

Modelling Political Trust in a Developing Country

Paul Andrew Bourne

Department of Community Health and Psychiatry, Faculty of Medical Sciences,
The University of the West Indies, Mona, Kingston, Jamaica

Abstract: Jamaica is not atypical in its high levels of corruption, nor is it surprising that there is a low degree of public trusts in government – only 8 out of 100 people trust the government. One of the measures that can be used as an approximation for the public's distrust in government is the increasing decline in voting behaviour in elections, and the increase in unconventional political participation over the last half a decade. Within the context of the aforementioned issues, we will be examining the factors that account for this reality, as well as the extent of trust (or distrust) in the government and in interpersonal relationships in Jamaica from an econometric perspective. And so we will seek to build a model that explains the people's trust in government. This study utilizes primary observational data collected by the Centre of Leadership and Governance, Department of Government, the University of the West Indies at Mona, Kingston, Jamaica between July and August, 2006. The observational data was collected by way of a 166-item questionnaire. It was a stratified nationally representative sample of some 1,338 Jamaicans from all 14 parishes. The observational data were collected and stored using the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 16.0. Descriptive statistics were done to provide background information on the sample, and tests were done for Cronbach alpha to examine the validity of the construct – i.e. wellbeing and political participation. Then, logistic regression was used to build a model. A goodness of fit statistics test was carried out on the model. Of a sampled population of 1,338 respondents, 37% (approximately 4 out of 10 persons) reported that they trust other persons compared to 8% (8 out of 100 people) who indicated that they trust the government. The observational data were used to test the general hypothesis [trust in government is a function of some 14 factors, and estimate the parameters of the final function. We found that of the 14 predisposed variables that were identified by the literature, only 6 were statistically significant influencers. The 6 factors explain 27.3% of the variance in trust in government. Those factors in regard to degree of importance in descending order are: confidence in socio-political institutions, governance of the country, interpersonal trust, political participation, administration of justice and sex of respondents. Governments in Jamaica have been suffering from a deficit in trust, just like the nation's budget And any building of trust in government must first begin by accepting the factors that affect trust, and secondly by being aware that their actions (or inactions) coupled with that of their related institutions affect public confidence, cooperation from the citizenry and civic engagement. Given the limitations of this study, we recommend that a longitudinal study be conducted with the same set of variables, as well as the others that were identified in the literature but were not used. And instead of using perceived corruption as a proxy for corruption, we utilized the operational definition of Transparency International, as corruption appears to be a primate variable in trust in government, but were unable to verify this with the use of perceived corruption.

Key words: Governance, Jamaica, modelling political trust, political participation, political trust, trust in government

INTRODUCTION

The current study examines political trust in Jamaica, and in the process seeks to model this phenomenon in order to provide an understanding of people's perception of the issues, which account for this political reality. Jamaica is not atypical in its high levels of corruption (Transparency International, 1999-2007) nor is it surprising that there is a low degree of public trusts in government (Powell *et al.*, 2007) – only 8 out of 100

people trust the government. One of the measures that can be used as an approximation for the public's distrust in government is the increasing decline in voting behaviour in elections (Boxill *et al.*, 2007; Munroe, 1999; 2002; Stone, 1974) and the increase in unconventional political participation over the last half a decade. Within the context of the aforementioned issues, we will be examining the factors that account for this reality as well as the extent of trust (or distrust) both in the government and in interpersonal relationships in Jamaica from an

econometric perspective. And so we will seek to build a model that explains people's trust in government. But, does corruption affect trust?

2006 was marked by a storm of corporate corruption scandals that hit the world's largest exporting country, Germany, particularly hard. Automaker Volkswagen, the German branch of the Swedish furniture outlet IKEA and the engineering group Siemens were all caught up in allegations of corruption, with several bribery prosecutions. Other firms were in the spotlight as well, including the Chinese industrial equipment-maker Shanghai Electric Group Co., whose chairman was investigated following allegations of corruption, and Dutch electronics manufacturer Phillips, accused by a Hamburg prosecutor of bribing retailers. (Transparency International, 2006)

public trust in institutions, especially the police, is central to an effective anti-corruption System (Transparency International, 2005)

Corruption is one of the many contributing factors to the level of distrust in a society, organization or nation (Fukuyama, 1995; Covey and Merrill, 2006; Transparency International, 2005; Uslaner, 2005). It slows development, increases costs, fosters bureaucracy and retards social capital. Corruption breeds crime (for example, bribery, misappropriation of funds, extortion, threats, treason, fraud, murder), and crime fosters silence, lowers integrity in the system and further intensifies distrust, as people's confidence in each other's credibility or in that of an institution, their intent, motives, and honesty are always questioned, because 'positive expectations' do not derive from corruption. Nor does character build in this milieu, as it is the hallmark of a dysfunctional system. Such a milieu produces dysfunctional relationships, confrontations, defensive posturing, legal positioning, labelling of others as informants, verbal, emotional and physiological abuses, guarded monologues, doubts of reliability, questionable commitments, militant stakeholders, low cooperation and hidden agendas. Ergo, in this milieu trust is thrown through the window and the aforementioned characteristics replace it.

