

Proposed title for the Module	Drivers of institutional trustworthiness in Europe
Single or repeat measurement within panel	Repeated measurement within panel
Principal applicant	Santiago González
Position	Policy Analyst
Institution	OECD, Public Governance Directorate
Address for correspondence	2 Rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France
Telephone:	+(33-1) 45 24 15 90
Email:	santiago.gonzalez@oecd.org

Relevance and rationale (max. 600 words)

The erosion of institutional trust is undermining the legitimacy of public institutions and nurturing the emergence of political polarization and populist movements (Devine et al 2020). Such a trend is reinforced by negative economic shocks as the one the COVID-19 outbreak will cause (Anayev and Guriev 2019). Recent results show, in the COVID-19 context, increased public demand for strong leadership and willingness to give up individual freedom on the basis of a trusting relationship with institutions (Amat et al., 2020). However, as the current scenario perpetuates distrust in the way governments have handled the pandemic are resulting in lower compliance with rules and increasing scepticism on the long term recovery. Understanding how to regain trust is of essence for implementing recovery policies that could benefit all.

Trust is defined as a person's belief that another person or institution will act consistently with their expectations of positive behaviour (OECD 2017a). Trust relationships are clustered into two broader categories: (i) interpersonal trust, in the realm of social interactions, and (ii) institutional trust, in the realm of public and political institutions.

Institutional trust is recognized as one of the key outcomes of public administrations and is one of the most referred indicators for assessing governments performance (OECD 2019). However, there is still lack of clarity on what drives trust and how to capture it. This proposal aims at filling this gap by presenting a methodology for measuring the drivers of institutional trust that happens when citizens appraise public institutions as promise-keeping, efficient, fair and honest (Blind, 2006).

Consistency in the trust literature exists in two different but complementary components for understanding and analysing institutional trust: (i) *competence* or what concerns operational efficiency, or capacity and good judgement to actually deliver on a given mandate; and (ii) *values* or the underlying intentions and principles that guide actions and behaviours (Noteboom 2007; Choi and Kim 2012; Bouckaert 2012; Van de Walle and Michelgbrink, 2020).

The OECD framework deconstructs trust into two key components, *Competence* and *Values*, that follow the broad distinction reflected in the literature. Second, for each component, it identifies relevant dimensions that could make it amenable to policy change: *Responsiveness*, *Reliability*, *Integrity*, *Openness* and *Fairness* (OECD 2017b). This framework (See Table 1) guides the module included in this proposal. Its inclusion in the CRONOS-2 survey will allow a holistic understanding of institutional trust and its drivers.

Table 1 OECD trust framework

Component	Driver	Definition
Competence: <i>ability of governments to deliver high quality services</i>	Responsiveness	the provision of accessible, efficient and citizen-oriented public services that effectively address the needs and expectations of people
	Reliability	the ability of governments to minimize uncertainty in the economic, social and political environment facing people, and to act in a consistent and predictable manner
Values <i>drivers and principles that inform and guide government action</i>	Integrity	the alignment of public institutions with ethical principles and standards of conduct in order to safeguard the public interest
	Openness	the extent to which information is shared with citizens in a transparent accessible and usable manner and a comprehensive approach to interact with stakeholders is in place
	Fairness	the consistent treatment of citizens and business in policy making and policy implementation

Source: OECD (2017b)

The survey questions included in this proposal are not stereotypical behavioural questions: they don't focus on the individual behaviour but on the expected conduct from a third party, in this case public institutions. As such, it rather provides measurement on the trustworthiness of a given institution. Differently than attitudes (passive response) and behaviours (active response), trustworthiness is based on expectations which according to theory should lead to action (Merton, 1995).

Suitability for the CRONOS-2 (max. 400 words)

Evidence exists showing that short term factors and different types of shocks (e.g. economic shocks, corruption scandals) influence people's trust in institutions, for example many governments have seen an increase in their trust levels by some population segments as a result of the COVID-19 outbreak in what is known as a "rallying around the flag" effect (Mascherini and Eszter, 2020). However, this hasn't been tested longitudinally and cross nationally. The inclusion of these questions could allow testing how different types of short term events affect institutional trust over time. It is based on the understanding that people's relation with public institutions is dynamic and permeated by a variety of elements including policy developments, external shocks, access and exposure to different sources of information as well as contextual and personal changes.

The proposed module aims at understanding primarily how trust levels vary at the country level in relation to the drivers identified in the framework. Nonetheless, it is also amenable to investigating the effects that changes in the personal situation (e.g changes in income level, marital status, employment status, area of living), items already included in the ESS, could have on those drivers and ultimately on institutional trust.

