who has used the college grant program and those with no experience of the program are not significantly different. One explanation for this may be that there is overwhelming support for the college grant program from both service-users and non-service users. The frequency distribution shows that 72% of respondents rated the college grant program to be generally effective, with 71% of those without experience of the program rating it to be “generally effective” and 77% of service-users sharing this opinion. This could indicate a distinction between general attitudes toward the college grant program and the other programs included in the survey, in that while all the programs included in the assessments of program effectiveness are means-tested, the other programs are welfare programs, whereas the college grant program is not. Therefore, the stigma attached to welfare programs may not apply to the college grant program, resulting in more positive evaluations by both service-users and non-service users. Perhaps in the absence of experience, people rely on political ideology as a heuristic guide for assessing the quality of a program.

Model 6 examines the relationship between service utilization and evaluations of the effectiveness of welfare and public assistance programs. Both socio-demographic characteristics and political attitudes arise as statistically significant influences on positive service evaluations. Men are more likely to have positive evaluations of welfare programs than women, with males being 1.3 times as likely as women to rate welfare programs as “generally effective.” In addition, being white and having a college degree

are negatively correlated with service evaluations. Whites are 31% less likely than others to believe welfare programs are “generally effective.” Also, those who have a college degree are 22% less likely to positively evaluate welfare programs.

Looking at the influence of political variables, both conservative and liberal arise as significant correlates of program effectiveness. Those who identify themselves as political conservatives are 42% less likely than moderates and others to rate welfare programs as “generally effective.” In addition, those who see themselves as political liberals are 69% more likely to believe welfare programs are “generally effective.”

Examining the influence of being a service-user on evaluations of welfare programs, personally having received welfare benefits is significantly correlated with program satisfaction. An individual who has personally used the welfare program is 2.6 times more likely to rate welfare and public assistance programs as generally effective as those without personal experience of the program. However, Model 6 shows that family use of welfare is not significantly correlated with program satisfaction. Those who have family who have benefitted from the welfare program but have not used the program themselves do not have significantly different evaluations of welfare and public assistance programs than others.

In addition to the models examined above, it is also possible to examine a seventh model based on use of the WIC program and service evaluations of “welfare and public assistance.” Although this utilization variable is not based specifically on the same program as the effectiveness measure, as shown in the previous models, benefits received through the WIC program can be categorized under the heading “welfare and public

assistance.” Thus, examining this relationship may shed further light on the effects of utilization on evaluations of program effectiveness.

Looking at the influence of socio-demographic variables on evaluations of the effectiveness of welfare and public assistance programs, education is significantly correlated with service satisfaction. An individual with a college degree is 20% less likely than those without a college degree to rate welfare and public assistance programs to be “generally effective.” In addition, identifying oneself as a conservative is negatively correlated with evaluations of service effectiveness. Conservatives are 31% less likely than moderates or others to indicate that welfare and public assistance programs are “generally effective.”

Examining the influence of being a user of the WIC program on evaluations of the effectiveness of welfare and public assistance programs, Model 7 shows that there is no significant correlation between these variables. Neither using the WIC program personally nor having a family member who has used the program arises as a significant influence on attitudes concerning the effectiveness of welfare and public assistance programs. Noting that being a service-user of the welfare program positively correlated with evaluations of welfare in Model 6, one explanation here may be that the heading ‘welfare and public assistance’ may be too broad to be specifically related to use of WIC in respondents’ evaluations

Several trends stand out in the analysis of the above models. First, although the influence of socio-demographic variables is not uniform across the models of the seven programs being evaluated, socio-demographic factors do seem to influence assessments of the effectiveness of government programs. In five of the seven programs examined,

race is a significant influence on service satisfaction. Whites are generally less likely than those of other races to positively evaluate government programs. Second, citizen evaluations of government programs are also influenced by political factors. Ideology appears to be an important influence on attitudes of service satisfaction, with the variable conservative arising as a negative correlate of program evaluation in every program model.

Finally, these models show that personal experience with government programs matters to attitudes of satisfaction. For every program, except for the college grants and WIC programs, evaluations of program effectiveness are positively correlated with having personally used the program. This shows that there is a significant difference between evaluations of program effectiveness by service-users and non-service users. This finding corroborates the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis, which assumes that experiencing government services that perform well will increase attitudes of service satisfaction.

In addition, only in the public housing and Head Start models was the use of government programs by a family member but not by the respondent statistically significant. This shows that generally, it is personal experience of a program that influences program evaluations, as hypothesized in the performance-trust hypothesis. Therefore, second-hand program evaluations by family members do not have the same impact as personal experience with government programs.

Negative Binomial Regression Model

In order to better understand the influences on service satisfaction, it is worthwhile to examine respondents' overall assessments of government programs. This can be done by counting the number of programs that an individual rates as "generally effective." Since this dependent variable is a count, a negative binomial regression model will be used, allowing for further evaluation of what influences citizen satisfaction with public services. The regression model examines the influence of socio-demographic and political variables on attitudes of effectiveness. In addition, this model permits evaluation of the influence of program utilization on evaluations of effectiveness. Variables measuring the influence of the number of means-tested welfare programs personally used by the respondent or by the respondent's family member are included in the model. Furthermore, the number of government programs that a respondent has used personally, or that a respondent's family members have used, are also included in the model.

Table 12 presents the results of the negative binomial regression analysis. First, examining the influence of socio-demographic variables on service satisfaction, this model shows that race does have a significant influence on service satisfaction. Interpreting the incidence rate ratio, whites are 14% less likely to evaluate an additional program "generally effective" than those of other races, while holding the other variables constant in the model. However, sex, education and income are not significantly correlated with perceptions of program effectiveness.

Looking at the influence of political variables on the number of programs a respondent rated “generally effective,” ideology and partisanship arise as significant influences on program satisfaction. Looking at the influence of ideology, identifying oneself as a liberal is positively correlated with program evaluations. Interpreting the incidence rate ratio, liberals are 11% more likely than moderates or others to evaluate an additional program to be “generally effective,” while holding the other variables constant in the model. In addition, those who identify themselves as conservatives are less likely to positively evaluate government programs. Interpreting the incidence rate ratio, conservatives are 17% less likely than moderates and others to rate an addition program “generally effective,” while holding the other variables constant in the model. Finally, partisans, those who identify themselves as either Republicans or Democrats, are more likely than others to positively evaluate government programs. The incidence rate ratio indicates that partisans are 9% more likely than independents and others to rate an additional program “generally effective” while holding the other variables constant in the model.

Examining the influence of service utilization on satisfaction with government programs, personal experience with government services arises as a significant influence on program evaluations. The first utilization variables examined are the use of means-tested welfare programs. The model shows that the number of means-tested welfare programs a respondent has personally used is positively correlated with the number of programs a respondent regards as “generally effective.” For each additional means-tested program personally used by the respondent, he or she is 3% more likely to evaluate an additional program to be “generally effective,” while holding the other variables constant

in the model. However, use of means-tested programs by a family member but not by the respondent personally is not significantly correlated with evaluations of government programs.

In addition, examining a different aspect of service utilization shows that the number of government programs personally used by the respondent is positively correlated with the number of programs judged to be “generally effective.” For each additional program used by the respondent, he or she is 2% more likely to evaluate an additional program to be “generally effective,” while holding the other variables in the model constant. On the other hand, the number of government programs used by a respondent’s family member is not significantly correlated with the number of programs evaluated to be “generally effective.” These findings support the premise of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis that being a service user positively influences evaluations of service satisfaction.

The results of the negative binomial regression model strongly support the previous findings. As also found in the above binary logistic regression models, white is the only socio-demographic variable that arises as statistically significant in the negative binomial regression model, exerting a negative influence on the number of programs a respondent evaluates to be generally effective. In addition, political variables exert a strong influence on the number of programs a respondent judges to be “generally effective,” with identifying oneself as conservative also appearing as statistically significant in this model, along with being a liberal or a partisan.

Further supporting the importance of being a service-user as demonstrated in the models above, the negative binomial regression model shows that both the number of

government programs personally used and the number of means-tested welfare programs personally used each have a significant, although slight, positive influence on the number of programs judged to be “generally effective.” However, neither the number of means-tested programs used by a family member nor the total number of government programs used by a family member had a significant influence on the number of programs positively evaluated in the negative binomial regression model, which also supports the findings of the previous models.

Discussion of Multivariate Analysis

Several key points arise in the multivariate analysis of the influences on service satisfaction. First, socio-demographic variables do influence evaluations of program effectiveness, with race arising as a significant correlate in both the logistic and negative binomial regression models. These models show that whites are less likely to positively evaluate government programs than those of other races. One explanation may be that whites are less likely than African Americans, who represent the largest minority group in the sample population, to live below the poverty level, and thus to qualify for or need the use of means-tested programs (U.S. Census Bureau 2012).

Second, political factors also influence program evaluations, with ideology arising as a significant correlate of service satisfaction in both the logistic and negative binomial regression models. These models demonstrate that conservatives are less likely than moderates to rate government programs as “generally effective.” This likely relates to conservatives’ views of the proper role of government and general disapproval of government spending on social welfare and means-tested programs in particular. In

addition, this finding shows that even controlling for experience with public services, an individual still judges government programs through an ideological lens, reflecting the influence of diffuse support for government on service satisfaction.

Third, these models show that service users do have significantly different evaluations of government services than non-users, with those who have used a particular program being more likely to rate it as “generally effective.” This finding strengthens the performance-trust hypothesis, in that using public services provides a platform for evaluations based on specific support for government, rather than attitudes of diffuse support for government that spill over into evaluations of service effectiveness. Therefore, supporting the underlying assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis, those who use public services will be able to experience improvements in government performance, and through these positive experiences with services, are likely to be more satisfied.

CHAPTER VII

EVALUATING CITIZEN ATTITUDES TOWARD PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS

Introduction

The second implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis to be examined is the idea that interactions with government administrators matter to the formation of citizen attitudes about government. Recent efforts to enhance trust based on the New Public Management reforms have focused on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the bureaucracy, in order to improve citizen evaluations of government performance. However, the New Public Management reforms overlook the multi-dimensional nature of trust, focusing only on one dimension, the cognitive element of trust, which is competence. This cognitive dimension of trust is based on an individual's calculation that trusting someone else will maximize his or her self-interest.

However, many empirical studies have shown that there are two distinct dimensions of trust, recognizing the cognitive element of trust, but also pointing to a second dimension, an affective element of trust, which is not addressed in the New Public Management reforms. This affective dimension of trust emphasizes the importance of how citizens are treated in the process of providing public services, what I will refer to as 'caring.' This affective dimension of trust highlights a process of interaction with citizens based on democratic values and citizen perceptions of fairness, equity, respect and honesty in their dealings with public administrators (Van Ryzin 2011).

Consequently, it is important to gain a better understanding of the influences on citizen attitudes about the competence and caring of public administrators in order to

better understand what role attitudes toward bureaucrats play in overall trust in government. Additional research is needed specifically to address the following questions: What influences citizen attitudes toward public administrators? Are attitudes about the competence and caring of public administrators influenced by a similar set of correlates?

Descriptive Analysis

Table 13 presents percentage distributions for citizen attitudes of trust in public officials, the competence of federal employees and being treated with respect by federal employees. Consistent with the notion that trust in government is low, only 195 respondents (35%) agree that “you can generally trust public officials to try to do the right thing.” In contrast, perceptions about government administrators are more positive. Just over half of respondents (305 or 52%) agree that “the people working for the federal government are competent.” Only 144 (or 25%) disagree, and the remaining respondents neither agree nor disagree (116 or 20%). Not only are federal workers generally regarded as competent, respondents report being treated with respect by federal employees with whom they have had interactions. Over three-fourths of respondents (377 or 65%) agree that they were “treated with respect” while only 72 (or 12%) disagree with this statement.

These attitudes are more positive than what may be expected, in light of generally negative perceptions of government and an associated atmosphere of low trust. However, these results are consistent with public opinion data reported by Goodsell (2004), who contends that, “The quality of public service in the United States is vastly underrated” (xi). He argues that while the bureaucracy is consistently criticized by the media and

elected officials, citizen surveys show that specific evaluations of personal experiences with the bureaucracy tend to be positive. In addition, survey data comparing public and private sector returns show more favorable evaluations of government over private institutions (Goodsell 2004).

Multivariate Analysis

Examining the correlates of citizen attitudes toward federal workers, the results of the logistic regression analysis are reported in Table 14. In the first model of Table 14, the correlates of citizen perceptions of the competence of federal workers are examined. While political trust research has not consistently found socio-demographic attributes to be related to trusting attitudes, education is correlated with perceptions of the competence of public administrators in this model. The more highly educated an individual is, the more likely she is to believe public administrators are competent. In fact, individuals with a college degree are twice as likely as others to agree that federal workers are competent. While the literature on the effects of education is mixed, most commonly, education is found to have a positive effect on trust (Bouckaert and Van de Walle 2001; Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Christensen and Laeigreid 2005; Listhaug and Wiberg 1995), largely because higher levels of education may translate to a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, the political-administrative process (Marlowe 2004; Tolbert and Mossberger 2006). Consistent with the political trust literature, the other socio-demographic variables included in this model—male, white and income—are not correlated with attitudes of competence.

Model 1 also examines the influence of political attributes on attitudes of the competence of federal workers. These findings show that several political attributes are correlated with attitudes concerning the competence of public administrators. First, presidential approval is significant and exerts a positive influence on perceptions of competence. Individuals who approve of the job the president is doing are 2.2 times as likely as others to agree that federal workers are competent. Consistent with political trust research, many studies have found that evaluations of the president influence trust (Citrin and Green 1986; Citrin and Luks 1998). Keele (2007) also points out that, “The actions of incumbent leaders and evaluations of government institutions are also thought to be critical to levels of trust. In particular, the actions of Congress and the president appear to have a formative influence on how trusting the public is of government” (242; see also Chanley et al. 2000; Hetherington 1998). In addition, Houston and Harding (forthcoming) find that perceptions of the competence of government administrators are influenced by political variables, more so than by perceptions of citizen treatment in interactions with bureaucrats. Furthermore, noting that the ideology variables are not significant in an alternative model excluding presidential approval, this variable reflects the spillover of attitudes about one part of government into another. Thus, presidential approval may represent the influence of diffuse support for government on perceptions of bureaucratic competence.

Further examining the political variables in Model 1, political efficacy arises as a significant positive influence on ‘competence.’ This demonstrates that individuals who feel that they have a say in what government does are more likely to feel that they have been treated with respect by federal employees. In fact, an individual who perceives

himself to be politically effective is 1.5 times as likely as others to agree that federal workers are competent. This is consistent with findings in the political trust literature, which show that those who believe in their own abilities to participate effectively in the political system and think that the political system is responsive to citizen demands are likely to have greater levels of trust in government (Morrell 2003; Niemi et al. 1991; Parent et al. 2005).

In addition, Model 1 shows that citizen evaluations of their own economic situations are positively correlated with attitudes of the competence of public administrators. The better that an individual perceives his own economic situation to be, the more likely he is to believe that federal workers are doing a good job. In fact, those who agree that their economic situation has improved over the last several years are 1.5 times as likely as others to agree that federal workers are competent. This finding is consistent with political trust studies showing that citizens assess the performance of government based on their individual financial status and the health of the national economy (Espinal, Hartlyn, and Kelly 2006; Kelly 2003; MacKuen, Erikson, and Stimson 1992).

In order to further evaluate the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, Model 1 also examines the influence of service satisfaction on perceptions of bureaucratic competence. The performance-trust hypothesis assumes that better performing public services will result in more satisfied citizens and thus improve trust in government. A key link in this hypothesis is the relationship between service satisfaction and attitudes pertaining to citizen interactions with bureaucrats. Based on the underlying premise of the performance-trust hypothesis that bureaucrats matter to trust, it is

important to better understand the relationship of service satisfaction and output-based trust in public administrators, which is related to competence. Two variables are used to examine service satisfaction based on an evaluation of seven government programs. The first variable, which is included in Model 1, is a measure of the number of programs an individual evaluated as “generally effective.” The second variable, which is included in Model 2, examines dissatisfaction with government services, measuring the number of programs an individual evaluated as “not very effective.” For the variables “generally effective” and “not very effective,” each represents a reverse of the other, and both measure the same concept of level of satisfaction with public services.⁵

Looking at the influence of service satisfaction on perceptions of the competence of public administrators, Model 1 shows that the number of programs an individual evaluates as “generally effective” is positively correlated with output-based trust in public administrators. In fact, for each additional program rated as “generally effective,” an individual is 16% more likely to agree that federal workers are competent. This result supports the hypothesis that service satisfaction increases trusting attitudes, specifically output-based trust in public administrators, as would be expected according to the performance-trust hypothesis. In addition, this finding is consistent with empirical research supporting the link between service satisfaction and trust in government (Bouckaert and Van de Wall 2003; Fornell 2002; Heintzman and Marson 2005; Vigoda-

⁵ Although the situation in which the variables “generally effective” and “not very effective” are significant in a model on their own and not significant when included in a model together represents a classic indication of high collinearity, variance inflation factor scores of 1.36 and 1.34, respectively, computed for Model 1, indicate that this is not the case.

Gadot and Yuval 2003). The literature also supports the relationship of service satisfaction with attitudes towards bureaucrats. In an aggregate analysis of 33 countries and an individual-level analysis of the United States, Van Ryzin (2011) finds that public attitudes about the trustworthiness of civil servants are influenced by government success at delivering outcomes to the public.