Corruption has been plaguing developing countries such as Nigeria, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Angola, Chad, New Guinea, Sudan, Uganda and Somalia (i.e. the most corrupt nation in the world in 2006 – Transparency International) for some time now. And this is not restricted to African nations as the issue is spread across the globe to include Latin American and Caribbean nations like Haiti, Jamaica, Guyana, Guatemala, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Trinidad and Tobago to name a few countries, as well as nations in Europe, Asia, the Middle

Eastern countries and the Americas, plus Belarus, Bulgaria, Italy, United States, Korea, Germany, United Kingdom, Iraq, Japan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, and China. According to Transparency International reports (1999-2007), countries like Haiti (placing 177th out of 180 countries - Transparency International, 2006) and Jamaica (ranked 86th out of 180 nations in 2006 by Transparency International; and in 2003 ranked 57th of 133 countries) are experiencing increased corruption. TI's report has shown that corruption is increasing in some countries, particularly Jamaica. This is not limited to politicians, drug cartels or dons, but has been disseminated across the entire public and private sectors as well as private citizenry.

Recently the Police Commissioner of the Jamaica Constabulary Force (JCF), Rear Admiral Hardley Lewin, accused the members under his charge of being corrupt, and he went further to say that there are criminals in the JCF. The matter of criminals being in the force suggests that individuals who have been convicted of criminal activities are still working in the institution, but if this is so it points to the extent of corruption within that organization. The Commissioner of Police's argument may be borne out by the unprecedented number of police officers arrested since 2007. This is not limited to Jamaica, as in another Caribbean location (Cayman Islands), some senior police officers are currently being charged for corruption. Nevertheless, the issue of corruption goes beyond the police force, as a Jamaican politician some time ago was sentenced to a jail term for his involvement in corruption (Mr. JAG Smith). It has been revealed that private individuals have been arrested for their involvement in 'stealing electricity and tampering with the National Water Commission's meter system' in an effort to lower their expenditure. Then there is the other matter of extortion, which has become pervasive in Jamaican society over the last 5 years. But, how widespread is the issue of corruption in the society?

Transparency International's corruption index has shown an increasing trend in the area of corruption in Jamaica, although some people argue that this is absurd and a fabrication of the real facts. A national representative cross-sectional sample survey conducted by Waller *et al.* (2007) of some 1,140 Jamaicans 16 years of age and older, found that the five institutions perceived as the most corrupt in the nation are the police force (8 out of 10 people) followed by parish councils (6 out of 10 people), customs (6 out of 10 Jamaicans), central government (5 out of 10 people), and public works (approximately 5 out of 10 people). In the same study, when Jamaicans were asked 'How easy is it for corruption to be detected in the Jamaican public sector?' 71% of them reported that this was difficult to detect, while 21% indicated that it was very difficult to detect. To follow up on people's perception of matters relating to corruption

and its punishment, the researchers asked the question 'How likely is it that the corrupt individuals will be punished for their actions?' 56% of Jamaicans indicated that it was not likely for corrupt individuals to be caught and punished. But, does perceived corruption affect trust?

Francis Fukuyama, Stephen Covey and Rebecca Merrill, and Eric Uslaner are a few of the scholars who have argued that low accountability and lack of transparency are all tenets of corruption. Although Fukuyama's (1995), Covey and Merrill's (2006) works were not based on sample survey research data, the works covered years of observations, personal experiences and other qualitative approaches that allowed them to write those materials. Eric Uslaner's (2005) work entitled "Trust and Corruption", on the other hand, was based on sample survey research data (i.e. World Values Surveys – 47 countries), and he found that there was a strong reciprocated relation between trust and corruption (simple correlation 0.724). Another scholar, using a sample survey methodology of some 1,338 Jamaicans in a cross-sectional national survey, found that corruption does affect trust, but that the negative association was a weak one, it being the seventh factor of 8 - (Wald statistic = 4.691, Odds ratio = 0.634, 95%CI: 0.420 to 0.868) (Bourne, 2008). Using logistic regression to model 'trust in organizations' Bourne identified that the perceived 'administration of justice' in the nation is the most significant predictor of the aforementioned trust (Wald statistic = 13.5, Odds ratio = 0.496, 95%CI: 0.342 to 0.722). We have now established that corruption (using either Transparency International's operational definition – Uslaner - or perception – Waller *et al.*'s (2007) work) influences trust; and based on the level of perceived corruption in government in Jamaica (be it parish council or central government), people's confidence in those institutions will be low. A study conducted by Powell *et al.* (2007), using a sample survey research methodology of over 1,300 Jamaicans, found that 7 out of 100 people trust the government. Although distrust in government is very high in Jamaica, a nationally representative sample survey research of some 1,557 Americans 18 years and older, as interviewed by NPR (2000), found that 4 out of 10 people trusted the local government, and the same was reported for the state compared to 3 out of 10 for the federal government (GALLUP, 2008; Jones, 2007). The American National Election Studies, in 1966, reported that trust in federal government was 6 out of 10 people, which means that trust in federal government has been reduced by one-half in 33 years. Hence, the issue of distrust extends beyond geopolitical borders.