The proposal put forward envisages having 10 questions on the drivers of trust to be fielded in waves 1 and 2 of the CRONOS-2 panel survey (a total of 20 questions). According with the possibilities set in the terms of reference these questions could be ideally fielded as well in waves 4 and 5. Some of these questions have been experimentally fielded through online surveys as part of the OECD Trustlab initiative in a handful of

countries in different contexts showing their applicability and relevance for understanding changes in institutional trust (Murtin et al, 2017)

This proposal relies on the fact that the ESS is already including trust questions on a series of institutions (i.e. parliament, legal system, police, politicians, political parties, the European Parliament, the United Nations) and could therefore focus on the drivers. Additionally, for having a full understanding of what influences institutional trust levels it will also rely on other items already included in the ESS recognized in the literature as having a relationship with institutional trust such as interpersonal trust, political efficacy, perception about the economy, voice and exit behaviours, political affiliation and different models of democracy as will be included in one of the rotating modules for wave 11 of ESS.

Research team (max. 250 words)

Santiago González: Lead economist of the Governance indicators and performance measurement division of the OECD Public Governance Directorate. His main research areas are public governance indicators; trust in public institutions; political efficacy, drivers of satisfaction with services and the relation between good governance and people's well-being. Santiago led the creation of the OECD Trust dataset and question modules on the drivers of institutional trust put forward by the OECD Guidelines on Measuring trust and the Trustlab initiative. Santiago is a Belgian citizen.

Mónica Ferrín: Professor at the Department of Sociology and Communication at University of La Coruña in Spain. She received her PhD at the European University Institute in Florence and worked as researcher at Collegio Carlo Alberto in Turin, and the University of Zurich. Her areas of research include Gender inequalities in politics, society and economics; Europeans' attitudes to democracy; and public opinion more generally; and political participation. She is part of the QDT of the ESS Module on Democracy in Round 6 and Round 10. She has publications in major international journals.

Mariano Torcal: Full Professor in Political Science and ICREA Research Fellow at the Department of Political and Social Science at the Pompeu Fabra University in Barcelona and Director of the Research and Expertise Centre for Survey Methodology (RECSM). He is the current editor of *Revista Latinoamericana de Opinión Pública* and current President of WAPOR Latinoamérica. His research areas include political disaffection, political trust and satisfaction with democracy, electoral behavior, political participation and party system institutionalization in major international journals.

Feasibility of implementation (max. 800 words – excluding draft questions which can be in addition)

The OECD trust guidelines made a thorough assessment of the statistical accuracy of existing trust metrics in non-official households survey (OECD 2017a; González and Smith 2017). A key conclusion of those guidelines is that existing metrics of institutional trust should be considered as experimental and that not consistent measurement of their drivers of institutional trust is currently available. In consequence the guidelines put forward an experimental set of 8 questions on the drivers of trust based on people expectations of those institutions behaviour.

This proposal builds on those questions and envisages 20 closed questions to be fielded over multiple waves. As previously indicated these questions have been tested cross-sectionally in a handful of OECD countries

representing different contexts showing the feasibility of their implementation (Murtin et al 2017; OECD/KDI 2017)

The module put forward by this proposal is based on a particular way of formulating questions specially linked to the trust concept which, as previously defined, is based on the expectations of positive behaviour. In consequence the proposed module identifies a series of stereotypical situations linked to the behaviour of public institutions, or when relevant as represented by their agents, and inquires about its expected outcome. This way of asking allows exploring trust beyond the mere perception of whether or not others can be trusted. In general terms, the questions put forward for measuring the drivers of institutional trust are designed in the following way. **If X happens do you trust (your government or a given public institution) to do Y?**

Different from acknowledging the lag in data collection when reporting the results and being aware of the effects that sudden unexpected systemic changes or shocks (e.g. anticipated election, natural disaster) in a given country context could have *vis a vis* the others on the interpretability of their data, the timeframes as specified in the proposal do not pose any challenge for the implementation or analysis of this module. The box below presents the proposed set of questions, which have been already tested by fielding them in Korea, Finland and Norway.

Previous experience has shown two methodological aspects that needed to be taken into account when fielding this module. First, question wording should be precise enough for the respondents to understand the concepts clearly, including examples (e.g. of administrative procedures). Second, the item specific “non-response” (including don’t knows) should also be included and its rates reported *vis a vis* other items of the survey to monitor whether the questions are complex and/or difficult to understand. The suggested module on the drivers of institutional trustworthiness in Europe is presented in Box 1

BOX 1 SUGGESTED MODULE ON THE DRIVERS OF INSTITUTIONAL TRUSTWORTHINESS IN EUROPE

The following questions are about your expectations of behaviour from public institutions. In each question, you will be asked whether you think a particular example of behaviour is something that would be expected not to occur at all, or to always occur.

Please respond on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means very unlikely and 10 means very likely.

Responsiveness

Q1 If a large group of citizens expresses dissatisfaction with the functioning of a public service (e.g. the education, health or justice system) do you think that corrective actions will be taken?

Very unlikely Very likely

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Q2 If a government employee has an idea that could lead to better provision of a public service, do you think that it would be adopted?

Very unlikely Verly likely

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Reliability

Q3 If an alert due to the appearance of a new disease is raised, do you think that existing public health plans would be effective?