Model 1 also includes variables examining the influence of using means-tested welfare programs on perceptions of bureaucratic competence. This concept is tested in two variables, which examine first, the number of means-tested welfare programs that a respondent has used personally, and second, the number of means-tested welfare programs that a respondent's family members have used, but the respondent has not used himself. These variables distinguish between the influence of personal experience with government programs and personal interactions with bureaucrats, as opposed to secondhand perceptions based on the experiences of family members with these services. However, neither of these variables arises as a significant correlate of trust in this analysis. In addition, these variables are not significant in any altered model, holding out the political variables or the service satisfaction indicators.⁶ Therefore, perceptions of bureaucratic competence are not influenced by whether an individual personally received benefits from means-tested programs or had a family member who received benefits.

Model 2 holds constant the same set of socio-demographic, political and service utilization variables, while examining the influence of the number of programs an

⁶ The number of means-tested programs a respondent has used personally or that a family member has used are not highly collinear, with variance inflation factors of 1.08 and 1.04, respectively for Model 1.

individual judged to be “not very effective.” These variables perform in the same manner in Model 2 as shown in Model 1, with college education, presidential job approval and economic situation continuing to exert a significant positive influence on perceptions of confidence in federal workers, and the utilization of means-tested welfare programs demonstrating no correlation with these attitudes. However, political efficacy is no longer a significant correlate of perceptions of ‘competence’ in Model 2. As with the service satisfaction measure in Model 1, this measure of dissatisfaction with public services is also significantly correlated with perceptions of the competence of public administrators. For each program that an individual rated “not very effective,” he is 18% less likely to agree that federal workers are competent. This finding is consistent with research by Kampen, Van de Walle, and Bouckaert (2006), which indicates that dissatisfaction with government services is negatively correlated with trust in the branches of government. In addition, although the direction of the relationship is as hypothesized, the magnitude of the negative effect of dissatisfaction on perceptions of competence is not significantly larger than the positive effect of satisfaction. Therefore, this finding does not support the hypothesis that citizen dissatisfaction with public services will have a stronger negative impact on attitudes of trust in federal workers and government officials in general than will the positive impact of citizen satisfaction with public services.

The results of Models 1 and 2 support the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, suggesting that this aspect of the service-satisfaction link, in which evaluations of government services influence perceptions of the competence of federal workers, does operate as hypothesized. This further suggests that performance matters,

particularly, that better performing services do result in more positive perceptions of bureaucratic competence, which represents the output-based dimension of trust.

Therefore, when citizens get what they want from government services, they are more likely to grant trust, and vice versa when government outputs do not meet their interests.

Models 3 and 4 examine influences on attitudes about the ‘caring’ of public administrators, which is measured as the “agree” response to perceptions of being treated with respect in interactions with federal employees. This variable represents the process-based dimension of trust, in which citizens grant trust based on perceptions of fairness, equity, respect and honesty in interactions with public administrators (Van Ryzin 2011). Looking at the socio-demographic and political correlates in Model 3, only political efficacy arises as a significant positive influence on ‘caring.’ This shows that individuals who feel that they have a say in what government does are more likely to feel that they have been treated with respect by federal employees. In fact, an individual who perceives himself to be politically efficacious is 1.7 times as likely as others to agree that he has been treated with respect in interactions with public administrators. This finding is supported in research by Houston and Harding (forthcoming) who find that perceptions of the trustworthiness of public administrators, examining the affective dimension of trust in particular, are influenced by attitudes of political efficacy, in which those who find the government to be responsive to citizens are more likely to perceive government administrators as trustworthy. None of the other political variables were significantly correlated with perceptions of being treated with respect by federal employees. This was also supported by Houston and Harding’s (forthcoming) analysis of attitudes of the

trustworthiness of public administrators, which found that partisanship did not influence attitudes based on the affective dimension of trust.

Model 3 examines the influence of service satisfaction on perceptions of being treated with respect by federal employees. Again, service satisfaction is found to be positively correlated with citizen perceptions of public administrators. For every additional government service an individual rated as “generally effective,” she is 1.2 times as likely as others to feel that she has been treated with respect by government employees. This finding supports the service satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis, in that service satisfaction does exert a positive influence on attitudes about bureaucrats, which has been corroborated empirically in political trust literature (Fornell 2002; Heintzman and Marson 2005). However, it also points to a link between satisfaction with services and process-based trust, which has not been acknowledged in New Public Management reforms. Those who are satisfied with a greater number of government services are more likely to perceive that they were treated with fairness and respect in the process of interacting with public administrators. This highlights the importance of process factors in service delivery. According to VanRyzin (2011), “public perceptions of the trustworthiness of civil servants depend not just on the extent to which government succeeds at delivering outcomes to citizens, but also on getting the process right by treating people fairly, avoiding favoritism, and containing corruption” (11). The empirical link between process concerns in service delivery and attitudes towards government administrators (and government broadly) is well-supported in the public trust literature (Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002; Taylor-Gooby 2006b; Tyler 2006; Van Ryzin 2011).

Holding constant the socio-demographic, political and service utilization variables, Model 4 focuses on the influence of dissatisfaction with public services on perceptions of the ‘caring’ of federal workers. The number of government programs an individual indicates to be “not generally effective” is negatively correlated with perceptions of being treated with respect by federal employees. For each government program an individual assesses to be “not very effective,” he is 24% less likely to agree that he has been treated with respect by government workers. This relationship is consistent with the hypothesis that dissatisfaction with services would negatively influence trust in public administrators and government officials, although the magnitude of the negative effect is not significantly greater than the magnitude of the positive influence of satisfaction on perceptions of ‘caring.’ The relationship between dissatisfaction with services and trust in public administrators is consistent with empirical findings in the political trust literature (Kampen, Van de Walle, and Bouckaert 2006). This finding further underscores the relationship between service satisfaction and process-based trust in public administrators.

While political efficacy remains significant at the 90% confidence level in Model 4, none of the other socio-demographic, political or service utilization variables arise as a significant influence on perceptions of being treated with respect by federal employees in Models 3 or 4. While the finding that socio-demographic variables are not correlated with attitudes toward public administrators is consistent with the political trust research (Listhaug 1998; Rose and Pettersen 2000), the finding that no political variable, except for political efficacy, correlates with perceptions of the ‘caring’ of public administrators is not consistent with the majority political trust research. However, it is consistent with

the findings of Houston and Harding (forthcoming), which specifically address the difference in correlates between the affective and calculative dimensions of trust in public administrators.

Discussion of Multivariate Analysis

Examining the correlates of ‘competence’ and ‘caring’ provides insight into the multi-dimensional nature of trust in public administrators, and provides a better understanding of attitudes toward bureaucrats in general. First, these models show that, for the most part, socio-demographic variables do not significantly influence attitudes toward public administrators, although having a college degree is positively correlated with perceptions of ‘competence.’ One explanation may be that those who are more highly educated are more likely to be aware of the workings of the bureaucracy and the limitations imposed by the checks and balances of power in democratic government.

Second, a comparison of the political correlates of ‘competence’ and ‘caring’ shows that while these two components of trust are related, they also are distinct. Perceptions of ‘competence’ show much greater influence by political variables than perceptions of ‘caring.’ Perceptions of being treated with respect by federal workers are apolitical, or not influenced by politically-driven performance measures. However, attitudes of ‘competence’ are influenced by both presidential job approval and assessments of an individual’s personal economic situation. These variables are often used as measures of government performance, assessing if government is doing the right thing, and especially, if government is “doing the right thing for me.” It is not surprising that perceptions of ‘competence,’ which represents output-based trust, are correlated with

output-based factors that measure whether the government is doing what citizens want or what benefits them. On the other hand, perceptions of ‘caring’ are not influenced by these political, performance-based factors, or the idea of “what is government doing for me.” Only political efficacy, or having a say in what government does, arose as a significant influence on perceptions of caring, reflecting the importance of process concerns such as participation, openness and responsiveness in citizen interactions with government administrators. This distinction between the affective and calculative dimensions of trust in bureaucrats is consistent with Houston and Harding’s (forthcoming) analysis of the competence and trustworthiness of public administrators.

Third, this analysis shows that service satisfaction and dissatisfaction are correlated with both attitudes of the ‘competence’ and ‘caring’ of public administrators. On one hand, this supports the service satisfaction link in the performance-trust hypothesis, demonstrating that attitudes of trust in public administrators are influenced by evaluations of public services, as expected by the New Public Management. This corroborates the underlying premise of the performance-trust hypothesis that bureaucrats matter, in that perceptions of bureaucrats are linked with attitudes of satisfaction. In addition, the finding that service satisfaction influences perceptions of competence supports the performance aspect of the performance-trust hypothesis: that citizens who are satisfied perceive government performance positively.

On the other hand, the finding that evaluations of service satisfaction influence perceptions of the ‘caring’ of public administrators demonstrates the importance of process concerns in evaluations of government services. Those who are satisfied with government services are more likely to feel not only that they got what they needed from

government, but also that they were treated fairly in the process of interaction with public administrators. This highlights the importance of process concerns—such as being dealt with fairly, equitably, honestly and with respect—that are overlooked by the New Public Management reforms, ostensibly in place of a focus on criteria such as performance and efficiency. Therefore, these findings illustrate that both output and process-based trust in public administrators are linked to evaluations of service satisfaction.

CHAPTER VIII

TRUST IN GOVERNMENT: EXAMINING THE INFLUENCE OF SERVICE SATISFACTION, COMPETENCE AND CARING

Introduction

The performance-trust hypothesis posits that a better performing government will increase citizen satisfaction with public services, consequently resulting in higher levels of citizen trust in government. Thus far, this study has examined empirically correlates of service satisfaction, particularly addressing the implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis that satisfaction is based on specific support for government. Findings demonstrate that those who have personally used government services do have significantly different evaluations of those services and are more likely to view them as “generally effective” than those who have not personally used the government services. In addition, controlling for socio-demographic characteristics and political attitudes, race and ideology arise as correlates of satisfaction, demonstrating that whites are more likely to be satisfied with government services than those of other races, whereas conservatives are more likely than others to have negative evaluations of government services.

In addition, this study has also examined empirically attitudes toward public administrators, exploring the distinction between process and output-based trust in public administrators. Supporting the multidimensionality of trust, correlates of perceptions about the caring of public administrators differ from perceptions of bureaucratic competence. Findings show that competence is influenced by output-based political

factors, reflecting system performance in relation to how the individual benefits.

However, perceptions of caring are influenced not by political performance factors, but by process factors, with political efficacy, or feeling that an individual has a say in what government does, arising as a significant correlate of caring.

In order to fully examine the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, it is necessary now to assess empirically the influence of service satisfaction, experience with government services, and citizen attitudes toward public administrators on general trust in government. This analysis will evaluate whether these variables demonstrate the hypothesized influence on trust, thus testing the performance-trust hypothesis and contributing to a better understanding of trust in government and influence of citizen experience with the public bureaucracy.

Multivariate Analysis

How do citizen assessments of service satisfaction, the competence of government administrators and their treatment by government administrators influence attitudes of trust in government? The logistic regression models reported in Tables 15 and 16 address this question. Of the 604 total respondents to the 2006 Maxwell Poll, missing data on one or more questions reduced the final sample to 375 for Models 1 and 2, 328 for Model 3 and 292 for Model 4.

What factors influence an individual's trust in public officials? First, the influence of socio-demographic and political-cultural variables on these trusting attitudes will be examined. The results of this analysis, depicted in Model 1, show that the socio-demographic variables male, white, college education and income are not correlated with

trust in public officials. These findings are consistent with other studies of trust in government, which suggest that socio-demographic variables do not significantly influence trusting attitudes (Elchardus and Smits 2002; Levi and Stoker 2000; Rose and Pettersen 2000).

However, looking at the influence of political-cultural variables on trust, these results demonstrate that political factors do impact trusting attitudes. In Model 1, the variables partisanship, political efficacy, and presidential approval arise as significant correlates of trust. Partisanship, defined as identifying with one of the two major American political parties, is found to enhance trust in public officials. The odds ratio shows that respondents who identify themselves as either a Republican or a Democrat are 1.8 times more likely than independents or others to agree that public officials can generally be trusted “to try to do the right thing.” This is consistent with the findings of other studies of public trust (Huseby 1995; Newton and Norris 2000), which have found similar results highlighting the influence of partisanship on trust. Recognizing the important role that parties play in the political system, identifying with a political party demonstrates participation in and acceptance of the workings of the system. Therefore, those who identify with either the Republican or Democratic parties may feel a greater connection to government because the party that they support has had a stake in the decision-making process. Furthermore, feelings of political efficacy and evaluations of the legitimacy of government decisions are enhanced as citizens feel that their interests are being represented through the party organizations (Christensen and Lægreid 2005). On the other hand, independents and others who do not identify with a political party are

less likely to be tied to the political system (Keele 2005) and may feel that their interests are not represented.

Also, as shown in Model 1, political efficacy, or a feeling that personal political action can influence the political system, is also positively correlated with trust in public officials. As an individual's attitude of political efficacy increases, his or her trust is likely to increase as well. Individuals who believe that they have a say about what government does are 1.9 times as likely to trust public officials as those who feel that they don't have much say about government actions. Consistent with the political trust literature, those who believe that they can participate effectively in the political system may feel more connected to the system than others, and thus more a part of the decision-making process that created the system, which may, in turn, lead to more trusting attitudes (Tolbert and Mossberger 2006). In addition, those who believe that they are powerless in the political realm and that government is unresponsive to their needs may feel that it is not worthwhile to perform civic duties, such as voting and following politics, and may consider themselves to be outsiders or disenfranchised by the system (Campbell, Gurin, and Miller 1954)—and therefore are less trusting (Parent et al. 2005; Tolbert and Mossberger 2006).

Furthermore, Model 1 shows that an individual's assessment of the performance of the president is positively correlated to trust in public officials. As an individual's approval of the president increases, his trust in government is likely to increase as well. An individual who approves of the job the president is doing is 2.84 times as likely to trust public officials overall as others. This finding is consistent with the public trust literature, which shows that evaluations of the President's job approval and personal

characteristics influence political trust (Citrin 1974; Citrin and Green 1986; Hetherington 1998). Evaluations of the President, as the central figure of government are found to affect overall perceptions of government (Hetherington 1998), as trust in one branch of government is likely to spill over into other attitudes about government actors and institutions (Listhaug 1998). Noting that political ideology is controlled for in the model, presidential job approval likely reflects the influence of diffuse attitudes toward government and its impact on perceptions of other components of government.

Finally, neither political ideology nor an individual's assessment of his or her own economic situation is significantly correlated to trust in public officials. Even in a model tested excluding the partisan and presidential approval variables, neither the variable conservative nor liberal arose as a significant correlate of trust. This finding that ideology does not influence trust is contrary to some studies that have reported an individual's position on the left-right ideological spectrum to be related to trusting attitudes (Christensen and Lægreid 2003; Huseby 1995; Newton 2001). In addition, while an individual's assessment of his or her own economic situation has been used in some research as a measure of overall government performance, findings have been mixed as to its relationship to public trust. Therefore, while socio-demographic variables do not influence public trust, several political variables arise as relevant in explaining trust in government officials.

Model 2 begins examination of the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, which is the most theoretically relevant aspect of this research. First, Model 2 addresses the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis by examining the influence of satisfaction with government services on trusting attitudes. Here two variables are

introduced measuring an individual's satisfaction with public services and dissatisfaction with public services as correlates of public trust. These variables are based on an individual's evaluation of the effectiveness of seven federal programs. The number of programs judged to be "generally effective" is not correlated with trust in public officials, showing that satisfaction with government services does not have the hypothesized positive influence on trust. This finding is counter to the performance-trust hypothesis, which is based on the premise that better government performance leads to higher levels of service satisfaction, and thus increases citizen trust in government. Therefore, according to these results, service satisfaction does not translate to higher levels of trust in the manner hypothesized by the New Public Management.

However, Model 2 shows that dissatisfaction with government programs is significantly linked to trust. The more federal programs that an individual judges to be "not very effective," the less likely an individual will be to trust public officials "try to do the right thing." With each program that a respondent regards as "not very effective," the likelihood of "agreeing" that public officials "try to do the right thing" decreases by 26%. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that citizen dissatisfaction with public services will have a stronger negative impact on trust in government than the positive impact of citizen satisfaction with public services. In addition, research by Kampen, Van de Walle, and Bouckaert (2004) supports this finding, showing that negative attitudes toward public services decrease public trust, but positive evaluations of services fail to alternately increase public trust. According to Kampen, Van de Walle, and Bouckaert (2006), "the impact of a negative experience with a public agency is much more pronounced than the effect of a positive one. Decreasing the number of disappointed

clients will therefore have a much stronger effect on increasing trust in the public institutions, and ultimately in government, than increasing the number of well-pleased clients” (399).

Therefore, while the effect of service satisfaction is not as hypothesized based on the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, there is still a relationship between service satisfaction and trust, with dissatisfaction negatively influencing trust. Even controlling for the effects of evaluations of government programs, the positive influence of political efficacy and presidential approval on trust remain statistically significant in this model, while partisanship no longer arises as a significant influence on trusting attitudes. One explanation may be that evaluations of government programs are influenced by partisan attitudes, thus capturing the effects of partisanship in the model.

Further evaluating the premises of the performance-trust hypothesis, Model 3, presented in Table 16, examines the impact of attitudes towards public administrators on trust in government. According to the performance-trust hypothesis, a better performing public service will increase trust in public officials through better public service delivery, emphasizing the output-based dimension of trust, which is competence. However, empirical research has also pointed to the importance of the process-based dimension of trust, neglected by in New Public Management reforms, which is caring. This dimension of trust highlights how citizens are treated in their interactions with government administrators. Therefore, Model 3 addresses whether or not citizen assessments of the competency of government administrators or citizen treatment by government administrators influence citizen attitudes of trust in government.