There are scholarships that have shown that trust is a crucial factor in social capital (Hibbing and Theiss-Moore, 2002; Uslaner, 2002; Levi and Stoker, 2000), and if corruption is inversely related to trust, and corruption is widespread in Jamaica (Transparency International

1997-2007; Waller *et al.*, 2007), then social capital will undoubtedly be low (Fukuyama, 1995; Boxill *et al.*, 2007; United Nations, 2007), distrust will be high, crime and victimization will be high, and productivity and production will equally be affected because of the low social capital (Covey and Merrill, 2006; Fukuyama, 1995). Jamaica is not atypical in its high levels of corruption (Transparency International, 1990-2007) nor is the low degree of public trust in government surprising. One of the measures that can be used, as an approximation for the public's distrust in government, is the continuous decline in voting behaviour in general elections (Munroe, 1999; 2002; Baier, 1986; Boxill *et al.*, 2007; Stone, 1974) and the increase in unconventional political participation over the last century.

Corruption is not the only yardstick used by the public to assess their confidence in socio-political institutions (Espinal and Hartlyn, 2006; Hazan, 2006), but there are many other components. Among these are past performance (or the lack of), lack of integrity and honesty, credibility issues, wastage and inefficiency, cynicism, 'suspicion of politicians and dons', competence, and the matter of misappropriation of public funds. In addition to those issues mentioned earlier, the World Values Survey identified another factor, which is the recent political transition (Klingemann, 1999; Espinal and Hartlyn, 2006). Within the context of the aforementioned issues, we will examine the factors that account for this reality as well as the extent of trust (or distrust) in government and interpersonal relationships in Jamaica from a quantitative perspective. Thus, we are led to the next crux of this paper, what is trust and trust in government? Confidence in political institutions is not limited to corruption, and so we will seek to build a model that explains people's trust in government.

Conceptual Framework: "People want to be trusted. They respond to trust. They thrive on trust" (Covey and Merrill, 2006). What is trust? And does trustfulness indicate gullibility? Or should trustfulness correspond to vigilance? The issue of trust and gullibility is important in the study of social capital, profitability, productivity, democracy, and according to Fukuyama (1995), it [trust] holds a society together. Some people believe that in order to trust, one must 'blindly' believe in the credibility, intent, motives and words of another. Such a position indicates gullibility, and not trust. Trusting individuals are not necessarily gullible, but some scholars argue that gullibility, vulnerability and trust go hand in hand (Jones, 1996; Schlenker *et al.*, 1973; Webster, 1913). One scholarship has found that a positive relation exists between trust, gullibility and a tendency for conformity (Garske, 1976). This goes to the crux of the perception that some people, in spite of information that shows the rationale for them not to trust, will in fact do so (Schlenker *et al.*, 1973).

Contrary to the aforementioned scholarships, gullibility does not correspond to trust or trustfulness. Whereas some level of vulnerability is needed prior to the establishment of trust or trustfulness, it does not imply gullibility. A group of researchers have written that people can be watchful while being trusting (Yamagishi *et al.*, 1999). Another study concurs with other works that trustful people are not gullible; Rotter (1980) finds that “high trusters are no more gullible than low trusters”. The debate so far has excluded an important element, the definition of trust. What is trust?

According to Covey and Merrill (2006), Berman, (1997), La Porte and Metlay (1996), Lipset and Schneider (1987) “simply put, trust means confidence”. Covey and Merrill (2006) opine, “[And] the opposite of trust is suspicion”. Such a conceptual definition implies that low confidence means distrust that suspicion is an indicator of distrust and that this is a ‘good’ proxy for distrust. This also implies that there is a trust continuum, and that to the one extreme there is trust and to the other is distrust. Trust is not confidence, but what it does is to enhance confidence and thereby foster cooperation from people (United Nations, 2007).

Within the purview of a complex man, no social construction of trust can claim to be simple or to be merely simple enough to capture the multidimensional aspect of humans.

Trust is the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community. Those norms can be about deep “value” questions like the nature of God or justice, but they also encompass secular norms like professional standards and codes of behaviour. That is, we trust a doctor not to do us deliberate injury because we expect him or her to live by the Hippocratic Oath and the standards of the medical profession (Fukuyama, 1995).