Very unlikely Very likely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Q4 If you start a business today do you think that the conditions under which you operate (taxes, regulations, etc.) will remain stable enough so that unexpected changes do not threaten your business?

Very unlikely to remain stable Very likely to remain stable

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Integrity

Q5 If a large business offered a well-paid job to a high level politician in exchange for political favours during their time in office, do you think that he/she would refuse this proposal?

Most likely to accept- Most likely to refuse

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Q6 If a parliamentarian were offered a bribe to influence the awarding of a public procurement contract, do you think that he/she would refuse the bribe?

Most likely to accept- Most likely to refuse

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Openness

Q7 If a decision affecting your community were to be taken by the local or regional government, how likely is it that you and others in the community would have an opportunity to voice your concerns?

Very unlikely Very likely

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Q8 If you need information about an administrative procedure, do you think that it will be easy to find? (OECD 3.10)

Very unlikely Very likely

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Fairness

Q9 If an individual belongs to a minority group (e.g. sexual, racial/ethnic and/or based on national origin), how likely is it that he or she will be treated the same as other citizens by a government agency?

Very unlikely Very likely

01 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Q 10 If a tax reform is implemented, do you think that the financial burden would be shared fairly across social and income groups?.

Very unlikely Very likely

01 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 88 dk

Dissemination plans (max 250 words)

The dissemination of the data could take at different stages between 2021, 2022 and 2023. In order to reach high level policy makers, the results could be presented at one of the 2 annual meetings (April or November) of the OECD Public Governance Committee where public governance experts of OECD and partners countries meet to discuss key public governance developments and challenges as well as policy responses and solutions. It could also be presented at the OECD Committee for Statistics and Statistical Policy (April of November) where heads of National Statistical Offices are represented.

In order to reach a larger audience including practitioners and the academic community. The results of the special module could be presented as a special feature in the OECD flagship report Government at a Glance to be published in 2023. Up to date the 2019 edition of the publication has been downloaded about 50.000 times primarily by civil servants and academics. Results could also be disseminated through OECD social medial platforms such as twitter.

Finally, to engage in a dialogue with the academic community, one or several working papers could be prepared to be presented at academic conferences in the course of 2022.

The results will also be presented as one of the ESSTopline series in agreement with ESS for the specific date. All the above will be done fully acknowledging the results as steeming from the ESS CRONOS-2 panel survey and will be funded with existing OECD resources.

References

- Amat, F., Arenas, A., Faló Gimeno, A. & Muñoz, J. (2020). Pandemics meet democracy: Experimental evidence from the COVID19 crisis in Spain. Working Paper, Preprint, arXiv: <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/dkusw/>
- Ananyev, Maxim and Guriev, Sergei, (2019), Effect of Income on Trust: Evidence from the 2009 Economic Crisis in Russia, *Economic Journal*, 129, issue 619, p. 1082-1118.
- Blind, P. (2006) Building Trust in Government in the Twenty-First Century: Review of Literature and Emerging Issues. 7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government. United Nations
- Bouckaert, G. (2012). Trust and public administration. *Administration*, 60(1), 91–115.
- Choi, S. O. & Kim, S. (2012). An Exploratory model of Antecedents and Consequences of public trust in Government. Technical report, mimeo, University of Korea.
- Devine, D, Gaskell, J., Jennings W and Stoker, G (2020). Exploring Trust, Mistrust and Distrust. Working Paper Series, University of Southampton: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5c21090f8f5130d0f2e4dc24/t/5e995ec3f866cd1282cf57b1/1587109577707/TrustGov+-+Trust+mistrust+distrust+-+20.04.2020.pdf>
- González, S. and C. Smith (2017), "The accuracy of measures of institutional trust in household surveys: Evidence from the oecd trust database", *OECD Statistics Working Papers*, No. 2017/11, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/d839bd50-en>.
- OECD (2019), *Government at a Glance 2019*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/8ccf5c38-en>.
- OECD (2017a), *OECD Guidelines on Measuring Trust*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264278219-en>.
- OECD (2017b), *Trust and Public Policy: How Better Governance Can Help Rebuild Public Trust*, OECD Public Governance Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264268920-en>.
- Mascherini, M. and E. Sandor (2020), *History repeating itself? The impact of the Covid-19 crisis on youth*, *Social Europe*, Vol 1, <https://www.socialeurope.eu/author/massimiliano-mascherini-and-eszter-sandor>
- Merton, R. (1995), The Thomas Theorem and the Matthew effect, *Social Forces*, 74(2), p 379-424
- Murtin, F., et al. (2018), "Trust and its determinants: Evidence from the Trustlab experiment", *OECD Statistics Working Papers*, No. 2018/02, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/869ef2ec-en>.

Nooteboom, B. (2006). Social capital, institutions and trust. Tilburg University.

VandeWalle,S.and K, Migchelbrink (2020), Institutional quality, corruption and impartiality:
The role of process and outcome for citizen trust in public administration in 173 European regions.
Journal of Economic Policy Reform,doi.org/10.1080/17487870.2020.1719103