First, I find that citizen attitudes about the competence of federal workers are positively correlated with trust in public officials. Therefore, individuals who believe that public servants are able to operate government services effectively are about twice as likely to trust in public officials as those who do not believe that government administrators are competent. This finding supports the hypothesis that the more competent an individual perceives public servants to be, the more trust he or she will have in government overall. In addition, these findings are consistent with the principles of New Public Management (Braithwaite 1998; Jennings 1998), and support the underlying premise of the performance-trust hypothesis that bureaucratic performance influences trust. Citizen evaluations of competence, according to Ruscio (1996), depend on a “logic of consequences,” or an individual’s calculation that trusting someone else will maximize his or her self-interest. Therefore, the emphasis on efficiency and performance by the New Public Management reforms do target this output dimension of trust as the performance-trust hypothesis suggests, in which citizens make rational judgments whether or not to trust based on performance and service quality (Calnan and Rowe 2006).

In addition, Model 3 shows that being treated with respect by federal workers also significantly influences public trust. Those who agree that they have been treated with respect by federal employees are 2.2 times as likely as others to trust public officials. Therefore, individuals who feel that government administrators’ actions take their interests to heart, and feel that the processes of government are fair, are more likely to trust public officials broadly. This supports the hypothesis that individuals who feel that they have been treated with respect by public servants are likely to be more trusting of

government. In addition, this finding is consistent with empirical research that has emphasized the importance of process-based trust in evaluations of bureaucrats (Van Ryzin 2011). According to Kim (2005), “citizens tend to trust in government when they feel that the government shows genuine care and concern for its citizens” (625), a hypothesis also supported by numerous authors (Berman 1997; Braithwaite 1998; Wicks, Berman, and Jones 1999). Furthermore, research shows that citizens base evaluations of government on process considerations, such as the fairness, openness and responsiveness of government processes (Donovan and Bowler 2004; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 1998; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2001; Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002).

These findings suggest that citizen attitudes toward bureaucrats do influence their trust in government generally. Therefore, individual’s attitudes and interactions with public servants are relevant to public trust, even after controlling for the influence of other government officials and perceptions about the effectiveness of public services. This supports the underlying premise of the performance-trust hypothesis found in the literature on New Public Management, that evaluations of bureaucrats matter to trust in government broadly. Accordingly, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2003) point out that, “Most administrative reform projects put citizens’ image of specific public services and agencies at the center of efforts to improve citizens’ general image of government” (533). Furthermore, in Kampen, Van de Walle and Bouckaert’s (2003) study of citizen evaluation of government in Flanders, they find that citizens differentiate between trust in the institutions of the bureaucracy and trust in the political bodies, noting that “satisfaction with the federal government and the working of democracy have impact on the level of trust, but . . . the largest effect comes from satisfaction with the public

administrations and services” (2). Similarly, Van de Walle et al. (2005) find that in addition to images of politicians, images of civil servants also contributed significantly to models of citizen satisfaction with public services and overall trust in government. Therefore, the findings of this study corroborate other empirical research emphasizing the importance of evaluations of bureaucrats for trust in government broadly.

Model 3 also demonstrates that process-based trust in public administrators, or being treated with respect, exerts a greater effect on trust in public officials broadly than perceptions of the competence of public administrators. Comparing the odds ratios of these variables, citizen perceptions of the caring of public administrators (2.17) have a greater influence on trust than perceptions of bureaucratic competence (1.94). Although the difference in the effects of attitudes of competence and caring on trust is slight, this finding has significant theoretical import. Process-based trust in public administrators may be just as important an influence on attitudes of trust in public officials generally, or even a more important influence, than output-based trust. Therefore, efforts by the New Public Management to improve trust may be self-defeating if they undermine process concerns that are of value to citizens. This finding on the comparative impact of process and output-based trust is corroborated in research by Van Ryzin (2011) on trust in public administrators. He states, “In all but one of the models reported...[both individual level and country level], the effect of process on trust appears larger—in some cases several times larger—than the effect of outcomes on trust” (Van Ryzin 2011, 11). Consistently demonstrating a substantively large process effect across the different models, and across levels of analysis, Van Ryzin (2011) notes that “process appears to be a very important

factor in the formation of trust judgments and not just outcomes, as often assumed by the performance movement and the related public administration literature” (13).

Finally, Model 4 presents a fully specified model that controls for socio-demographic and political cultural variables, as well as service satisfaction variables and attitudes toward public administrators, while also examining how experiences with means-tested welfare programs influence trust in public officials. Two variables are used to assess the influence of experiencing means-tested welfare programs. The first examines how the number of means-tested welfare programs personally used by the respondent impacts trust, while the second variable demonstrates the impact of the number of means-tested programs used by a respondent’s family. The distinction between experiencing the service personally and family use of services helps to highlight the importance of being a service user, personally interacting with government administrators and experiencing the quality of a particular public service through the process of service delivery, as opposed to secondhand evaluations of service quality or benefits.

Findings show that the use of means-tested programs by a respondent’s family members does not exert a significant influence on trust. However, a respondent’s personal use of means-tested programs is positively correlated with trust in public officials. The more means-tested programs that a respondent uses, the more likely he is to trust government. In fact, for each additional means-tested program personally used, a respondent is 26% more likely to trust government. This finding does not support the hypothesis that that personal experience with means-tested welfare programs will be negatively related to trust in government. In addition, this finding is contrary to studies

showing that selective, means-tested programs decrease trust in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Kumlin and Rothstein 2002). These studies suggest that selective services—which require individuals to demonstrate their need to qualify and the level of their need to determine how much of the service to which they are entitled—create a dynamic between the citizen and the bureaucrat that undermines perceived procedural justice, and thus, trusting attitudes (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005). However, the finding that experiencing benefits from means-tested programs increases trust in government may indicate that service users see government as being responsive by providing needed programs and services, which leads to positive attitudes toward government.

Looking at the socio-demographic and political-cultural correlates of trust in Models 3 and 4, partisanship, political efficacy and presidential approval continue to arise as significant, positive influences on trust, even when controlling for attitudes toward bureaucrats and use of means-tested welfare programs. Furthermore, the political-cultural variable liberal is significant in these models and exerts a positive influence on trust. This is consistent with hypotheses that those on the left end of the spectrum are more likely to be trusting of government than those on the right, as a result of the left's traditional support for the public sector and strong government institutions (Huseby 1995; Lægreid 1993). In addition, the socio-demographic variable male also asserts a positive influence on trust in Models 3 and 4—a finding that has also been reported in other studies (Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Houston and Harding forthcoming; Keele 2005)—which suggests that men are likely to be more trusting of government actors and institutions than women, perhaps because they hold more prominent positions in

government and are less likely to experience inequity in social institutions (Brewer and Sigelman 2002; Keele 2005).

Discussion of Multivariate Analysis

Several conclusions can be drawn from these empirical findings. First, these findings show that there is a relationship between the effectiveness of public services and trust in public officials. This relationship is most strongly reflected in negative assessments of performance and negative attitudes toward public officials. To increase public trust, the emphasis need not be placed on increasing the number of very satisfied citizens, instead it appears that it is more important to reduce the number of dissatisfied citizens. These findings provide some support for the performance-trust hypothesis.

Second, individuals' perceptions of government administrators do influence attitudes of trust in public officials, even when controlling for perceptions of service effectiveness. Public administrators, not just political actors, impact the public's trust in government, and thus must play a role in any solution for enhancing public trust. This is an aspect of public trust that the political trust literature has not yet addressed.

Third, it is not just increasing the competence of government administrators that is important, it is also critical to pay attention to how administrators do what they do. As expected, both the competence and caring of government administrators are important to enhancing citizen attitudes of trust in public officials, with caring demonstrating an even greater effect than competence. To encourage a focus on administrative competence to the exclusion of caring is likely to be self-defeating.

CHAPTER IX CONCLUSION

Overview

Examining the relationship among government performance, service satisfaction and trust in government, this research contributes to a better understanding of the performance-trust hypothesis and its assumptions. This study examines the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis, investigating influences on service satisfaction and how these translate into trust. In particular, two implicit assumptions of the performance-trust hypothesis are explored. First, citizen experience with public services is evaluated as a measure of specific support for government. In addition, the role of the citizen interactions with the bureaucracy is examined, especially identifying the influence of citizen attitudes toward public administrators on general trust in government. Furthermore, this study investigates the multi-dimensional nature of trust, evaluating the influence of output and process-based trust on assessments of bureaucrats and citizen trust in government. Analyzing the implications of this research, the findings provide empirical evidence by which to assess past government reforms and to inform future efforts.

Examining the Satisfaction Link of the Performance-Trust Hypothesis

The performance-trust hypothesis, which is a key principle underlying the New Public Management reform movement, has emphasized the importance of improving government performance in order to increase citizen satisfaction with public services, and thus improve levels of trust in government (Van Ryzin 2007). This performance

orientation, focusing on improving service delivery, efficiency, and outcomes, and thereby producing results that matter to citizens, has been implemented in reforms across the globe (Van Ryzin 2011). However, despite widespread reforms and improvements in performance, trust has continued to decline, leading to questions about the accuracy of the hypothesized relationship between performance, satisfaction and trust (Van de Walle and Bouckaert 2003; Yang and Holzer 2006). Van Ryzin (2011) has called for “more careful scrutiny” (1) of the performance trust hypothesis and a better understanding “with the support of empirical evidence, the pieces of this puzzle—the links among government performance, citizen satisfaction, and trust” (Van Ryzin 2007, 522). Therefore, in response to these concerns, this research contributes to a better understanding of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis by empirically examining how satisfaction works, and by evaluating the relationship among performance, satisfaction and trust. This study specifically sheds light on what factors influence citizen satisfaction with government services, how being a service user impacts service satisfaction, and finally, how satisfaction influences trust in government.

Who is Satisfied?

First, this research contributes to a better understanding of citizen satisfaction with public services by controlling for a common set of socio-demographic characteristics and political attitudes, addressing the question: Who is satisfied with government services? Kampen, Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2006) and Heintzman and Marson (2005) have each noted that previous studies examining satisfaction with public service delivery and government performance are “at best incomplete,” largely because

these studies fail to include information beyond the administration-specific dimension or to control for personal value orientations, generalized attitudes and wider social factors. Therefore, addressing these gaps in the literature, this work provides evaluations of service satisfaction for six programs, controlled for socio-demographic characteristics and political attitudes. In this examination, several factors arise as significant influences on satisfaction across multiple program evaluation models. First, race is a significant determinate of who is satisfied with government services. Whites are less likely to positively evaluate government programs than those of other races. One explanation may be that minorities may have more positive perceptions of government programs designed to increase equality, as do those examined in this study (Marlowe 2004). In addition, political ideology is also a factor influencing service satisfaction. Political conservatives are less likely than others to believe that government programs are “generally effective.” This may be explained by the generally critical attitude of conservatives toward the public sector, and in particular, government programs aimed at alleviating the effects of poverty (Huseby 1995; Lægreid 1993).

Identifying the influence of these socio-demographic and political factors has important ramifications for reforms based on the New Public Management. Despite improvements in performance, the influence of race and ideology on attitudes toward government services may limit gains in satisfaction. Citizen demographic characteristics and value orientations that result in a negative view toward government programs may undermine satisfaction levels to an extent, regardless of how much service delivery is improved. Therefore, citizen predisposition toward government could offer a partial explanation of why New Public Management reforms, boasting improvements in

efficiency and outcomes, have not significantly influenced positive changes in attitudes of satisfaction or trust.

Service Satisfaction: Experience is the Key

Second, this study contributes to a better understanding of the performance-trust hypothesis by exploring the relationship between being a user of specific public services and satisfaction with those services. The question of whether or not service use makes a difference in satisfaction is a very important point for the performance-trust hypothesis. In order for government performance to have an impact on trust, through satisfaction with public service delivery (as the hypothesis suggests), using services should directly affect satisfaction, and lead to changes in trust in government, demonstrating the influence of specific support for government. However, if levels of service satisfaction do not change based on using a specific public service, it would suggest that satisfaction with a public agency may be of a general nature, or based on diffuse support for government, and is not influenced by the performance of a particular agency or particular citizen experience of this service.

Addressing the influence of experience with government services on service satisfaction, this study examines the relationship between using a particular government service and evaluations of the effectiveness of that service, for seven government programs. The findings show that service users have significantly different evaluations of government services than non-service users. Personally experiencing the service delivery of a particular government program results in higher levels of service satisfaction compared to levels among those who have not personally used the program.

This result supports the satisfaction-link of the performance-trust hypothesis, showing that satisfaction is not only based on diffuse support of government, but also, for those who experience a government service themselves, is directly linked to evaluations of the performance of the particular program used.

This substantiation of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis has notable implications for New Public Management reforms. This shows that improvements in performance can drive increases in citizen satisfaction, confirming that performance-oriented reforms may be a step in the right direction. Therefore, studies of citizen satisfaction with government service delivery that have not differentiated between service users and those who have not personally used the service in question may be testing the wrong concept. While specific support for government may be shown in questions directly linking user experience with service quality, studies that examine satisfaction with government services in general, and do not assess whether the individual is a service user, may be tapping attitudes of diffuse support for government, and not actual evaluations of service quality or satisfaction. Consequently, the influence of performance can only be measured directly through citizen experience with the performance of a particular service. This finding should inform future research on the relationship between government performance and citizen satisfaction.

Further evaluating the role of citizen experiences with the bureaucracy, this study examines the influence of experiencing a particular type of government service on both service satisfaction and trust in government. Studies of Scandinavian countries have shown that experiencing selective, means-tested welfare programs has been found to reduce citizen trust in government (Christensen and Lægreid 2005) and interpersonal

trust (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005). However, this examination of U.S. data demonstrates that citizen experience with means-tested welfare programs significantly increases both measures of service satisfaction and trust in government. The more means-tested welfare programs a citizen uses, the more likely he is to be both satisfied with government services and to trust in government. This is a departure from previous findings, but the difference may be explained by the structure of the American welfare system. As compared to the Scandinavian system, in which means-tested programs are a small component of a large welfare state with primarily universal benefits, the American system has fewer universal benefit programs and aids the poor primarily through a means-tested welfare system. Therefore, despite a program structure that would appear to undermine perceptions of procedural justice, in which citizens must demonstrate their need to qualify for benefits and bureaucrats serve as gatekeepers with discretion to interpret and apply program guidelines, using means-tested welfare programs increases citizen satisfaction with services and trust in government. This finding is further corroboration of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis. Utilizing needed government services, and thus experiencing program performance and interacting with public administrators, results in higher levels of service satisfaction and trust. Therefore, New Public Management reforms aimed to improve performance and enhance the quality of services in means-tested welfare programs should see corresponding gains in service satisfaction and trust levels from service users.

The Satisfaction-Trust Link: The Role of Dissatisfied Citizens

Examining the satisfaction-trust link of the performance-trust hypothesis, this study evaluates how satisfaction influences trust in government. According to the performance-trust hypothesis, increases in service satisfaction should result in corresponding increases in trust in government. However, this study shows that satisfaction does not impact trust in the manner hypothesized by the New Public Management. Increases in service satisfaction do not significantly increase levels of citizen trust in government. Rather, it is the negative impact of dissatisfaction with government services that significantly influences levels of trust.

The implications of this finding are momentous considering the widespread application of New Public Management reforms across the globe targeted on improving performance in order to increase citizen satisfaction with government services, and thus influence increased trust. This finding shows that while there is a relationship between satisfaction and trust, satisfaction does not have the expected impact on trust. Therefore, reform efforts to improve government performance may be wasting valuable resources by focusing on the wrong things. It may be more effective for government to identify and target the problems that most often cause negative evaluations, than to improve overall program performance levels. Currently, resources may be wasted aiming for high performance, when satisfaction, and thus trust, may be better influenced by simply reducing the worst complaints. Further evaluation of this finding is needed in order to assess more thoroughly the relationship between satisfaction and trust, and to apply this knowledge for more efficient spending on government reforms.

Exploring Attitudes toward Public Administrators

The second main objective of this study is to explore the implicit assumption of the performance-trust hypothesis that interactions with government administrators influence the formation of citizen attitudes about government. Recent efforts to enhance trust based on New Public Management reforms have focused on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the bureaucracy, in order to improve citizen evaluations of government performance. Therefore, the idea implicit in the performance-trust hypothesis is that improving bureaucratic performance will increase trust in government, based on citizen evaluations of their interactions with bureaucrats. This study explores the relationship between attitudes toward public administrators and trust in government, specifically examining the multi-dimensional nature of trust in bureaucrats, what influences these attitudes, and their role in the performance-trust hypothesis.

Trust in Public Administrators: Perceptions of Competence and Caring

New Public Management reforms, based on the performance-trust hypothesis, have assumed that improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the bureaucracy in delivering results-oriented services to the public will increase trust in government. Under the New Public Management, public administrators are valued for what they can do for the consumer of government services, how efficiently they can produce the outputs of government. The entire premise of the performance-trust hypothesis is that citizens will trust government more if government does more for them, more efficiently. Therefore, government reforms have focused on improving perceptions of bureaucratic performance, or output-based trust. This dimension of trust, identified as competence, depends on a

“logic of consequences,” or an individual’s calculation that trusting someone else will maximize his or her self-interest (Ruscio 1996).

While the New Public Management has assumed that focusing on the output-based dimension of trust is the key to improving trust in government, empirical evidence demonstrating the importance of process-based trust is growing (Van Ryzin 2011). Although this finding on the importance of process has arisen in research across many fields, it has not been recognized in the public administration literature and has been overlooked in New Public Management reforms, which emphasize outcomes over process in the pursuit of better performance (Van Ryzin 2011). Process-based trust, identified in this study as ‘caring,’ encompasses perceptions of fairness, equity, honesty and respect in citizen interaction with government administrators (Van Ryzin 2011). Noting Van Ryzin’s (2011) finding that “bureaucratic process appears to matter to citizens as much as, if not more than, outcomes of government” (13), this study examines attitudes toward bureaucrats, comparing perceptions of the competence and caring of public administrators, which correspond to the output and process-based dimensions of trust. Controlling for a shared set of socio-demographic and attitudinal variables, this study assesses whether or not the correlates of trust differ across its two dimensions, thus exploring whether attitudes based on output factors and process factors are influenced by different variables.