Like Covey and Merrill (2006), Fukuyama (1995) believes that confidence is an ingredient in a discussion on trust. Whereas Covey and Merrill ended with a simple conceptual definition of trust, Fukuyama went further and was all-inclusive in his definition. He incorporated positive expectations to include cooperation, honesty and shared values. Another scholar’s definition of trust, like that of Fukuyama (1995), identified positive expectation as an element of trust as well as results. “Trust occurs when parties holding certain favourable perceptions of each other allow this relationship to reach the expected outcomes” (Wheless and Grotz, 1997). Although Fukuyama (1995) expanded the construct of trust, he also alluded to a uni-dimensional approach in its conceptualization.

Covey and Merrill (2006) and Fukuyama (1995) see trust on a continuum; and so they use low trust and trust to indicate their view of trust on this continuum. Embedded in Fukuyama’s (1995) construct is confidence (or low trust) along with the other modifications – honesty, cooperation, and expectations. The expectation that drives trust is positive expectation, and ergo negative expectation explains low trust, which goes back to the issue of confidence. Such a trust is interpersonal trust, which could extend to organizations, and when interpersonal trust is coalesced with organizational trust it is referred to as behavioural trust.

People do trust within some context, and this context is past experience, expectation, past performance, credibility, honesty, intent and motives of the truster. All of this operates under the guise of vigilance. Vigilance is a general awareness that each individual is not necessarily trustworthy; and so some degree of caution is used in relations. Here we are emphasizing the importance of information that makes us cognizant of the likely opportunistic behaviour of others. Gurtman and Lion (1982) help us to understand that vigilant people seem to have a lower threshold in recognizing stimuli that can be used to identify opportunism. Hence, the opposite of vigilance is gullibility, and according to Rotter (1967) “believing another person when there [is] some clear-cut evidence that the person should not be believed”. It should be pointed out here that being vigilant and using information to arrive at informed decisions does not constitute suspicion or distrustfulness (Kramer, 1999). When trust is based on information, it is called rational trust.

Although Covey and Merrill’s (2006) conceptual definition of trust was simple, their work extended to competence, credibility, intention, expectation, motives, honesty, past performance, transparency and accountability. Hence, the work was from a behavioural perspective. It is clear from Covey and Merrill (2006) and Fukuyama (1995) that rational trust is within the broader area of behavioural trust. As it is from information that credibility will be adjudged, so will expectation, motives, past performance, honesty, transparency and accountability be established by the trustee (i.e. the individual who is receiving). Hence, one’s attitude to an event, a person, or an organization is guided by some information, which is based on rational trust. Again, rational trust drives interpersonal trust, or trust in organizational – behavioural trust.

Some scholarships distinguish between interpersonal trust – trust in people (Inglehart, 1997), organizational trust, which is institutional trust, political trust (i.e. trust in government, governmental institutions, politicians), and socio-political trust – encompassing political institutions, family, churches, and other institutions. Covey and Merrill (2006) and Rahn and Rudolph (2002) make a

distinction between trust in local government and in the national government (or federal) (Levi and Stokes, 2000). Political trust is based on the individual's evaluation of the political milieu, which could be parish, state, national, or federal. Again organizational trust is not blind, and so there is need for some degree of distrust in order to maintain democracy and guard it against those who may want to capture its functioning (Patterson, 1999).

The public will trust government, the church, family, school to name a few institutions (or organizations) based on their competence, the character of the entity, which includes an individual, as well as on past performance from which credibility is established, and 'good' intention. Furthermore, when citizenry have come to expect a consistent result from governmental institutions inclusive of politicians, this builds their level of trust in the specified entity. Hence, consistent results are one way that political institutions are able to foster trust in them from their public. People then begin to evaluate the integrity of the institution, by analyzing whether honesty is a hallmark of the organization as well as assessing its intention in an effort to see if it is 'good'. Political trust is, ergo, based on the public's evaluation of government and its affiliated institutions' policies, programmes, promises, efficiency, fairness, honesty and justice, as well as individual politicians (Miller and Listhaug, 1990; Newton and Norris, 2000)

Measuring trust: Subjectivity (i.e. perception) is used by many scholars to evaluate certain events that traditional scholars believed could only be measured by objectification. The issue of subjectivity in the operationalization of events is well researched from a quality of life perspective (Easterlin, 2003, 2001; Edward, 1984, 2000; Stutzer and Frey, 2003), but this extends to corruption and trust. The measurement of trust dates back to the World Values Survey in 1959 and Almond and Verba (1963) who used a single question to operationalize trust (i.e. generalized trust). The question reads, "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?" Two choices were given: "most people can be trusted" (coded 1) and "one needs to be very careful" (coded 0). The generalized trust question which was started in the late 1950s and continued to the early 1960s has been modified by other scholars such as Nye (1997), Hardin (1993) and Powell *et al.* (2007). Scholars like Powell *et al.* (2007) measure interpersonal trust and trust in government by way of ascertaining people's perspectives on generalized trust. Hence, they asked "Generally speaking, would you say that most people are essentially good and can be trusted, or that most people are not essentially good and cannot be trusted"? Powell *et al.* (2007) question for collecting data on generalized trust differs marginally from that of James and Sykuta

(2004) - "Generally speaking, do you believe that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people"?