The findings of this study show that citizen perceptions of the competence and caring of public administrators are indeed influenced by different factors, reflecting the distinctions between process and output-based trust. While perceptions of ‘competence’ are influenced by politically-driven performance measures, perceptions of ‘caring’ appear

to be apolitical. Influenced by both presidential job approval and assessments of an individual's personal economic situation, attitudes of bureaucratic competence are based on citizen evaluations of government performance, assessing if government is doing the right thing, and especially, if government is "doing the right thing for me." This finding that perceptions of 'competence,' which represents output-based trust, are correlated with output-based factors, which measure whether the government is doing what citizens want or what benefits them, supports the performance-trust hypothesis. The New Public Management reforms, which have focused solely on output factors while ignoring process factors, have aimed to improve bureaucratic performance and to increase trust by impacting citizen evaluations of bureaucrats; and, they are, at least in part, targeting the right thing. Evaluations of competence are influenced by government performance measures, output-based factors that assess performance in relationship to the respondent's personal benefit from government. Therefore, targeting this output-based dimension of trust may be an effective strategy to link performance improvements with more positive evaluations of bureaucrats, as expected by the performance-trust hypothesis.

Conversely, looking at the correlates of the process-based dimension of trust, caring, these politically driven performance factors do not influence citizen perceptions of being treated with respect by federal employees. This contrast demonstrates a fundamental difference between attitudes of competence and caring, highlighting the multi-dimensional nature of trust. While attitudes of competence are related to performance-based political factors, attitudes of caring are apolitical—not motivated by what government does, but by how government does it. The only socio-demographic or political correlate of caring is political efficacy. This variable does not represent the

output driven evaluations of “what government does for me,” but rather, the process-based concerns for government responsiveness to the needs of citizens and participation in the process of decision-making. Those who believe that people like themselves have a say in what government does are more likely to feel that they have been treated with respect by government administrators. When people feel they are included in the process, that government listens to their concerns and cares what they think, their process-based trust in bureaucrats increases.

Therefore, although these findings show that competence is driven by output-based performance factors, the New Public Management focus on performance to the exclusion of process fails to address the process-based dimension of trust—caring. While trust has been treated in the past as a one-dimensional concept, these findings emphasize that trust is a multi-dimensional concept with two distinct aspects that are influenced by different factors. Consequently, reforms geared to improve government performance may effectively enhance attitudes of the competence of public administrators, while not only failing to positively impact process-based trust, but also possibly undermining it through reforms that value performance over process.

Noting the distinction between the two dimensions of trust, the finding that both attitudes of competence and caring are linked to evaluations of service satisfaction stands out as an important point. The linkage between satisfaction and competence is a confirmation of the relationship expected by the performance-trust hypothesis, in that output-based performance factors are assumed to increase service satisfaction, and thus result in more positive evaluations of the competence of government administrators. However, the linkage between satisfaction and process-based trust shows that those who

are satisfied with government services are more likely to feel not only that they got what they needed from government, but also that they were treated fairly in the process of interaction with public administrators. This relationship between service satisfaction and caring demonstrates that process concerns matter in citizen interactions with government, and that reforms overlooking the importance of fairness, equity, honesty and respect in citizen dealings with government administrators may undermine both process-based trust and service satisfaction.

Attitudes toward Public Administrators and Trust in Government

Looking at the final link in the puzzle, influences on trust in government, the findings indicate that attitudes toward bureaucrats do influence trust in government broadly. This corroborates the implicit premise of the performance-trust hypothesis that citizen evaluations of bureaucrats do matter to trust in government. Therefore, efforts to improve citizen perceptions of government administrators may be effective in increasing trust in government broadly, and in helping to reverse the downward spiral in trust. This finding that attitudes toward bureaucrats may play a strategic role in influencing trust in government broadly and that citizen interactions with bureaucrats during service delivery may be a key link in attitude formation is of significant import for public administration research. Citizen perceptions of bureaucrats do matter, and they may matter more than has been acknowledged in the field. Noting that “examination of subjective data such as opinion data has always been, and still is, limited in comparison to the widespread use of performance indicators in public administration research,” resulting in neglect of the citizen as an object of study, it is important to explore more deeply these attitudes

(Bouckaert, Van de Walle, and Kampen 2005, 232). Thus, more research is needed to further investigate citizen perceptions of the bureaucracy, the role of citizen interaction with bureaucrats in attitude formation, the multi-dimensional nature of trust in government administrators, correlates of trust in government administrators, and their influence on overall trust in government.

Having demonstrated that attitudes toward bureaucrats do influence trust in government, the final point of this analysis examines the relative influence of citizen attitudes of the competence and caring of public administrators on trust in government. The findings show that it is not only competence that influences trusting attitudes, as expected by the performance-trust hypothesis, but also caring. In fact, this process-based trust in government administrators, being treated with respect, may be more important to citizen trust in government than perceptions of bureaucratic competence. Comparing the odds ratios of competence and caring, these findings show that perceptions of having been treated with respect in interactions with federal employees have a greater impact on citizen trust in government than perceptions of bureaucratic competence. Therefore, while competence, or output-based trust, is an important influence on trust in government broadly, caring, or process-based trust, is equally important, if not more so. The implications of this finding for the New Public Management reform movement are far-reaching. Although the output-based performance factors that have been emphasized by the New Public Management do arise as a positive influence on trust in government, the absence of process concerns may explain the failure of the New Public Management reforms to engender a positive impact on trust in government.

Limitations of this Research

Although these findings contribute to a better understanding of the satisfaction link of the performance-trust hypothesis and the influence of output and process-based trust in public administrators on general trust in government, the limitations of this study must be acknowledged. Primarily, the survey data used as the basis for this research presents several limitations. First, the questions forming the basis of the core analyses of this study, which assess citizen attitudes toward federal workers, were only used in the 2006 version of the survey, with 601 respondents, thus significantly reducing the ‘n’ of the analyses from the total of 2,430 respondents. In addition, missing data for one or more variables further reduced the ‘n’ of the multivariate models in the final analysis of the study to a low of 292 respondents. Although this small ‘n’ weakens the application of the findings to the greater population and limits the generalizations possible from these conclusions, the uniqueness of this dataset in offering questions pertaining to the caring and competence of public administrators, citizen satisfaction with public services, and overall trust in government makes it a valuable resource. Therefore, despite these limitations, this research contributes to a better understanding of the performance-trust hypothesis, specifically allowing empirical examination of its assumptions and the application of research findings to New Public Management reforms.

A second limitation of this dataset is the wording of the questions forming the dependent variables for the core analyses of the study. The term “public officials,” interpreted to include elected officials, and the term “people working for the federal government,” interpreted as federal employees, are somewhat vague, and thus may potentially cloud the application of these findings. While interpretation of these terms, as

explained in-depth in the data and methods chapter, is reasonable based on the context and cues taken from the survey itself, the wording of these questions is not ideal. In addition, the use of the survey question regarding trust in “public officials” as a measure of generalized trust in government also lacks clarity, and could be improved with wording more specifically targeted to measurement of this concept. In relation to this same issue of vague question wording concerning the distinction between ‘politicians’ and ‘civil servants’ in the 2006 ISSP survey data, which was similarly used to measure process and output-based trust in public administrators, Van Ryzin (2011, 14) states:

This is an inevitable problem of using secondary data to test such a model and of using questions that were not necessarily designed as indicators of the research variables. In future investigations, it would be ideal to have more established, validated measures of both perceived process and perceived outcomes.

Echoing this sentiment, I hope that this research will lead to a future study of the effects of process and output-based trust in public administrators and their influence on overall trust in government that utilizes indicators specifically created for valid measurement of these concepts. However, short of this ideal, this research sheds light on a better understanding of the performance-trust hypothesis, and in particular, the influence of service satisfaction and perceptions of public administrators on trust in government.

Toward a New Model of Trust: The ‘New Public Service’ and Implications for Reform

Although the findings of this research confirm the importance of output-based trust, which is at the basis of the performance-trust hypothesis, process factors also arise as a significant influence on trust in government. Failing to acknowledge the importance

of democratic values in public administration, critics of the New Public Management contend that its emphasis on efficiency at the expense of process concerns undermines citizen trust. Houston and Harding (forthcoming) point out that underlying these critiques “is the assumption that low public regard for government officials stems from a perceived unresponsiveness to citizen needs, and a lack of honest and ethical conduct in discharging the public business” (see also Box 1998; Mitchell and Scott 1987). Furthermore, Frederickson (1982) also asserts that “much of the present low regard for government organizations has to do with the widespread view that there are great breaches in the fair treatment of citizens or in justice” (504). Echoing this sentiment, King and Stivers (1998) argue that Americans hold negative attitudes about government because “not only is it inefficient and wasteful, but it appears to care little about ordinary citizens, their lives, and their problems” (11). Therefore, acknowledging low citizen trust in government and the failure of New Public Management reforms to reverse this trend of declining trust, previously overlooked process-concerns should be taken into account in future government reform efforts. In order to structure reforms that more effectively target increased citizen trust in government, a new model of trust, balancing the dual dimensions of output and process-based trust, must stand as the foundation for future reform efforts.

Emphasizing the values inherent in process-based trust, the ‘New Public Service,’ an alternative approach to public administration and critique of the New Public Management, offers a vision for bureaucratic reform that calls attention to the importance of democratic principles in the public sector. Advocates of the New Public Service argue that overemphasis on performance and output in the New Public Management movement

weakens the role of democracy in government administration (Denhardt and Denhardt 2003; Denhardt and Denhardt 2011). Therefore, the New Public Service focuses on serving citizens, not customers, emphasizes process over productivity, and values public stewards, rather than entrepreneurs, in the administration of government services.

First, the New Public Services stresses the importance of “serv[ing] citizens, not customers” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 555). While the customer-service orientation of the New Public Management has focused on giving people what they want as consumers of government services, the New Public Service suggests that “government should not first or exclusively respond to the selfish, short-term interests of ‘customers’” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 555). Rather, public administrators should treat individuals as citizens who have a stake in what government does, and thus should “focus on building relationships of trust and collaboration with and among citizens” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 555). Conceiving of people as citizens, the New Public Management expects individuals to move beyond their own short-sighted interests, and to consider the long-term good of the community and their own responsibility and role in ensuring the public interest (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Denhardt and Denhardt 2011). Denhardt and Denhardt (2001) argue that treating citizens as “consumers” devalues their role in democratic government (397). In particular, they note that:

As citizens we expect government to act in a way that promotes not only consumption of services ...but also a set of principles and ideals that are inherent in the public sphere. Citizens cannot be reduced to customers without grave consequences for the notion of democratic citizenship (397).

Therefore, rather than devaluing citizens’ role in democratic government by viewing them as customers, clients or consumers, public administrators should enhance it by

facilitating collaboration and responsiveness in the pursuit of a shared public interest (King and Stivers 1998).

Second, the New Public Service emphasizes the importance of process over efficiency in democratic governance, seeking to facilitate openness, responsiveness and participation in government processes. The New Public Management, on the other hand, subverting process for efficiency, has encouraged cutting bureaucratic ‘red tape’ in order to streamline decision-making, reduce mechanisms of control and encourage entrepreneurialism in the pursuit of ‘results that matter.’ However, with the emphasis on efficiency and making government work like the private sector, the New Public Management reform efforts have gone beyond adopting business management practices, but also have accepted business values of self-interest, competition, market orientation, and entrepreneurialism in government (Denhardt and Denhardt 2001). Rejecting the notion that government should look like the private sector, the New Public Service views the role of government as uniquely based in “democratic norms of justice, fairness, and equity” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 554; see also Denhardt and Denhardt 2011; Ingraham and Ban 1988; Ingraham and Rosenbloom 1989). Therefore, the role of government is not only to pursue efficiency in public service delivery, but also to ensure “that both the solutions themselves and the process by which solutions to public problems are developed are consistent with democratic norms” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 554).

The aim, then, is to provide a government that is responsive to its citizens, is characterized by openness and accessibility, promotes citizen participation and collaboration in decision-making, and operates according to democratic principles

(Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Denhardt and Denhardt 2011). Noting that this commitment to democratic values was a core focus of early public administration, but was lost in the 1970's and subverted to proponents of the rising managerialism, Fredrickson (1982) calls for a "new civism," grounded in values of justice, responsiveness, and citizen collaboration. Noting the importance of this collaboration between citizens and public administrators as a means of enhancing public trust (Box et al. 2001), one can assert that "it is only through conversations between citizens and administrators that the public will come to see employees as caring and committed to the public interest" (Houston and Harding, forthcoming; see also Hummel and Stivers 1998). Therefore, upholding democratic norms as paramount in any conceptualization of government administration, "values such as efficiency and productivity should not be lost, but should be placed in the larger context of democracy, community, and the public interest" (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 557).

While the New Public Management conception of the public administrator takes on an instrumental character, the New Public Service rejects this model of the public administrator as entrepreneur or as a self-interested utility-maximizer. Rather, public administrators are valued as public stewards, public servants who are motivated by more than pay or job security, but by a desire to serve the public and to make a difference in the lives of others (Denhardt 1993; Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Perry and Wise 1990; Vinzant 1998). Failing to recognize this public service ethic, the New Public Management views public administrators as a valuable resource, or as tools to employ in the pursuit of more productive and efficient service delivery, utilizing rational attempts to control human behavior, such as productivity improvement, performance measurement,

and process reengineering systems. However, the New Public Service emphasizes the importance of “managing through people,” acknowledging the values and interests of members of the organization in order to “build responsible, engaged, and civic minded employees” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 557). Further, Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) contend that, “If public servants are expected to treat citizens with respect, they must be treated with respect by those who manage public agencies” (557).

In addition, the New Public Management has emphasized entrepreneurial government, which on one hand denotes “using resources in new ways to maximize productivity and effectiveness” (Osborne and Gaebler 1992, xix). On the other hand, this emphasis on entrepreneurialism also includes a focus on ‘ends over means’ in achieving goals, and “suggests that the individual government agent should act on his or her own self-interest (or that of the agency),” giving precedence to “the entrepreneurial skills of the single individual over the powers of established institutional processes—or over the slower and more hesitating, but more involving and perhaps more democratic, efforts of groups of citizens” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2001, 394-395). Rejecting the idea of the public administrator as entrepreneur, the New Public Service envisions public administrators as conservators of government organizations (Terry 1995), stewards of government resources (Kass 1990), catalysts for citizen engagement (Denhardt and Gray 1998; Lappé and Du Bois 1994), enablers of citizenship and democratic dialogue (Box 1998; Chapin and Denhardt 1995; King and Stivers 1998), and street-level leaders (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Vinzant and Crothers 1998). The New Public Service also envisions the public administrator as one committed to ethical norms of justice and benevolence above those of efficiency and effectiveness (Kass 1990). In this model, the

public administrator is one who facilitates citizen dialogue and deliberation in the crafting of public policy (Box 1998), and is guided by a strong commitment to the preservation of constitutional principles and individual rights (Terry 2003). Noting the influence of ethical behavior in interactions between citizens and public administrators, McGovern (2011) argues that a public administrator “has the potential to restore the public’s faith in civil service” (62). This perspective, contrasting sharply with the entrepreneurial model of a business owner pursuing profit and efficiency, upholds the public administrator as one who “demonstrate[s] integrity, honesty, and moral leadership” (Wang and Van Wart 2007, 276), protecting democratic values in the processes of government, while pursuing the public interest alongside citizens.

Conclusion

Acknowledging both the importance of improvements in government performance and the necessity of conserving democratic values in public administration, the purpose of this research is to shed light on a model of trust that takes into account both the process and output-based dimensions of trust. Uniting the themes of two main approaches to administration, New Public Management and New Public Service, these findings show that both the competence of public administrators and their treatment of citizens are linked to increased trust in government. While these findings buttress the importance of output-based trust, demonstrated in the satisfaction-link of the performance-trust hypothesis and in attitudes of the competence of government administrators, as emphasized by the New Public Management, they also show that process-based trust is just as important, if not more important, for understanding overall

levels of trust in government. It is necessary, then, to find a more balanced approach to government reform that takes into account both the output and process-based aspects of trust. The failure of the New Public Management reforms to affirm the importance of democratic processes in government administration may account for their inability to deliver on the rhetoric of improving trust in government through better performance. Rather than increasing trust, efforts to improve efficiency by deconstructing processes important to citizen perceptions of the fairness, openness and responsiveness of government may have undermined any gains to be made through enhanced performance. Therefore, a mingling of the New Public Management performance-based reforms with a renewal of democratic values emphasized by the New Public Service, thus reflecting the importance of both the output and process-based dimensions of trust, will contribute to reforms that more effectively target improvements in citizen trust in government.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aardal, Bernt, and Henry Valen. 1989. *Velgere, partier og politisk avstand* [Voters, Parties and Political Distance]. *Social and Economic Studies* (Oslo, Norway: Statistisk Sentralbyrå, Vol. 69). As cited in Christensen and Lægneid, 2005.
- Aberbach, Joel. D., and Tom Christensen. 2005. Citizens and Consumers: An NPM Dilemma. *Public Management Review* 7(2): 225-245.
- Alaszewski, Andy. 2003. Risk, Trust and Health. *Health, Risk and Society* 5(3):235-239.
- Alford, John R. 2001. We're all in this Together: The Decline of Trust in Government, 1958–1996. In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it About Government that Americans dislike?*, pp. 28–46. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Almond Gabriel, and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- American National Election Study. 2010. The ANES Guide to Public Opinion and Electoral Behavior: Trust the Federal Government 1958-2008. Retrieved August 1, 2012, from: http://electionstudies.org/nesguide/toptable/tab5a_1.htm.
- Anderson, C.J., Andre Blais, Shaun Bowler, Todd Donovan, and Ola Listhaug. 2005. *Loser's Consent: Elections and Democratic Legitimacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Atkinson, Sally, and David Butcher. 2003. Trust in Managerial Relationships. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* (18)4: 282-304.
- Audit Commission and MORI Social Research Institute. 2003. *Exploring Trust in Public Institutions*. London: Audit Commission.
- Austin, Robert and Patrick Larkey. 1992. The Unintended Consequences of Micromanagement: The Case of Procuring Mission Critical Computer Resources. *Policy Sciences* 25(1): 3-28
- Baldersheim, Harald, Tore Hansen, Lawrence Rose, and Per Arnt Pettersen. 1990. *Publikums syn på kommunalpolitikk og kommunale tjenester* [The attitudes of citizens concerning local politics and local government services]. Report 1990/2. Bergen: LOS-senteret.
- Barbalet, Jack. 2002. *Emotions and Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barber, Benjamin. 1983. *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barnes, Cheryl, and Derek Gill. 2000. *Declining Government Performance? Why Citizens Don't Trust Government*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand State Services Commission.
- Barns, Marian, and David Prior. 1996. From Private Choice to Public Trust: A new Social Basis for Welfare. *Public Money and Management* 16(4): 51-57.
- Barrett, Katherine and Richard Greene. 1999. Grading the States: A Management Report Card. *Governing* 12(5): 17-90.
- Becerra, Manuel, and Amil Gupta. 1999. Trust Within the Organization: Integrating the Trust Literature with Agency Theory and Transaction Cost Economics. *Public Administration Quarterly* 23(2): 178-203.
- Beck, Paul, Hal Rainey, and Carol Traut. 1990. Disadvantage, Disaffection, and Race as Divergent Bases for Citizen Fiscal Policy Preferences. *Journal of Politics* 52(1): 71-93.

- Behn, Robert D. 1995. The Big Questions of Public Management. *Public Administration Review* 55(4): 313-324.
- Bekke, Hans A. G. M., and Frits M. van der Meer. 2000. West European Civil Service Systems: Variations and Similarities. In Hans A. G. M. Bekke and Frits M. van der Meer (eds.), *Civil Service Systems in Western Europe*, pp. 275-290. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Berman, Evan M. 1997. Dealing With Cynical Citizens. *Public Administration Review* 57(2): 105-112.
- Blair, William and James C. Garand. 1995. Are Bureaucrats Different? Democratic Values, Political Tolerance, and Support for the Political System among Government Employees and Other Citizens, 1982-1992. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 31-September 3, Chicago.
- Bobo, Lawrence, and Franklin Gilliam. 1990. Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment. *American Political Science Review* 84(2): 377-393.
- Bok, Derek C. 1997. Measuring the Performance of Government. In Joseph S. Nye, Phillip. D. Zelikow, and David C. King (eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government*, pp. 55-76. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bok, Derek C. 2001. *The Trouble with Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bouckaert, Geert. 2008. *Managing Performance: International Comparisons* (New Edition). London: Routledge.
- Bouckaert, Geert, and Steven Van de Walle. 2001. Government Performance and Trust in Government. Paper for the Permanent Study Group of Productivity and Quality in the Public Sector at the European Group of Public Administration Annual Conference: Vaasa, Finland.
- Bouckaert, Geert, and Steven Van de Walle. 2003. Comparing Measures of Citizen Trust and User Satisfaction as Indicators of Good Governance: Difficulties in Linking Trust and Satisfaction Indicators. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 69(3): 329-343.
- Bouckaert, Geert, Steven Van de Walle, and J. K. Kampen. 2005. Potential of Comparative Public Opinion Research in Public Administration. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 71(2): 229-240.
- Bovaird, Tony. 2007. Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. *Public Administration Review* 67(5): 846-860.
- Box, Richard C. 1998. *Citizen Governance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Box, Richard C., Gary S. Mitchell, B. J. Reed, and Christine M. Reed. 2001. New Public Management and Substantive Democracy. *Public Administration Review* 61(5): 608-619.
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 271-294.
- Braithwaite, Valerie. 1998. Communal and Exchanged Trust Norms: Their Value Base and Relevance to Institutional Trust. In Valerie Braithwaite and Margaret Levi (eds.), *Trust and Governance*, pp. 46-74. New York: Russell Sage.

- Brehm, John, and Wendy Rahn. 1997. Individual-Level Evidence for the Causes and Consequences of Social Capital. *American Journal of Political Science* 41(3): 999-1023.
- Brewer, Gene A. 2003. Building Social Capital: Civic Attitudes and Behavior of Public Servants. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13(1): 5-26.
- Brewer, Gene A., and Sally Coleman Selden. 1998. Whistleblowers in the Federal Civil Service: New Evidence of the Public Service Ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(3): 413-439.
- Brewer, Paul R., and Lee Sigelman. 2002. Trust in Government: Personal Ties that Bind? *Social Science Quarterly* 83(2): 624-631.
- Brudney, Jeffrey L., and Robert E. England. 1983. Toward a Definition of the Coproduction Concept. *Public Administration Review* 43(1): 59-65.
- Buzan, B.C. 1980. Chicano Community Control, Political Cynicism and the Validity of Political Trust Measures. *Western Political Quarterly* 33(1): 108-120.
- Cabinet Office. 2002. *Risk: improving governments' capability to handle risk and uncertainty. Full report—a source document*. Strategy Unit, Cabinet Office, London.
- Calnan, Michael, and Rosemary Rowe. 2006. Trust Relations in Health Care: Developing a Theoretical Framework for the “New” NHS. *Journal of Health Organization and Management* 20(5): 376-396.
- Campbell Angus, Phillip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes D. 1958 American National Election Studies 1958 Post Election Study. Place: University Of Michigan, Survey Research Center.
- Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. 1954. *The Voter Decides*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Carnevale, David G., and Barton Wechsler. 1992. Trust in the Public Sector: Individual and Organizational Determinants. *Administration and Society* 23(4): 471-494.
- Carnevale, David G. 1995. *Trustworthy Government: Leadership and Management Strategies for Building Trust and High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cattell, Ramond B. 1965. *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Chanley, Virginia A., Thomas J. Rudolph, and Wendy M. Rahn. 2000. The Origins and Consequences of Public Trust in Government. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(3): 239-256.
- Chanley, Virginia A., Thomas J. Rudolph, and Wendy M. Rahn. 2001. Public Trust in Government in the Reagan Years and Beyond. In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it About Government that Americans Dislike?*, pp. 59-78. New York: Cambridge.
- Chapin, Linda W., and Robert B. Denhardt. 1995. Putting “Citizens First!” in Orange County, Florida. *National Civic Review* 84(3): 210-215.
- Chetkovich, Carol. 2003. What’s in a Sector? The Shifting Career Plans of Public Policy Students. *Public Administration Review* 63(6): 660-674.

- Christensen, Tom, and Per Lægreid. 2005. Trust in Government: The Relative Importance of Service Satisfaction, Political Factors, and Demography. *Public Performance and Management Review* 28(4): 487-511.
- Cho, Jinsook. 2006. The mechanism of trust and distrust formation and their relational outcomes. *Journal of Retailing* 82(1): 25-35.
- Choudhury, Enamul. 2008. Trust in Administration: An Integrative Approach to Optimal Trust. *Administration and Society* 40(6): 586-620.
- Citizens First 3. 2003. Erin Research Inc. for the Institute for Citizen-Centred Service and the Institute for Public Administration of Canada, Toronto.
- Citrin, Jack. 1974. Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government. *American Political Science Review* 68(3): 973-988.
- Citrin, Jack, and Donald P. Green. 1986. Presidential Leadership and the Resurgence of Trust in Government? *British Journal of Political Science* 6(4): 431-453.
- Citrin, Jack, and Samantha Luks. 1998. Political Trust Revisited: Déjà Vu All Over Again? Presented at the Hendricks Symposium on Public Dissatisfaction with Government, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Citrin, Jack, and Samantha Luks. 2001. Political Trust Revisited: Déjà vu All Over Again? In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it About Government that Americans Dislike?*, pp. 9-27. New York: Cambridge.
- Coleman, James. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
- Conway, Margaret. 2000. *Political Participation in the United States*. 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Cook, Fay L., Lawrence R. Jacobs and Dukhong Kim. 2010. Trusting What You Know: Information, Knowledge and Confidence in Social Security. *The Journal of Politics* 72(2): 397-412.
- Cook, Karen, Russell Hardin, and Margaret Levi. 2005. *Cooperation Without Trust*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Cook, Timothy E., and Paul Gronke. 2005. The Skeptical American: Revisiting the Meanings of Trust in Government and Confidence in Institutions. *The Journal of Politics* 67(3): 784-803.
- Cordasco, Kristina M., David P. Eisenman, Deborah C. Glik, Joya F. Golden, and Steven M. Asch. 2007. 'They Blew the Levee': Distrust of Authorities Among Hurricane Katrina Evacuees. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 18: 277-282.
- Council for Excellence in Government Survey. 2006. Retrieved August 10, 2012 from the iPOLL Databank, The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut:
http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html.
- Craig, Stephen C. 1993. *The Malevolent Leaders: Popular Discontent in America*. Boulder: Westview.
- Craig, Stephen C. 1996. The Angry Voter: Politics and Popular Discontent in the 1990s. In Stephen C. Craig (ed.), *Broken Contract: Changing Relationships between Americans and Their Government*, pp. 46-66. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Crasswell, R. 1993. On the Uses of Trust. *Journal of Law and Economics* 36(1): 487–500.
- Crewson, Philip E. 1997. Public Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 499-518.
- Cross, Rob, and Lance Prusak. 2003. The Political Economy of Knowledge Markets in Organizations. In M. Esterby-Smith, and M. Lyles (eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, pp. 454-472. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2005. The Social Transformation of Trust in Government. *International Review of Sociology* 15(1): 133-154.
- Das, T.K and Bing-Sheng Teng. 2004. The Risk-based View of Trust. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 19(1): 85–116.
- Dasgupta, Partha. 1988. Trust as a Commodity. In Diego Gambetta (ed.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 49–72.
- Dasgupta, Partha. 2002. *Social Capital and Economic Performance*, Department of Economics, University of Cambridge.
- Del Pino, Eloisa. 2002. Las Actitudes de los Ciudadanos Hacia las Administraciones, las Politicas y los Servicios Publicos en Espana, doctoral thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.
- Denhardt, Janet V., and Robert B. Denhardt. 2003. *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Denhardt, Robert B. 1993. *The Pursuit of Significance*. Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.
- Denhardt, Robert B. 2002. Trust as Capacity: The Role of Integrity and Responsiveness. *Public Organization Review* (2)1: 65-76.
- Denhardt, Robert B., and Janet V. Denhardt. 2000. The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review* (60)6: 249-259.
- Denhardt, Robert B., and Janet V. Denhardt. 2001. The New Public Service: Putting Democracy First. *National Civic Review* 90(4): 391-400.
- Denhardt, Robert B., and Joseph E. Gray. 1998. Targeting Community Development in Orange County, Florida. *National Civic Review* 87(3): 227-235.
- Dilulio, John J., Jr., Gerald Garvey, and Donald Kettl. 1993. *Improving Government Performance: An Owner's Manual*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Dinsdale, Geoff, and D. Brian Marson. 1999. *Citizen/Client Surveys: Dispelling Myths and Redrawing Maps*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development.
- Donovan, Nick, Joanna Brown, and Lisa Bellulo. 2001. *Satisfaction with Public Services* (Discussion Paper). London: Performance and Innovation Unit.
- Donovan, Todd, and Shaun Bowler. 2004. *Reforming the Republic: Democratic Institutions for the New America*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Döring, Herbert. 1992. Higher education and confidence in institutions: a secondary analysis of the “European Values Survey,” 1981-83. *West European Politics* 15: 126-146.
- Downs, Anthony. 1967. *Inside Bureaucracy*. Boston: Little, Brown.

- Dunn, John. 1993. Trust. In Robert E. Goodwin and Philip Pettit (eds.), *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, pp. 638-645. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dyer, Jeffrey H., and Wujin Chu. 2003. The Role of Trustworthiness in Reducing Transaction Costs and Improving Performance: Empirical evidence from the United States, Japan, and Korea. *Organization Science* 14(1): 57-68.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Easton, David. 1975. A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support. *British Journal of Political Science* 5(4): 434-457.
- Elchardus, Mark, and Wendy Smits. 2002. Anatomie en oorzaken van het wantrouwen [Anatomy and Causes of Distrust]. Brussels: VUB Press. As cited in Van de Walle, Kampen, and Bouckaert, 2005.
- Epstein, Seymour. 1994. Integration of the Cognitive and the Psychodynamic Unconscious. *American Psychologist* 49(8): 709-724.
- Erber, Ralph, and Richard Lau. 1990. Political Cynicism Revisited: An Information Processing Reconciliation of Policy-Based and Incumbency-Based Interpretations of Changes in Trust in Government. *American Journal of Political Science* 34(2): 236-253.
- Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Espinal, Rosario, Jonathan Hartlyn and Jana Morgan. 2006. Performance Still Matters: Explaining Trust in Government in the Dominican Republic. *Comparative Political Studies* 39(2): 200-223.
- Feldman, Stanley. 1983. The Measurement and Meaning of Trust in Government. *Political Methodology* 9(3): 341-354.
- Finucane, Melissa, and Joan Holup. 2006. Risk as Value. *Journal of Risk Research* 9(2): 141-164.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1978. Economic Retrospective Voting in American National Elections: A Micro-Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science* 22(2): 426-443.
- Flynn, James, William Burns, C.K. Mertz, and Paul Slovic. 1992. Trust as a Determinant of Opposition to a High-Level Nuclear Waste Repository. *Risk Analysis* 12(3): 417-429.
- Fornell, Claes. 2002. ACSI Commentary: Federal Government Scores. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from: [http:// www.theacsi.org/government/govt-02c.html](http://www.theacsi.org/government/govt-02c.html).
- Frank, Sue A. and Gregory B. Lewis. 2004. Government Employees: Working Hard or Hardly Working? *American Review of Public Administration* 34(1): 36-51.
- Frederickson, H. George. 1982. The Recovery of Civism in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 42(6): 501-508.
- Fredrickson, George, and Kevin B. Smith. 2003. *The Public Administration Theory Primer*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Frewer, Lynn J., Chaya Howard, Richard Shepherd. 1998. The Influence of Initial Attitudes on Responses to Communication About Genetic Engineering in Food Production. *Agriculture and Human Values* 15(1): 15-30.
- Frewer, Lynn J., Chaya Howard, Duncan Hedderley, and Richard Shepherd. 1996. What Determines Trust in Information about Food-Related Risks? *Risk Analysis* 16(4): 473-485.

- Frewer, Lynn J., and Susan Miles. 2003. Temporal stability of the psychological determinants of trust: Implications for communication about food risks. *Risk and Society* 5(3): 259-271.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- Gabarro, John J. 1978. The Development of Trust, Influence, and Expectations. In Anthony G. Athos and John J. Gabarro (eds.), *Interpersonal Behavior: Communication and Understanding in Relationships*, pp. 290-303. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gambetta, Diego. 1988. *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gamson, William A. 1968. *Power and Discontent*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Garrett, R. Sam, James A. Thurber, A. Lee Fritschler, and David H. Rosenbloom. 2006. Assessing the Impact of Bureaucracy Bashing by Electoral Campaigns. *Public Administration Review* 66(2): 228-240.
- Gelders, Dave, and Steven Van de Walle. 2007. Marketing Government Reforms. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing* 14(1-2): 151-168.
- Goodsell, Charles T. 2004. *The Case for Bureaucracy: A Public Administration Polemic*, 4th edition. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Goodsell, Charles T. 2006. A New Vision for Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*: 66(4), 623-635.
- Gore, Al. 1993. *Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less: The Report of the National Performance Review*. New York: Plume.
- Hall, Peter Hall. 1999. Social Capital in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science* 29(3): 417-461.
- Hardin, Russell. 1998. Trust in Government. In Valerie Braithwaite and Margaret Levi (eds.), *Trust and Governance*, pp. 9-27. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hardin, Russell. 2002. *Trust and Trustworthiness*, New York: Russell Sage.
- Hardin Russell. 2006. *Trust*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Harisalo, Risto. and Jari Stenvall. 2002. Citizens' Trust in Government, paper presented at the Annual Conference of the European Group of Public Administration, Study Group on Productivity and Quality in the Public Sector, Potsdam, 4-7 September.
- Harris Poll. 2006 (July). Retrieved August 9, 2012, from the iPOLL Databank, The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut: http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html.
- Heintzman, Ralph, and Brian Marson. 2005. People, Service and Trust: Is There a Public Sector Value Chain? *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 71(4): 549-575.
- Hermansson, J. 2003. *Politik på upplysningens grund. Om den demokratiska reformismens möjligheter och problem*. Malmö, Sweden: Liber.
- Herreros, Francisco, and Henar Criado. 2008. The State and the Development of Social Trust. *International Political Science Review* 29(1): 53-71.
- Hetherington, Marc J. 1998. The Political Relevance of Political Trust. *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 791-808.