Correlates of Trust in Government: We have laid the foundation for a definition of trust as well as providing a measurement for this construct, which leaves one thing to be discussed and that is 'what are the factors that can be used to explain trust in government?' Using sample survey research data from during the 1980s, Niemi and Junn (1998) sought to model factors that predict trust in government among senior high school students, and found that of the entire predisposed variable they only explain 5% of the variance in the model. Among the variables that were used in Niemi and Junn's (1998) regression model is voting behaviour, confidence in participation in school activities, and participation in religious organizations in addition to other factors.

The study conducted by Torney-Purta *et al.* (2004) was a secondary one. It was a nationally representative sample survey research of 90,000 students who were 14 years old and beyond, from 28 countries in 1999; and in 2000 it was comprised of 50,000 students (ages 16 to 19 years) from upper secondary schools in 16 countries. Using those two research projects, Torney-Purta *et al.*'s (2004) study was based on 5 of the 28 countries. The countries were selected based on: stable democracies – United States and England – countries that recently were under authoritarian rule – Bulgaria and Chile – and another because of corruption and lack of impartiality in the justice system among other aspects of governance – Colombia. The researchers identified the following factors as predictors of institutional trust (or organizational trust) – political participation, involvement in religious organizations, confidence in schools, discussion of politics, political efficacy, civic knowledge, reading newspapers, volunteering and collecting for charity. The study was a five-country research project that included Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, England and the United States. The R square coefficient was very low – Bulgaria (0.05), Chile (0.071), Colombia (0.054), England (0.079), and the United States (0.108) (Torney-Purta *et al.* 2004). According to Torney-Purta *et al.* (2004), organizational trust was measured on a 4-point rating scale of particular governmental institutions (national government, national parliament, local government, justice institutions (courts and police) and political parties). Hazan (2006), United Nations (2007), Espinal and Hartlyn (2006) concur with Torney-Purta *et al.* (2004) that civil engagement (political participation) is a factor that indicates trust in government; and in addition to the aforementioned issue, Espinal and Hartlyn (2006) find that corruption plays a role in influencing trust in government (Transparency International, 2005).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilizes cross-sectional surveyed data collected by the Centre of Leadership and Governance, Department of Government, the University of the West Indies at Mona, Kingston, Jamaica between July and August, 2006. The purpose of the survey was to collect observational data on Jamaican’s political culture, which included pertinent information on the basic orientation of leadership, governance and democracy, perception of wellbeing, trust and confidence in socio-political institutions, political participation and civic engagement, electoral preferences and leadership. The observational data were collected by way of a 166-item questionnaire. It was a stratified nationally representative sample of some 1,338 Jamaicans from all 14 parishes. The questionnaire consists of questions dealing with civic culture and orientation to democracy, and generalized trust composed of the following core variables - interpersonal trust, institutional trust - confidence, perception of wellbeing, crime and corruption and political participation, as well as the standard demographic variables. The observational data were collected and stored using the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 16.0. Dummy variables were created from some demographic and other variables – sex, race, religiosity, area of residence, generalized trust, unemployed person, perceived social class and justice. Wellbeing and political participation were computed from a number of scale questions. Descriptive statistics were done to provide background information on the sample; tests were done for Cronbach alpha to examine the validity of the construct – i.e. wellbeing and political participation. Then, logistic regression was used to build a model. A goodness of fit statistics test was done on the model.

Measure:

Sex, ‘X’. Sex is a binary measure, where 1 = male and 0 = female.

Subjective Social Class, ‘S’. This is people’s perception of their social and economic position in life, based on social stratification.

Class1 1 = Middle class, 0=other

Class2 1 = Upper class, 0=other

The reference group is ‘Lower Classes’

Religiosity, ‘R’. The frequency with which people attend religious services, which does not include attending functions such as (1) graduations, (2) weddings, (3) christenings, (4) funerals. This variable begins with 0 being the most attended, through to 7, being none at all.

Political Trust, ‘T_i’. This is people’s perception of their ‘trust’ in government. Thus, trust is a binary variable, where 1= ‘Can be trusted, and 0=Never be too Careful.

Subjective Psychological Wellbeing Index, ‘SPWB’. $SPWB = \sum Q_i / \sum f$; where Q_i is the selected value from each ladder of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Need, ‘f’ being the frequency of the event. The Cronbach $\alpha=0.762$ for the 5-item variables, which are used to constitute this Index.

Political Participation Index, ‘PPI’. Based on Trevor Munroe’s (2002) work, ‘political participation’ “...the extent to which citizens use their rights, such as the right to protest, the right of free speech, the right to vote, to influence or to get involved in political activity” (Munroe, 2002), We use the construct put forward by Munroe to formulate a $PPI = \sum b_i$, $b_i \geq 0$. The b_i represents each response to a question on political behaviour, such as voting, involvement in protests (Appendix I); and $0 \leq PPI \leq 19$ with the Cronbach α for the five-item scale being 0.76. The interpretation of the scores are as follows – (1) low is between 0 and 7, (2) moderate ranges from 8 to 13, and (3) high means a score from 14 to 19.

Confidence Index, ‘CFI’. The $CFI = \sum f_i \cdot c_i$, where f_i indicates the frequency of the occurrence of the event, and c_i denotes the event. F_i ranges from 1=no confidence, 2 = a little confidence, 3=some confidence, and 4=a lot of confidence. (Appendix II for extended listing of the ci). Confidence index = summation of 22 items, with each question being weighted equally; and $0 \leq \text{confidence index} \leq 88$, with a Cronbach α for the 22-item scale being 0.896. The higher the scores, the more people have confidence in socio-political institutions within the society. Thus, the confidence index is interpreted as: from 0 to 34 represents very little confidence; 35 to 61 is low confidence; 62 to 78 is moderate confidence and 79 to 88 is most confidence.

Educational Level, ‘E’.

Edu_level1 1= Primary/Preparatory, 0=Other

Edu_level2 1= All age, secondary and vocational skills, 0=other

Edu_level3 1= University, and professional training, 0=other

The reference group is ‘No formal’ education.

Perceived Corruption. Perception of corruption is a binary measure, which is represented by 1=yes or 0=no to the question “Have you or someone in your family known of an act of corruption in the last 12 months?” (Powell *et al.*, 2007).

Ethnicity, ‘E_i’.

Ethn1 1=Black, 0=Other

Ethn2 1=White, 0=Other

Ethn3 1=Brown, 0=Other

The reference group is Chinese, Indians, et cetera.

Justice, ‘J’. This variable is a non-metric variable, which speaks to people’s perception of the ‘fairness’ of the judiciary system (or ‘fairness, for that matter as it relates to the system favouring a few rich people in making a judicial decision). The construct will be dummy coded as 1=Yes, and 0=No.

Governance of the country, G, is defined as people's perception of administration of the society by the elected officials. This is a dummy variable, where 1 denotes in favour of a few powerful interest groups or the affluent, and 0 is otherwise

Area of Residence, 'AR'. This variable is the parish in which the individual lived while the study was being conducted.

AreaRes1 1= Kingston and St. Andrew, 0=Other
 AreaRes2 1=St. Catherine, 0=Other

Other denotes: Jamaica is classified into fourteen parishes, which include Kingston and St. Andrew. The others are – St. Thomas; Portland; St. Mary; St. Ann; Trelawny; St. James; Hanover; Westmoreland; St. Elizabeth; Manchester, Clarendon, and St. Catherine. Age, 'A'. This is a continuous variable, which is in years.

Model: The multivariate model used in this study captures a multi-dimensional concept of political trust as against the bivariate approach that has been used in the Caribbean.

$$T_G = f(W_i, CFI, E, R, J, S, A, O, PC, G, X, RA, PPI, T_i) \quad (1)$$

Where T_i is interpersonal trust of person i ; T_G is trust in government; R_i is religiosity of person i ; education of individual i , E_i ; RA_i denotes race of individual; PPI_i means political participation index of individual i ; S_i is sex of individual i ; S_i represents self-reported social class of individual i ; X_i indicates employment status of person i ; CFI_i is the confidence level of person i ; W_i is wellbeing of person i ; A_i - age of person i ; J_i this is justice of person i , area of residence, Z_i of person i ; O is occupation of person i ; PC is perceived corruption as indicated by the individual i , and G denotes the perception of governance of the country by elected officials.