- Hetherington, Marc J. 2001. Declining Political Trust and a Shrinking Public Policy Agenda: Why Media Scholars Should Care. In Roderick P. Hart and Daron R. Shaw (eds.), *Communication in U.S. Elections: New Agendas*, pp. 105-121. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hetherington, Marc J. 2004. *Why Trust Matters: Declining Political Trust and the Demise of American Liberalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hetherington, Marc J., and Suzanne Globetti. 2002. Political Trust and Racial Policy Preferences. *American Journal of Political Science* 46(2): 253-275.
- Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 1995. *Congress as Public Enemy: Public Attitudes Toward American Political Institutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 1998. Too Much of a Good Thing: More Representative Is Not Necessarily Better. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31(1): 28-31.
- Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2001. Process Preferences and American Politics: What the People Want Government to Be. *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 145-153.
- Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs about How Government Should Work*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinnant, Charles C. and Welch, EW. (2003). Managerial Capacity and Digital Government in the States: Examining the Link Between Self-Efficacy and Perceived Impacts of IT in Public Organizations. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICCS 2003) Ed. Ralph H. Sprague, Jr. Main paper on accompanying CD-Rom. January 6-9, 2003. as cited in Parent, Vanderbeek and Gemino 2005.
- Horner, Constance. 1994. Deregulating the Federal Service: Is the Time Right? In John J. DiIulio Jr., ed., *Deregulating the Public Service: Can Government Be Improved?*, pp. 85-101. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Hosmer, Larue T. 1995. Trust: The Connecting Link Between Organization Theory and Philosophical Ethics. *Academy of Management Review* 20(2): 379-403.
- Houston, David J. 2000. Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 713-727.
- Houston, David J. 2006. Walking the Walk of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood and Money. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(1): 67-86.
- Houston, David J. 2011. Implications of Occupational Locus and Focus for Public Service Motivation: Attitudes Toward Work Motives Across Nations. *Public Administration Review* 71(5): 761-771.
- Houston, David J., and Lauren K. Harding. Forthcoming. Public Trust in Government Administrators: Explaining Citizen Perceptions of Trustworthiness and Competence. *Public Integrity*.
- Hovland, Carl Iver, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley. 1953. *Communication and Persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Hoyt, Jehiel Keeler. 1922. *Hoyt's New Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations*. New York, London: Funk & Wagnalls company; Bartleby.com, 2009. www.bartleby.com/78/. [accessed May 1, 2013].
- Hummel, Ralph P., and Camilla Stivers. 1998. Government Isn't Us: The Possibility of Democratic Knowledge in Representative Government. In Cheryl Simrell King and Camilla Stivers (eds.), *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*. pp. 28-48. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Huseby, Beate M. 1995. Attitudes Towards the Size of Government. In Ole Borre and Elinor Scarbrough (eds.), *The Scope of Government*, pp. 87-118. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huseby, Beate M. 2000. Government Performance and Political Support: A Study of How Evaluations of Economic Performance, Social Policy and Environmental Protection Influence the Popular Assessments of the Political System. Trondheim, Norway: University of Trondheim, Department for Sociology and Political Science.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997a. *Modernization and Postmodernization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997b. Postmaterialist Values and the Erosion of Institutional Authority. In *Why People Don't Trust Government*, edited by Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Phillip D. Zelikow, and David C. King, 217-36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1999. Postmodernization Erodes Respect for Authority, but Increases Support Democracy. In Pippa Norris (ed.), *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*, pp. 236-256. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Paul Abramson. 1994. Economic Security and Value Change *American Political Science Review* 88(2): 336-354.
- Ingraham, Patricia W., and Carolyn Ban. 1988. Politics and Merit: Can They Meet in a Public Service Model? *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 8(2): 1-19.
- Ingraham, Patricia W., and David H. Rosenbloom. 1989. The New Public Personnel and the New Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 49(2): 116-125.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. 1987. *News that Matters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenkins-Smith, Hank C. 1992. *Culture, Trust, Ideology and Perceptions of the Risks of Nuclear Wastes: A Causal Analysis* (Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Society for Risk Analysis, San Diego, California, December 6-9).
- Jennings, M. Kent. 1998. Political Trust and the Roots of Devolution. In Valerie Braithwaite and Margaret Levi (eds.), *Trust and Governance*, pp. 218-244. New York: Russell Sage.
- Jiobu, Robert M., and Timothy J. Curry. 2001. Lack of Confidence in the Federal Government and the Ownership of Firearms. *Social Science Quarterly* 82(1): 77-88.
- Johnson, Branden B. 1999. Exploring Dimensionality in the Origins of Hazard-Related Trust. *Journal of Risk Research* 2(4): 325-354.

- Jones, Jeffrey. 2011. Supreme Court Approval Rating Dips to 46%, Down 15 percentage points from 2009. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/149906/Supreme-Court-Approval-Rating-Dips.aspx> [accessed April 10, 2013].
- Jungermann, Helmut, Hans Rudiger Pfister, and Katrin Fischer. 1996. Credibility, Information Preferences, and Information Interests. *Risk Analysis* 16(2): 251–261.
- Jurkiewicz, Carole J., Tom K. Massey, Jr., and Roger G. Brown. 1998. Motivation in Public and Private Organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 21(3): 230-250.
- Kaboolian, Linda. 1998. The New Public Management: Challenging the Boundaries of the Management vs. Administration Debate. *Public Administration Review* 58(3): 189-193.
- Kampen, Jarl K., and Molenberghs, G. 2002. Vertrouwen in de regering en tevredenheid met het gevoerde beleid [Trust in Government and Satisfaction with Government Policy]. In M. Swyngedouw and J. Billiet (eds.), *De kiezer heeft zijn redenen: 13 juni 1999 en de politieke opvattingen van Vlamingen*, pp. 179–191. Leuven: Acco. As cited in Van de Walle, Kampen and Bouckaert 2005.
- Kampen, Jarl K., Steven Van de Walle, and Geert Bouckaert. 2003. On the Relative Role of the Public Administration, the Public Services and the Political Institutions in Building Trust in Government in Flanders, paper prepared for ASPA's 64th National Conference 'The Power of Public Service', Washington, DC, 15–18 March. Session #237: The Power to Create Trust: The Impact of Public Sector Reforms on Citizens.
- Kampen, Jarl K., Steven Van De Walle and Geert Bouckaert. 2006. Assessing the Relation between Satisfaction with Public Service Delivery and Trust in Government: The Impact of the Predisposition of Citizens toward Government on Evaluations of Its Performance. *Public Performance and Management Review* 29 (4): 387-404.
- Kampen, Jarl K., Stephen Van de Walle, Geert Bouckaert, and Bart Maddens. 2003. Overheidsdienstverlening door de vlaming beoordeeld [Public Service Judge by the Flemish]. Leuven: Public Management Institute.
- Kass, Henry D. 1990. Stewardship as a Fundamental Element in Images of Public Administration. In Henry D. Kass and Bayard L. Catron (eds.), *Images and Identities in Public Administration*, pp. 113-131. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Keele, Luke J. 2005. The Authorities Really Do Matter: Party Control and Trust in Government. *Journal of Politics* 67(3): 873-886.
- Keele, Luke. 2007. Social Capital and the Dynamics of Trust in Government. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(2): 241-254.
- Keller, Ann and Todd R. La Porte. 1994. Assuring Institutional Constancy: A Crucial Element of Public Trust and Confidence in Managing Hazards in the 21st Century. Paper presented at the Conference on Deciding for the Future: Problems of Hazardous Wastes and Inter-generational Equity, National Academy of Public Administration, Washington, DC.
- Kelly, Janet M. 2003. Citizen Satisfaction and Administrative Performance Measures: Is There Really a Link? *Urban Affairs Review* 38(6): 855-866.

- Kettl, Donald F. 1997. The Global Revolution in Public Management: Driving Themes, Missing Links. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16(3): 446-462.
- Kettl, Donald F. 2000. *The Global Public Management Revolution*. Washington, DC: Brooking Institution Press.
- Kettl, Donald, and James Fesler. 2005. *The Politics of the Administrative Process* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Kim, Seok-Eun. 2005. The Role of Trust in the Modern Administrative State: An Integrative Model. *Administration and Society* 37(5): 611-635.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Susan Fiske. 1986. Presidents in the Public Mind. In Margaret G. Hermanm (ed.), *Handbook of Political Psychology*, pp. 193-218. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- King, Cheryl Simrell, and Camilla Stivers. 1998. Introduction: The Anti-Government Era. In Cheryl Simrell King and Camilla Stivers (eds.), *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*, pp. 3-18. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- King, Cheryl Simrell, and Camilla Stivers. 1998. *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Antigovernment Era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- King, David C. 1997. The Polarization of American Parties and Mistrust in Government. In Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Phillip D. Zelikow, and David C. King (eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government*, pp. 155-178. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Knack, Stephen. 2000. Social Capital and the Quality of Government: Evidence from the United States. *Policy Research Working Paper 2504*. Washington, DC: The World Bank Development and Research Group: Regulation and Competition Policy.
- Knack, Stephen, and Phillip Keefer. 1997. Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(4): 1251-1288.
- Kramer, R. M. 1999. Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology* 50: 569-598.
- Kumlin, Steffan, and Bo Rothstein. 2005. Making and Breaking Social Capital: The Impact of Welfare-State Institutions. *Comparative Political Studies* 38(4): 339-365.
- Lægreid, Per. 1993. Opinion og offentlig sektor [Public Opinion and the Public Sector]. In Per Lægreid and J.P. Olsen (eds.), *Organisering av offentlig sektor [Organizing the public sector]*. Oslo: TANO. As cited in Christensen and Lægreid, 2005.
- Lane, Jan-Erik. 1993. *The Public Sector: Concepts, Models, and Approaches*. London: Sage.
- La Porta, Rafael, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer and Robert W. Vishny 1997. Trust in Large Organizations. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 87: 333-338.
- LaPorte, Todd R. 1994. Large Technical Systems, Institutional Surprise and Challenges to Political Legitimacy. In Hans Ulrich Derlien, Uta Gerhardt, and Fritz Scharpf, eds., *Systemrationalitat und Partialinteresse*. (Systems Rationality and Partial

- Interests), pp. 433-452. Baden Baden: No mos Verlagsgesellschaft. Slightly revised version published in *Technology in Society* 1 (16): 269-288.
- LaPorte, Todd R., and Daniel S. Metlay. 1996. Hazard and Institutional Trustworthiness: Facing a Deficit of Trust. *Public Administration Review* 56(4): 341-347.
- Lappe, Frances Moore, and Paul Martin Du Bois. 1994. *The Quickening of America: Rebuilding Our Nation, Remaking Our Lives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Larson, Heidi J., and David L. Heymann. 2010. Public Health Response to Influenza A(H1N1) as an Opportunity to Build Public Trust. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 303(3): 271-272.
- Lawrence, Robert Z. 1997. Is It Really the Economy, Stupid? In Phillip Zelikow Joseph Nye, Jr. and David C. King (eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government*, pp. 111-132. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Levi, Margaret. 1988. *Of Rule and Revenue*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levi, Margaret. 1997. *Consent, Dissent, and Patriotism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levi, Margaret. 1998. A State of Trust. In Valerie Braithwaite and Margaret Levi (eds.), *Trust and Governance*, pp. 77-101. New York: Russell Sage.
- Levi, Margaret, and Laura Stoker. 2000. Political Trust and Trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 475-507.
- Light, Paul C. 2002. *The Troubled State of the Federal Public Service*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Light, Paul C. 2008. A Government Ill Executed: The Depletion of the Federal Service. *Public Administration Review* 68(3): 413-419.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and William Schneider. 1987. *The Confidence Gap: Business, Labor, and Government in the Public Mind*, revised ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Listhaug, Ola. 1998. Confidence in Political Institutions: Norway 1982-1996. Paper presented to the Research Seminar at the Centre for Nordic Policy Studies, University of Aberdeen. As cited in Christensen and Lægveid 2005.
- Listhaug, Ola, and Matti Wiberg. 1995. Confidence in Political and Private Institutions. In Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Dieter Fuchs (eds.), *Citizens and the State*, pp. 298-322. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Locke, John. 1690. *Second Treatise of Government*. (2012 ed.) New York: Simon and Brown.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1979. *Trust and Power*. New York: John Wiley.
- Lyons, William E., David Lowery, and Ruth H. DeHoog. 1992. *The Politics of Dissatisfaction: Citizens, Services, and Urban Institutions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- MacLagan, Patrick. 1998. *Management and Morality: A Developmental Perspective*. London: Sage
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1990. On the Relation of Altruism and Self-Interest. In Jane Mansbridge (ed.) *Beyond Self-Interest*, pp. 133-146. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Mansbridge, Jane. 1994. Politics as Persuasion. In Lawrence C. Dodd and Calvin Hillson, (eds.), pp. 298-310. *The Dynamics of American Politics: Approaches and Interpretations*. Boulder, CO.: Westview.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1997. Social and Cultural Causes of Dissatisfaction with U.S. Government. In Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Phillip D. Zelikow, and David C. King (eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government*, pp. 133-153. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- March, James G. 1994. *A Primer on Decision Making: How Decisions Happen*. New York: Free Press.
- March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.
- Marien, Sofie, and Marc Hooghe. 2011. Does Political Trust Matter? An Empirical Investigation into the Relation Between Political Trust and Support for Law Compliance. *European Journal of Political Research* 50(2): 267-291.
- Marlowe, Justin. 2004. Part of the Solution or Cogs in the System? *Public Integrity* 6(2): 93-113.
- Mashaw, Jerry L. 1983. *Bureaucratic Justice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McAllister, Ian. 1999. The Economic Performance of Governments. In Pippa Norris (ed.), *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*, pp.188-203. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McClosky, Herbert, and John Zaller. 1984. *The American Ethos: Public Attitudes Toward Capitalism and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McGinnier, Elliott, and Charles D. Ward. 1980. Better Liked Than Right: Trustworthiness and Expertise as Factors in Credibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 6(3): 467- 472.
- McGovern, Kate. 2011. The Promise of Administrative Conservatorship vs. the Threat of Administrative Evil in the Mission of Public Service. *Public Integrity* 14(1): 51-65.
- Menzel, Donald. 1995. The Ethical Environment of Local Government Managers. *The American Review of Public Administration* 25(3): 247-261.
- Metlay, Daniel. 1999. Institutional Trust and Confidence: A Journey into a Conceptual Quagmire. In George Cvetkovich and Ragnar E. Löfstedt (eds), *Social Trust and the Management of Risk*, pp. 100-116. London: Earthscan.
- Michelson, Melissa R. 2001. Governance and Minoritarian Representation: Political Trust among Chicago Latinos. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23(3-4): 323-334.
- Miller, Arthur. 1974a. Political Issues and Trust in Government, 1964-70. *American Political Science Review* 68 (3): 951-972.
- Miller, Arthur. 1974b. Rejoinder to Comment by Jack Citrin: Political Discontent or Ritualism. *American Political Science Review* 68(3): 989-1001.
- Miller, Arthur, and Stephen Borrelli. 1991. Confidence in Government During the 1980s. *American Political Quarterly* 19(2): 147-173.
- Miller, Arthur, and Ola Listhaug. 1990. Political Parties and Confidence in Government: A Comparison of Norway, Sweden, and the United States. *British Journal of Political Science* 20(3): 357-386.

- Miller, Warren E. 1991. Party Identification, Realignment, and Party Voting: Back to the Basics. *American Political Science Review* 85(2): 557-568.
- Mischler, William, and Richard Rose. 1997. Trust, Distrust, and Skepticism: Popular Evaluations of Civil and Political Institutions in Post-Communist Societies *Journal of Politics* 59(2): 418-451.
- Mishra, Jitendra, and Molly Morrissey. 1990. Trust in Employee/Employer Relationships: A Survey of West Michigan Managers. *Public Personnel Management* 19(4): 443-485.
- Mitchell, Terence R., and William G. Scott. 1987. Leadership Failures, the Distrusting Public, and Prospects of the Administrative State. *Public Administration Review* 47(6): 445-452.
- Moe, Terry M. 1984. The New Economics of Organization. *American Journal of Political Science* 28(4): 739-777.
- Möllering, Guido. 2005. The Trust/Control Duality: An Integrative Perspective on Positive Expectations of Others. *International Sociology* 20(3): 283-305.
- Morrell, Michael E. 2003. Survey and Experimental Evidence for a Reliable and Valid Measure of Internal Political Efficacy. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67(4): 589-602.
- Morrin, Richard, and Dan Balz. 1996. Americans Losing Trust in Each other and Institutions. *Washington Post*. (28 January): A1, A6-A7.
- Murphy, Kristina. 2004. The Role of Trust in Nurturing Compliance: A Study of Accused Tax Avoiders. *Law and Human Behavior* 28(2): 187-209.
- Nannestad, Peter. 2008. What Have We Learned About Generalized Trust, If Anything? *Annual Review of Political Science* (11): 413-436.
- National Commission on the State and Local Public Service. 1993. *Hard Truths/Tough Choices: An Agenda for State and Local Reform*. Albany, NY: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- National Performance Review. 1993. *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Newton, Kenneth. 1997. Social Capital and Democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5): 575-586.
- Newport, Frank. 2012. Americans Trust Judicial Branch Most, Legislative Least. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/157685/americans-trust-judicial-branch-legislative-least.aspx> [accessed April 10, 2013].
- Newton, Kenneth. 1999. Social and Political Trust, in Pippa Norris (ed.), *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*, pp.169-187. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newton, Kenneth. 2001. Trust, Social Capital, Civil Society, and Democracy. *International Political Science Review* 22(2): 201-214.
- Newton, Kenneth, and Pippa Norris. 2000. Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith Culture, or Performance? In Susan J. Pharr and Robert D. Putnam (eds.), *Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries*, pp. 52-73. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Niemi, Richard G., Stephen C. Craig, and Franco Mattei. 1991. Measuring Internal Political Efficacy in the 1988 National Election Study. *American Political Science Review* 85(4): 1407-1413.
- Niskanen, William. A. 1971. *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Norris, Pippa. 1999. Introduction: The Growth of Critical Citizens. In Pippa Norris (ed.) *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*, pp. 1-30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nye, Joseph S., Jr. 1997. Introduction: The Decline of Confidence in Government. In *Why People Don't Trust Government*, edited by Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Phillip D. Zelikow, and David C. King, 1-18. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nye, Joseph S., Jr., Phillip D. Zelikow, and David C. King (eds.). 1997. *Why People Don't Trust Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nyhan, Ronald C. 2000. Changing the Paradigm: Trust and its Role in Public Sector Organizations. *American Review of Public Administration* 30(1): 87-109.
- Obama, Barack. 2006. *An Honest Government, A Hopeful Future*. Speech at the University of Nairobi, Kenya, August 28, 2006. <http://obamaspeeches.com/088-An-Honest-Government-A-Hopeful-Future-Obama-Speech.htm> [accessed May 1, 2013]
- Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President. 2008. Budget of the United States Government, FY 2004, "Rating the Performance of Federal Agencies." Retrieved from: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/usbudget/fy04/pdf/budget/performance.pdf>
- Orren, Gary. 1997. Fall From Grace: The Public's Loss of Faith in Government. In Joseph S. Nye, Philip D. Zelikow, and David C. King (eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government*, pp. 77-107. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA; Addison-Wesley.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Ostrom, Vincent, and Elinor Ostrom. 1971. Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 31(2): 203-216.
- Owen, Diana, and Jack Dennis. 2001. Trust in the Federal Government. In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it About Government that Americans Dislike?*, pp. 209-226. New York: Cambridge.
- Parent, Michael, Christine A. Vandebeek, and Andrew C. Gemino. 2005. Building Citizen Trust Through E-Government. *Government Information Quarterly* 22(4) 720-736.
- Perry, James L. 1996. Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (6)1: 5-22.
- Perry, James L., and Lois Wise. 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367-373.

- Perry, Ronald W. 2004. The Relationship of Affective Organizational Commitment with Supervisory Trust. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 24(2): 133-149.
- Peters, B. Guy. 2001. *The Future of Governing: Four Emerging Models*, 2nd ed. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Peters, Guy B., and John Pierre. 1998. Governance Without Government? Rethinking Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2): 223-243.
- Peters, B. Guy, and John Pierre. 2000. Citizens Versus the New Public Manager: The Problem of Mutual Empowerment. *Administration and Society* 32(1): 9-28.
- Peters, Richard. G., Vincent T. Covello, and David B. McCallum. 1997. The Determinants of Trust and Credibility in Environmental Risk Communication: An Empirical Study. *Risk Analysis* 17(1): 43-54.
- Peterson, Geoff, and J. Mark Wrighton. 1998. Expressions of Distrust: Third Party Voting and Cynicism in Government. *Political Behavior* 20(1): 17-34.
- Pew Research Center for The People and The Press. 1998. Deconstructing Distrust: How Americans View Government. Retrieved May 17, 2012, from: <http://www.people-press.org/1998/03/10/how-americans-view-government/>.
- Pew Research Center for The People and The Press. 2010. The People and Their Government: Distrust, Discontent, Anger and Partisan Rancor. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from: <http://www.people-press.org/2010/04/18/distrust-discontent-anger-and-partisan-rancor/>.
- Pierce, John C., Nicholas P. Lovrich Jr., C. David Moon. 2002. Social Capital and Government Performance: An Analysis of 20 American Cities. *Public Performance and Management Review* 25(4): 381-397.
- Pijawka, David K., and Alvin H. Mushkatel. 1991-1992. Public Opposition to the Siting of the High-Level Nuclear Waste Repository: The Importance of Trust. *Policy Studies Review* 10(4): 180-194.
- Pollitt, Christopher, and Geert Bouckaert. 2004. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poortinga, Wouter, and Nick R. Pidgeon. 2003. Exploring the Dimensionality of Trust in Risk Regulation. *Risk Analysis* 23(5): 961-972.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Robert P. 1995a. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6(1): 65-78.
- Putnam, Robert P. 1995b. Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. *P S: Political Science and Politics* 28(4): 664-683.
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Quinn, Sandra Crouse, Supriya Kuman, Vicki S. Freimuth, Kelley Kidwell, and Donald Musa. 2009. Public Willingness to Take a Vaccine or Drug Under Emergency Use Authorization during the 2009 H1N1 Pandemic. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice, and Science* 7(3): 275-290.
- Rahn, Wendy M., and Thomas J. Rudolph. 2005. A Tale of Political Trust in American Cities. *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 69(4): 530-560.

- Rainey, Hal. 1982. Reward Preferences Among Public and Private Managers. *American Review of Public Administration* 16(4): 288-302.
- Raithatha, Nick, Richard Holland, Simon Gerrard, and Ian Harvey. 2003. A Qualitative Investigation of Vaccine Risk Perception Amongst Parents Who Immunize Their Children: A Matter of Public Health Concern. *Journal of Public Health Medicine* 25(2): 161-164.
- Renn, Ortwin. and Debra Levine. 1991. Credibility and Trust in Risk Communication. In R.E. Kasperson and P.J.M. Stallen (eds.), *Communicating Risks to the Public*, pp. 175- 217. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rice, Tom M., and Alexander F. Sumberg. 1997. Civic Culture and Government Performance in the American States. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 27(1): 99-114.
- Rice, Tony W. 2001. Social Capital and Government Performance in Iowa Communities. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23(3-4): 375-389.
- Richardson, Lilliard E., Jr., David J. Houston, and Chris Sissie Hadjiharalambous. 2001. Public Confidence in the Leaders of American Governmental Institutions. In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it About Government that Americans Dislike?*, pp. 83-97. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Romano, Donnaand, and Gary Greguras. 2003. *The Nature of Trust: Clarification of its Defining Characteristics*. Singapore: Singapore Management University.
- Rose, Lawrence E. 1999. Citizens (Re)orientation in the Welfare State: From Private to Public Citizens? In Jet Bussemaker (ed.), *Citizenship and the Welfare State Reform in Europe*, pp. 129-146. London: Routledge.
- Rose, Lawrence E., and Per Arnt Pettersen. 2000. The Legitimacy of Local Government: What Makes a Difference? Evidence from Norway. In Keith Hoggart and Terry Nicholas Clark (eds.), *Citizen Responsive Government*, pp. 25-66. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Rose, Richard. 1994. Postcommunism and the Problem of Trust. *Journal of Democracy* 5(3): 18-30.
- Rose, Richard, William Mischler, and Christian Haerpfer. 1998. Social Capital in Civic and Stressful Societies. *Studies in International Comparative Development* 32(3): 85-111.
- Rosenberg, Morris. 1956. Misanthropy and Political Ideology, *American Sociological Review* 21(6): 690-695.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Roth, Victor J., Lorne Bozinoff, and Peter MacIntosh. 1990. Public Opinion and the Measurement of Consumer Satisfaction with Government Services. *Canadian Public Administration* 33(4): 571-583.
- Rothstein, Bo. 1998. *Just Institutions Matter: The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothstein, Bo. 2003. *Sociala fällor och tillitens problem* [Social Traps and the Problem of Trust]. Stockholm: SNS Förlag.
- Rothstein, Bo, and Dietlind Stolle. 2002. How Political Institutions Create and Destroy

- Social Capital: An Institutional Theory of Generalized Trust. Paper presented at the Project on Honesty and Trust: Theory and Experience in the Light of Post-Socialist Experience. Workshop 2: Formal and Informal Cooperation, Collegium Budapest.
- Rousseau, Denise, Sim Sitkin, Ronald Burt, and Colin Camerer. 1998. Not So Different After All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust. *Academy of Management Journal* 23(3): 393-404.
- Rudolph, Thomas J., and Jillian Evans. 2005. Political Trust, Ideology, and Public Support for Government Spending. *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 660-671.
- Ruppel, Cynthia P., and Susan J. Harrington. 2000. The Relationship of Communication, Ethical Work Climate, and Trust to Commitment and Innovation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 25(4): 313-328.
- Ruscio, Kenneth P. 1999. Jay's Pirouette, or Why Political Trust is Not the Same as Personal Trust. *Administration and Society* 31(5): 639-657.
- Ruscio, Kenneth P. 1994. Pork and the Public Interest. *The American Prospect* 17(Spring): 89-96.
- Ruscio, Kenneth P. 1996. Trust, Democracy, and Public Management: A Theoretical Argument. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(3): 461-477.
- Saad, Lydia. 2011a. Americans Express Historic Negativity Toward U.S. Government. Retrieved May 17, 2012, from: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/149678/americans-express-historic-negativity-toward-government.aspx>.
- Saad, Lydia. 2011b. In. U.S., Local and State Governments Retain Positive Ratings. Retrieved May 17, 2012, from: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/149888/local-state-governments-retain-positive-ratings.aspx>.
- Schneider, Anne L. 1987. Coproduction of Public and Private Safety: An Analysis of Bystander Intervention, "Protective Neighboring," and Personal Protection. *Western Political Quarterly* 40(4): 611-630.
- Scholz, John T., and Mark Lubell. 1998a. Adaptive Political Attitudes: Duty, Trust, and Fear as Monitors of Tax Policy. *American Journal of Political Science* 42(3): 903-920.
- Scholz, John T., and Mark Lubell. 1998b. Trust and Taxpaying: Testing the Heuristic Approach to Collective Action. *American Journal of Political Science* 42(3): 398-417.
- Scholz, John T., and Neil Pinney. 1995. Duty, Fear, and Tax Compliance: The Heuristic Basis of Citizenship Behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 39(2) 490-512.
- Shore, David A. 2003. Communicating in Times of Uncertainty: The Need for Trust. *Journal of Health Communication* 8: 13-14.
- Schwarz, Norbet. 2000. Emotion, Cognition, and Decision Making. *Cognition and Emotion* 14(4): 433-440.
- Self, Peter. 1993. *Government by the Market? The Politics of Public Choice*. London: Westview Press.

- Seltzer, Richard A., Jody Newman, and Melissa Voorhees Leighton. 1997. *Sex as a Political Variable: Women as Candidates and Voters in U.S. Elections*. Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Sims, Harvey. 2001. *Public Confidence in Government and Government Service Delivery*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development.
- Skocpol, Theda, and Morris Fiorina. 1999. Making sense of the civic engagement debate. In Skocpol and Fiorina (eds.), *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, pp. 1-23. Washington, D C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Slovic, Paul. 2000. *The Perception of Risk*. London: Earthscan.
- Slovic, Paul. 1999. Perceived Risk, Trust, and Democracy. In George Cvetkovich and Ragnar E. Löfstedt (eds.), *Social Trust and the Management of Risk*, pp. 42-52. London: Earthscan. (This was also published in 1993 in *Risk Analysis* 13(6): 675-682.)
- Slovic, Paul, James Flynn, and Mark Layman. 1991. Perceived Risk, Trust, and the Politics of Nuclear Waste. *Science* 254(5038): 1603-1607
- Soni, Vidu. 2004. From Crisis to Opportunity: Human Resource Challenges for the Public Sector in the Twenty-First Century. *Review of Policy Research* 21(2): 157-178.
- Sorrentino, Richard M., John G. Holmes, Steven Hanna, and Ann Sharp. 1995. Uncertainty Orientation and Trust in Close Relationships: Individual Differences in Cognitive Styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(2): 314-327.
- Soss, Joe. 1999. Lessons of Welfare: Policy Design, Political Learning, and Political Action. *American Political Science Review* 93(2): 363-380.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M., and Anil K. Mishra. 1999. Giving Up Control Without Losing Control. *Group and Organization Management* 24(2): 155-187.
- Stimson, James A. 1999. *Public Opinion in America: Moods, Cycles, and Swings*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Sztompka, Piotr. 1998. *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor-Clark, Kalahn, Robert J. Blendon, Alan Zaslavsky, and John Benson. 2005. Confidence in Crisis? Understanding Trust in Government and Public Attitudes Toward Mandatory State Health Powers. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice, and Science* 3(2): 138-147.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter. 2006a. A Further Challenge to the Welfare State: Two Paradoxes of Trust. Paper presented at the Conference on "Challenges to the Welfare State" at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University, May 5, 2006.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter. 2006b. The Rational Actor Reform Paradigm: Delivering the Goods by Destroying Public Trust? *European Journal of Social Quality* 6(2): 121-141.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter. 2008. Trust and Welfare State Reform: The Example of the NHS. *Social Policy and Administration* 42(3): 288-306.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter. 2009. *Reframing Social Citizenship*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Terry, Larry D. 1995. *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Terry, Larry D. 2003. *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies: The Administrator as Conservator*, 2nd edition. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Thibaut, John, and Laurens Walker. 1975. *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thomas, Craig W. 1998. Maintaining and Restoring Public Trust in Government Agencies and Their Employees. *Administration and Society* 30(2): 166–193.
- Todd, Peter, and Gerd Gigerenzer. 2003. Bounding Rationality to the World. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 24: 143–165.
- Tolbert, Caroline J., and Karen Mossberger. 2006. The Effects of E-Government on Trust and Confidence in Government. *Public Administration Review* 66(3): 354-369.
- Tolchin, Susan J. 1996. *The Angry American: How Voter Rage is Changing the Nation*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Tullock, Gordon, 1965. *The Politics of Bureaucracy*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press.
- Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman. 1986. Rational Choice and the Framing of Decision, *Journal of Business* 59(2): S251–S278.
- Tyler, Tom R. 1990. *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, Tom R. 1998. Trust and Democratic Governance. In A. Braithwaite and M. Levi (eds.), *Trust and Governance*, pp. 269-294. New York: Russell Sage.
- Tyler, Tom R. 2001. The Psychology of Public Dissatisfaction with Government. In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it about Government that Americans Dislike?*, pp. 227–242. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyler, Tom R. 2006. *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, Tom R., and Peter DeGoey. 1995. Collective Restraint in Social Dilemmas: Procedural Justice and Social Identification Effects on Support for Authorities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69(3): 482-497.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2012. Income, Expenditures, Poverty, and Wealth: U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2012. <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0711.pdf> [accessed June 20, 2013].
- Uslaner, Eric M. 1994. *The Decline of Comity in Congress*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Uslaner, Eric M. 2001. Is Washington Really the Problem? In John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (eds.), *What is it About Government that Americans Dislike?*, pp. 118-133. New York: Cambridge.
- Uslaner, Eric M. 2002. *The Moral Foundations of Trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Van de Walle, Steven. 2004. Context-Specific Images of the Archetypical Bureaucrat: Persistence and Diffusion of the Bureaucracy Stereotype. *Public Voices* 1(1): 3–12.

- Van de Walle, Steven, and Geert Bouckaert. 2003. Public Service Performance and Trust in Government: The Problem of Causality. *International Journal of Public Administration* 26(8-9): 891-913.
- Van de Walle, Steven, and Geert Bouckaert. 2007. Perceptions of Productivity and Performance in Europe and the United States. *International Journal of Public Administration* 30(11): 1123-1140.
- Van de Walle, Steven, Jarl K. Kampen, and Geert Bouckaert. 2005. Deep Impact for High Impact Agencies? Assessing the Role of Bureaucratic Encounters in Evaluations of Government. *Public Performance and Management Review* 28(4): 532-549.
- Van Ryzin, Greg G. 2004. The Measurement of Overall Citizen Satisfaction. *Public Performance and Management Review* 27(3): 9-28.
- Van Ryzin, Gregg G. 2007. Pieces of a Puzzle: Linking Government Performance, Citizen Satisfaction, and Trust. *Public Performance and Management Review* 30(4): 521-535.
- Van Ryzin, Gregg G. 2011. Outcomes, Process, and Trust of Civil Servants. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(4): 745-760.
- Van Ryzin, Greg G., Douglas Muzzio, and Stephen Immerwahr. 2004. Explaining the Race Gap in Satisfaction with Urban Services. *Urban Affairs Review* 39(5): 613-632.
- Van Ryzin, Gregg, Douglas Muzzio, Stephen Immerwahr, Lisa Gulick, and Eve Martinez. 2004. Drivers and Consequences of Citizen Satisfaction: An Application of the American Customer Satisfaction Index Model to New York City. *Public Administration Review* 64(3): 331-341.
- Vigoda, Eran and Fany Yuval. 2001. *The Performance of Israeli Public Sector: A Citizens Survey and National Assessment*. Haifa: Center of Organizations and Human Resource Management and Department of Political Science, University of Haifa.
- Vigoda-Gadot, Eran, and Fany Yuval. 2003. Managerial Quality, Administrative Performance and Trust in Governance Revisited. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 16(7): 502-522.
- Vigoda-Gadot, Eran, and Shlomo Mizrahi. 2007. Public Sector Management and the Democratic Ethos: A 5-year Study of Key Relationships in Israel. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(1): 79-107.
- Vinzant, Janet. 1998. Where Values Collide: Motivation and Role Conflict in Child and Adult Protective Services. *American Review of Public Administration* 28(4): 347-366.
- Vinzant, Janet, and Lane Crothers. 1998. *Street-Level Leadership: Discretion and Legitimacy in Front-Line Public Service*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Wang, XiaoHu, and Montgomery Van Wart. 2007. When Public Participation in Administration Leads to Trust: An Empirical Assessment of Managers' Perceptions. *Public Administration Review* 67(2): 265-278.