Using the observational data, the final model (i.e. Eq. 2) is composed of only those variables that are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Hence, political trust in Jamaica is explained by the following variables:

$$T_G = f(CFI, G, X, PPI, J, T_i) \quad (2)$$

Having established that there are 6 factors that influence trust in government in Jamaica, based on cross-sectional surveyed data, we will now examine whether the aforementioned factors are explanatory ones or predictive ones of trust in government. Ergo, we will investigate this matter using a logarithmic function (Eq. 3). Using Eq. (2), we will use the formula $\lg[\pi_i/1-\pi_i]$.

$$\lg(\pi_i/1-\pi_i) = b_0 + b_1CFI + b_2G + b_3J + b_4X_i + b_5PPI + b_6T_i \quad (3)$$

Table 1: Demographic characteristic of sample, n = 1,338

Characteristics	Percentage (n)
Gender:	
Male	44.3 (574)
Female	55.7 (723)
Ethnicity:	
White	8.0 (106)
Black and Brown	90.0 (1,201)
Other	2.0 (26)
Subjective Social Class	
Lower	59.0 (766)
Middle	36.6 (476)
Upper	4.4 (57)
Respondents' Educational Level	
No Formal	1.5 (20)
Primary/Preparatory	3.1 (40)
Secondary	69.0 (892)
Tertiary	26.2 (339)
Age	35y ± 14 y, Range 69 y (85 – 16 y.)

where π_i is the probability of trust for model one; b_i parameters estimates of confidence in social and political institutions, governance, justice, political participation, interpersonal trust and sex of individual i , with b_0 being the constant.

$$\lg\{\pi_i/1-\pi_i\} = -4.263 + 1.198CFI - 1.074G - 0.818J + 0.578X_i + 0.120PPI + 0.977T_i \quad (4)$$

RESULTS

Of the 1,338 respondents interviewed for the study, 55.7% are females ($n = 723$) compared to 44.3% males ($n=574$), with a response rate of 96.7% (Table 1). The average age of the sample is 35 years ± 14 years. Substantially more of the sample classify themselves as being a part of the lower social class (59.0%, $n = 766$), 36.6% are of the middle class ($n = 476$) compared to 4.4% who are in the upper class ($n = 57$). The findings reveal that most of the respondents have attained secondary level education (69.0%, $n = 892$), 26.2% ($n = 339$) have acquired post-secondary training, 3.1% ($n = 40$) primary or preparatory level education compared to 1.5% who have no formal education whatsoever. Based on Table 1, Trelawny is the parish with the least number of interviewees, 3.8% ($n=50$), with the other area of residence showing a similar percentage of respondents. Another demographic variable of importance to this research is ethnicity/race, in that 90.0% of the interviewed are Blacks and Browns, with 8.0% being Whites (or Caucasians) compared to 2.0% being others such as Chinese, Indians, and Other races (Table 1).

Of a sampled population of 1,338 respondents, approximately 63% (62.7%, $n = 795$) report that they do not trust other people compared to 37% ($n = 472$). The sample had marginally more females (55.7%, $n = 723$) than males (44.3%, $n = 574$). Continuing, most of the respondents are Blacks, including those who classify themselves as Brown (90.0%, $n = 1,201$), with 8.0%

(n = 106) Caucasians, and 20% (n = 26) of other ethnicities. Furthermore, 59% of the respondents report that they are within the lower class, approximately 37% (36.6%, n = 476) middle class compared to 4.4% (n = 57) who say upper class. Another demographic characteristic was the educational level of the respondents: 1.5% (n = 20) report 'no formal' education, 3.1% (n = 40) say primary/preparatory education, 69% (n = 892) remark secondary/high and 26.2% (n = 339) indicate post-secondary level education (Table 1).

A finding of utmost importance is the 'subjective psychological wellbeing' (i.e. SPWB) of the respondents, the average for the SPWB index is 6.9 out of 10, with the mode being 7.8. This finding reveals that on an average the self-reported psychological wellbeing of Jamaicans is high. However, confidence in institutions in Jamaica, based on the sampled responses, is very low, i.e. 2.6 out of 22 (Table 2).

Of the sampled respondents, the majority of Jamaicans reported that in their opinion the administration of justice in the country is for a few power interest groups (i.e. favours a few affluent people within the society) – that is 74.1% (Table 2). This means that 7 out of every 10 Jamaicans perceived that the administration of justice favours the bourgeois class and not the masses. Similarly, 7 out of 10 Jamaicans reported that the governance of the country favours a few powerful interest groups or people (i.e. 72.6%). When we cross-tabulated the governance of the country by the administration of justice, we found that a weak statistical association exists between the two aforementioned variables – $\chi^2(1) = 167.26, p = 0.001$. The findings (Table 2) revealed that 82.4% of Jamaicans believe that when the administration of justice favours the rich, the country is governed in the interest of a few powerful people – the rich (Table 2). However, 55.3% of those who reported that the administration of justice favours all indicated that the country was governed for all. We are pointing out here that although statistically there is a weak relationship between the two aforementioned variables, for one factor out of a plethora of social conditions to be explaining 34% of an association between two conditions, that variable (the perception of the administration of justice) is a significant contributor to the perception of the governance of the country. When the phenomenon of governance of the country by the administration of justice was examined with regard to the total sampled population, we found that 61.4% (n = 751) reported that the governance of Jamaica for a few powerful interests is reflected in the administration of justice favouring that group.