- Welch, Eric W., Charles C. Hinnant, and M. Jae Moon. 2004. Linking Citizen Satisfaction with E-Government and Trust in Government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(3): 371-391.
- Whitaker, Gordon P. 1980. Coproduction: Citizen Participation in Service Delivery. *Public Administration Review* 40(3): 240-246.
- Whitener, Ellen M., Susan, E. Brodt, Audrey Korsgaard, and Jon Werner. 1998. Managers as Initiators of Trust. *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 513-530.
- Wicks, Andrew, Shawn Berman, and Thomas M. Jones. 1999. The Structure of Optimal Trust: Moral and Strategic Implications. *Academy of Management Review* 24(1): 99-116.
- Williams, John T. 1985. Systemic Influences of Political Trust: The Importance of Institutional Performance. *Political Methodology* 11(1/2): 125-142.
- Wilson, James Q. 1973. *Political Organizations*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Wittmer, Dennis. 1991. Serving the People or Serving for Pay: Reward Preferences Among Government, Hybrid Sector, and Business Managers. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 14(4): 369-383.
- Yackee, Susan Webb, and David Lowery. 2005. Understanding Public Support for the US Federal Bureaucracy: A Macro Politics View. *Public Management Review* 7(4): 515-536.
- Yang, Kaifeng. 2005. Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens: A Missing Link in citizen Involvement Efforts. *Public Administration Review* 65(3): 274-286.
- Yang, Kaifeng, and Marc Holzer. 2006. The Performance-Trust Link: Implications for Performance Management. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 114-126.
- Zand, Dale E. 1972. Trust and Managerial Problem Solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17(2): 229-239.
- Zand, Dale E. 1997. *The Leadership Triad: Knowledge, Trust and Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zucker, Lynne G. 1986. Production of Trust: Institutional Sources of Economic Structure, 1840-1920. *Research in Organizational Behavior* (8): 53-111.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Percentage Distributions for Program Effectiveness

Program	Generally effective	Only somewhat effective	Not very effective	No opinion	Total %	N
College Grants	72.4	19.0	6.2	2.4	100	1,747
Head Start	67.1	17.8	6.2	8.8	100	1,747
Medicaid	54.3	31.2	10.6	4.0	100	1,749
School Aid	54.0	22.7	17.7	5.7	100	1,746
Food Stamps	45.0	34.3	15.3	5.4	100	1,749
Public Housing	37.4	37.5	18.5	6.7	100	1,748
Welfare	27.2	43.5	23.8	5.5	100	1,748

Cell entries are row percentages.

Table 2. Percentage Distributions for Program Utilization

Program	Yes me	Yes, family member	No	No Response	Total %	N
Mortgage Interest Deduction	44.1	10.3	41.7	3.8	100	1,733
Social Security	31.6	39.9	27.8	0.8	100	1,740
Unemployment Compensation	27.2	17.4	53.9	1.5	100	2,336
Student Loans	26.6	31.0	41.4	1.0	100	1,738
Earned Income Tax Credit	26.4	12.6	54.0	7.1	100	2,339
Medicare	25.2	38.1	35.5	1.2	100	1,739
College Grants	22.5	21.3	54.9	1.3	100	1,739
Veteran's Benefits	12.0	27.4	59.0	1.6	100	1,738
Workman's Compensation	10.8	10.7	76.5	2.0	100	2,334
GI Bill	10.7	17.0	70.6	1.7	100	1,735
Food Stamps	9.5	10.3	78.5	1.7	100	2,334
Medicaid	8.9	22.8	65.9	2.4	100	2,339
Disability Benefits	8.4	12.5	77.2	1.8	100	2,333
WIC	7.5	11.9	76.5	4.1	100	2,333
Government Pension	7.1	13.2	78.0	1.7	100	1,737
Welfare	7.0	10.8	80.4	1.8	100	2,339
Head Start	4.1	8.8	84.8	2.3	100	2,332
Public Housing	3.8	4.8	89.9	1.5	100	2,331
Small Business Loan	2.6	4.0	91.9	1.5	100	1,729

Cell entries are row percentages.

Table 3. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Head Start Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	1081 66.7%	68 88.3%	1149 67.6%
Only somewhat effective	300 18.5%	6 7.8%	306 18.0%
Not very effective	105 6.5%	2 2.6%	107 6.3%
No opinion	136 8.4%	1 1.3%	137 8.1%
Total	1622 100.0%	77 100.0%	1699 100.0%
Chi-squared	16.11***		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 4. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Medicaid Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	834 53.3%	94 67.1%	928 54.5%
Only somewhat effective	499 31.9%	34 24.3%	533 31.3%
Not very effective	169 10.8%	10 7.1%	179 10.5%
No opinion	62 4.0%	2 1.4%	64 3.8%
Total	1564 100.0%	140 100.0%	1704 100.0%
Chi-squared	10.73**		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 5. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Food Stamps Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	665 43.0%	105 62.1%	770 44.9%
Only somewhat effective	552 35.7%	43 25.4%	595 34.7%
Not very effective	249 16.1%	15 8.9%	264 15.3%
No opinion	82 5.3%	6 3.6%	88 5.1%
Total	1548 100.0%	169 100.0%	1717 100.0%
Chi-squared	23.13***		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 6. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of College Grants Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	944 71.3%	301 76.8%	1245 72.5%
Only somewhat effective	254 19.2%	71 18.1%	325 18.9%
Not very effective	91 6.9%	16 4.1%	107 6.2%
No opinion	36 2.7%	4 1.0%	40 2.3%
Total	1325 100.0%	392 100.0%	1717 100.0%
Chi-squared	8.97**		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 7. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Public Housing Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	597 36.3%	42 60.0%	639 37.2%
Only somewhat effective	625 38.0%	20 28.6%	645 37.6%
Not very effective	313 19.0%	8 11.4%	321 18.7%
No opinion	112 6.8%	0 0.0%	112 6.5%
Total	1647 100.0%	70 100.0%	1717 100.0%
Chi-squared	18.57***		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 8. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness and Utilization of Welfare Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	408 25.6%	56 45.5%	464 27.0%
Only somewhat effective	708 44.4%	46 37.4%	754 43.9%
Not very effective	393 24.6%	19 15.5%	412 24.0%
No opinion	87 5.5%	2 1.6%	89 5.2%
Total	1596 100.0%	123 100.0%	1719 100.0%
Chi-squared	25.37***		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 9. Cross Tabulation: Effectiveness of Welfare, Utilization of WIC Program

	Yes, I have received benefits	No, I have not received benefits	Total
Generally effective	416 27.1%	37 29.8%	453 27.3%
Only somewhat effective	678 44.1%	54 43.6%	732 44.1%
Not very effective	370 24.1%	28 22.6%	398 24.0%
No opinion	73 4.8%	5 4.0%	78 4.7%
Total	1537 100.0%	124 100.0%	1661 100.0%
Chi-squared	0.56		

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 10. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Program Effectiveness

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Dependent Variable: Program rated "generally effective"	Head Start		Medicaid		Food Stamps		Public Housing	
Male	0.0714 (1.07)		0.0265 (1.03)		0.0092 (1.01)		-0.1474 (0.86)	
White	-0.1225 (0.88)		-0.2165 (0.81)		-0.5188 (0.60)	***	-0.5849 (0.56)	***
College degree or more	-0.1175 (0.89)		0.1144 (1.12)		-0.0672 (0.93)		0.1376 (1.15)	
Income \$75,000 or more	-0.0602 (0.94)		-0.1406 (0.87)		-0.2219 (0.80)	*	-0.2784 (0.76)	**
Political liberal	0.1550 (1.17)		0.1099 (1.21)		0.4579 (1.58)	***	0.0772 (1.08)	
Political conservative	-0.7989 (0.45)	***	-0.3254 (0.72)	**	-0.3606 (0.70)	***	-0.4491 (0.64)	***
Partisan	0.4827 (1.62)	***	0.1978 (1.22)		0.0735 (1.08)		0.1843 (1.20)	
Over last several years, economic situation has improved	0.1582 (1.17)		-0.0066 (0.99)		-0.1359 (0.87)		0.0970 (1.10)	
Yes. I have personally used this program	1.2825 (3.61)	***	0.7897 (2.20)	***	0.6940 (2.00)	***	0.8228 (2.28)	***
Yes, a member of my family has used this program, but not me	0.9616 (2.62)	***	0.1450 (1.16)		-0.0828 (0.92)		0.4835 (1.62)	*
Constant	0.9502 (2.5862)	***	0.2534 (1.2884)		0.3785 (1.4601)		0.0347 (1.0354)	
N	1285		1331		1328		1313	
Model χ^2	74.3	***	30.7	***	64.2	***	50.8	***
Log likelihood	-690.6		-898.2		-885.1		-852.2	
Pseudo R ²	0.0511		0.0168		0.0350		0.0289	

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

(Odds ratios are reported in parentheses.)

Table 11. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Program Effectiveness

	Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
Dependent Variable: Program rated "generally effective"	College Grants		Welfare		Welfare (WIC)	
Male	-0.1164 (0.89)		0.2352 * (1.27)		0.2082 (1.23)	
White	-0.4782 ** (0.62)		-0.3718 * (0.69)		-0.4458 ** (0.64)	
College degree or more	0.1150 (1.12)		-0.2538 * (0.78)		-0.2292 * (0.80)	
Income \$75,000 or more	0.1142 (1.12)		-0.1203 (0.89)		-0.1595 (0.85)	
Political liberal	0.0539 (1.06)		0.2714 * (1.31)		0.2639 * (1.30)	
Political conservative	-0.2744 * (0.76)		-0.5395 *** (0.58)		-0.5294 *** (0.59)	
Partisan	0.2293 * (1.26)		0.2176 (1.24)		0.1950 (1.22)	
Over last several years, economic situation has improved	0.1592 (1.17)		0.0373 (1.04)		0.0732 (1.08)	
Yes. I have personally used this program	0.2583 (1.29)		0.9586 *** (2.61)		0.0809 (1.08)	
Yes, a member of my family has used this program, but not me	0.2028 (1.22)		0.2033 (1.23)		0.2885 (1.33)	
Constant	1.2165 *** (3.3753)		-0.7428 *** (0.4758)		-0.6043 ** (0.5465)	
N	1364		1336		1303	
Model χ^2	21.9 **		60.5 ***		41.7 ***	
Log likelihood	-761.5		-762.8		-752.9	
Pseudo R ²	0.0141		0.0382		0.0270	

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

(Odds ratios are reported in parentheses.)

Table 12. Negative Binomial Regression Model: Program Effectiveness
Dependent Variable: Number of programs R rates “generally effective”

Model 1		
Male	0.0283 (1.0287)	
White	-0.1521 (0.8589)	***
College degree or more	0.0133 (1.0134)	
Income \$75,000 or more	-0.0558 (0.9457)	
Political liberal	0.1014 (1.1067)	**
Political conservative	-0.1915 (0.8257)	***
Partisan	0.0895 (1.0936)	**
Over last several years, economic situation has improved	0.0368 (1.0375)	
No. of federal programs R used	0.0214 (1.0217)	**
No. of federal programs R's family used (but not R)	0.0056 (1.0056)	
No. of means tested federal programs R used	0.0340 (1.0346)	*
No. of means tested federal programs R's family used (but not R)	0.0091 (1.0092)	
Constant	1.2460 (3.4765)	***
N	1180	
Model χ^2	95.01	***
Log likelihood	-2515	
Pseudo R ²	0.0185	

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

(Odds ratios are reported in parentheses.)

**Table 13. Percentage Distributions:
Trust in Public Officials and Federal Workers**

	Public officials can be trusted to do the right thing	The people working for the federal government are competent	I have been treated with respect by federal government workers
Agree	195 32.5%	305 52.4%	377 64.9%
Disagree	353 58.8%	144 24.7%	72 12.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	-	116 19.9%	47 8.1%
No Interaction	-	-	77 13.3%
No Response	52 8.7%	17 2.9%	8 1.4%
Total %	100%	100%	100%
N	600	582	581

Cell entries are number of respondents and column percentages.

Table 14. Binary Logistic Regression Models: Competence and Caring

	Agree: The people working for the federal government are competent		Agree: Have been treated with respect by federal government workers	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Male	0.2489 (1.28)	0.3166 (1.37)	-0.3162 (0.73)	-0.2056 (0.81)
White	-0.2943 (0.75)	-0.3168 (0.73)	0.2673 (1.31)	0.2555 (1.29)
College degree or more	0.7003 *** (2.01)	0.7231 *** (2.06)	0.3344 (1.40)	0.3442 (1.41)
Income \$75,000 or more	-0.1357 (0.87)	-0.1569 (0.85)	-0.0702 (0.93)	-0.0790 (0.92)
Political liberal	-0.0508 (0.95)	-0.0505 (0.95)	-0.2031 (0.82)	-0.1892 (0.83)
Political conservative	-0.4702 (0.62)	-0.4655 (0.63)	-0.1609 (0.85)	-0.1572 (0.85)
Partisan	0.2860 (1.33)	0.3292 (1.39)	-0.0050 (0.99)	-0.0022 (0.99)
Disagree: People like me don't have much say about what govt. does	0.3810 * (1.46)	0.3569 (1.43)	0.5270 * (1.69)	0.4660 * (1.59)
Approve of Pres. Bush's job	0.8030 *** (2.23)	0.7950 *** (2.21)	0.4527 (1.57)	0.4491 (1.57)
Over last several years, economic situation has improved	0.4089 * (0.51)	0.4451 * (1.56)	0.0194 (1.02)	0.0555 (1.06)
No. of federal programs judged to be "generally effective"	0.1457 ** (1.16)		0.2096 *** (1.23)	
No. of federal programs judged to be "not very effective"		-0.1999 ** (0.82)		-0.2661 *** (0.77)
No. of means tested federal programs R used	-0.0372 (0.96)	-0.0499 (0.95)	-0.0640 (0.94)	-0.0907 (0.91)
No. of means tested federal programs used by R's family only	-0.0483 (0.95)	-0.0505 (0.95)	-0.1419 (0.87)	-0.1320 (0.88)
Constant	-1.2039 **	-0.5331	0.0782	1.0493 *
N	354	354	321	321
Model χ^2	38.6 ***	38.07 ***	20.19 *	20.03 *
Log likelihood	-226.0	-226.2	-169.0	-169.1
Pseudo R ²	0.0787	0.0776	0.0564	0.0559

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$ (Odds ratios are reported in parentheses.)

**Table 15. Binary Logistic Regression Models:
Public officials can be trusted “to do the right thing”—“Agree”**

	Model 1		Model 2	
Male	0.3485 (1.42)		0.3914 (1.48)	
White	-0.5721 (0.56)		-0.4762 (0.62)	
College degree or more	0.1164 (1.12)		0.1164 (1.12)	
Income \$75,000 or more	-0.3365 (0.71)		-0.2097 (0.81)	
Political liberal	0.2613 (1.30)		0.1320 (1.14)	
Political conservative	-0.1719 (0.84)		-0.0452 (0.96)	
Partisan	0.5712 (1.77)	**	0.4632 (1.59)	
Disagree: People like me don't have much say about what govt. does	0.6554 (1.93)	***	0.6868 (1.99)	***
Approve of Pres. Bush's job	1.0446 (2.84)	***	1.1136 (3.05)	***
Over last several years, economic situation has improved	-0.1287 (0.88)		-0.1383 (0.87)	
No. of federal programs judged to be “generally effective”			0.0931 (1.10)	
No. of federal programs judged to be “not very effective”			-0.2990 (0.74)	***
Agree: The people working for the federal government are competent				
Agree: Have been treated with respect by federal government workers				
No. of means-tested federal programs R used				
No. of means-tested federal programs R's family used				
Constant	-1.3006 (0.27)	***	-1.4834 (0.23)	***
N	375		375	
Model χ^2	34.7	***	51.6	***
Log likelihood	-224.0		-215.6	
Pseudo R ²	0.0720		0.1069	

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$

(Odds ratios are reported in parentheses.)

**Table 16. Binary Logistic Regression Models:
Public officials can be trusted “to do the right thing”—“Agree”**

	Model 3		Model 4	
Male	0.5120 ** (1.67)		0.7038 ** (2.02)	
White	-0.5646 (0.57)		-0.3351 (0.72)	
College degree or more	-0.0676 (0.93)		-0.0015 (0.99)	
Income \$75,000 or more	-0.2978 (0.74)		-0.2757 (0.76)	
Political liberal	0.5799 * (1.79)		0.6599 * (1.93)	
Political conservative	0.1136 (1.12)		0.1148 (1.12)	
Partisan	0.6904 ** (1.99)		0.6237 * (1.87)	
Disagree: People like me don't have much say about what govt. does	0.7906 *** (2.20)		0.8308 *** (2.30)	
Approve of Pres. Bush's job	1.0803 *** (2.95)		0.9266 *** (2.53)	
Over last several years, economic situation has improved	-0.1527 (0.86)		-0.1276 (0.88)	
No. of federal programs judged to be “generally effective”	-0.0521 (1.05)		0.0630 (1.07)	
No. of federal programs judged to be “not very effective”	-0.2344 * (0.79)		-0.2374 * (0.79)	
Agree: The people working for the federal government are competent	0.6626 ** (1.94)		0.6540 ** (1.92)	
Agree: Have been treated with respect by federal government workers	0.7765 ** (2.17)		0.7975 ** (2.22)	
No. of means-tested federal programs R used			0.2302 * (1.26)	
No. of means-tested federal programs R's family used			0.0685 (1.07)	
Constant	-2.6943 *** (0.07)		-3.1995 *** (0.04)	
N	328		292	
Model χ^2	69.2 ***		64.7 ***	
Log likelihood	-174.7		-154.0	
Pseudo R ²	0.1653		0.1735	

* $p \leq 0.10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$ (Odds ratios are reported in parentheses.)

VITA

Lauren Harding is a graduate of Vanderbilt University where she majored in Political Science and Spanish Literature. During her college years, she spent a semester abroad studying at la Universidad Complutense in Madrid, Spain. In addition, she spent a semester interning for the Education Committee of the Tennessee General Assembly. Following graduation, she worked as a Research Analyst for the Tennessee Economic Council on Women, later taking on the role of Acting Executive Director. In this position, she conducted research on the economic status of Tennessee women, lobbied the Tennessee General Assembly for women's economic issues, conducted educational programs for young girls, and organized conferences to support women owned businesses and bring women across the state together to address economic issues. In 2005, she enrolled in the University of Tennessee, Graduate Program in Political Science, completing an internship in city administration in Morristown, Tennessee and earning her Masters of Public Administration in December of 2006. Having taught for several years at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Tennessee Technological University, she earned her Ph.D. in 2013, completing her coursework with a 4.0 grade point average. She currently serves as an instructor of political science at Tennessee Technological University.