The researchers, being a social demographer and a sociologist, are cognizant of the fact that the perception of the sexes is sometimes different, and so we disaggregated the findings in Table 3 by males and females to ascertain any differences in opinion between them. We found that

Table 2: Socio-political characteristics of sample, n = 1,338

Characteristics	Percentage (n)	
Political Participation Index mean ±SD	4.0 ± 3.7	
Subjective Psychological Wellbeing Index mean ±SD	6.9 ± 1.7	
Confidence Index mean ±SD	2.6 ± 0.5	
Employment status		
Employed	55.1 (732)	
Unemployed	25.9 (345)	
Self-employed	19.0 (252)	
Interpersonal trust: An Individual's Trust in Others		
Yes	37.3 (472)	
No	62.7 (795)	
Administration of Justice in Jamaica		
Favours a few	74.1 (929)	
For all	25.9 (324)	
Trust in Government		
Yes	8.0 (99)	
No	92.0 (1134)	
Governance of Jamaica		
Favours a few powerful interests	72.6 (921)	
For all	27.4 (348)	

Table 3: Perception of Governance of the country by Administration of Justice, n = 1,224

	Administration of Justice	
	Favours rich	Favours all
A few	82.4	44.7
Governance:		
All	17.6	55.3
Total	99	270

$\chi^2(1) = 167.26, p = 0.001, \phi = 0.34$

there is a statistical difference between the perceptions of males and those of their female counterparts. The findings revealed that 86.5% of the males believe that when the administration of justice favours the affluent, the governance of the country is in the interest of those few powerful groups or people, compared to 79% of the females. Concomitantly, we found that the views of males constitute a stronger explanation for the aforementioned issues (42.5%) compared to those of females (32.2%), as shown in Table 3.

Concurrently, this was the opposite for interpersonal trust. The findings revealed that most Jamaicans do not trust other persons (i.e. 37.3% of them trust each other – meaning that approximately 4 out of every 10 Jamaicans trust other persons). The issue was even more alarming when we investigated people's perception of 'trust in government', as only 8% of Jamaicans trust the government. This means that only 8 out of every 100 Jamaicans trust the government, which in comparison to interpersonal trust denotes that Jamaicans trust the government 5 times less than how they trust other persons (Table 4).

On investigating whether a relation exists between governance of the country in favour of the rich, and perceived corruption, 92.5% of the total population was used for this cross tabulation. We found a statistical association between the two aforementioned variables -

Table 4: Perception of Governance of the country by Administration of Justice, controlled for sex n = 1,224

	Male ¹		Female ²	
	Administration of Justice			
	Favours rich	Favours all	Favours rich	Favours all
Governance:				
A Few	86.5	44.0	79.0	45.8
All	13.5	56.0	21.0	54.2
Total	407	125	480	179

1: $\chi^2(1) = 96.031, p = 0.001, \phi$ (i.e. phi) = 0.425, with n= 532

2: $\chi^2(1) = 68.161, p = 0.001, \phi$ (i.e. phi) = 0.322, with n= 659

Table 5: Governance by Perception of Corruption, n = 1,238

	Perceived corruption	
	No	Yes
Governance:		
No	29.8	20.0
Yes	70.2	80.0
Total	968	270

$\chi^2(1) = 10.042, p = 0.001 < 0.05, \phi = 0.09$

Table 6: Trust in government by Perception of Corruption, n = 1,198

	Perceived corruption	
	No	Yes
Trust in gov't:		
No	92.1	90.6
Yes	7.9	9.4
Total	933	265

$\chi^2(1) = 0.615, p = 0.433$

$\chi^2(1) = 10.042, p = 0.001$, with the relation being a weak one - single correlation = 9%. Of those who indicated that they believe that corruption is a part of the society, 80% of them reported that the governance of the society favours the rich and all Jamaicans equally. On the other hand, of those who believed that corruption does not exist, 70.2% of them indicated that governance favours the rich. It follows from this finding that there is a positive statistical association between perceived corruption and the governance of the nation (Table 5).

Of the total population (N=1,338), 89.5% was used for the cross tabulation between trust in government and perception of corruption in the country. We found no statistical relation between the two aforementioned variables - $\chi^2(1) = 0.615, p = 0.433$. Approximately 9% of those who reported a belief that corruption exists in Jamaica indicated that they trusted the government. On the other hand, 8% of those who reported that no corruption exists in Jamaica revealed that they trust the government. There is no difference between the 8% and the 9%, which means that whether people believed that corruption exists, they still trusted the government (Table 6).

Further examination of those who responded to the question of perceived corruption and trust in government revealed that 2.1% of the entire sample indicated that corruption exists in Jamaica and that they trust the government. 20% of the sampled respondents reported

corruption existing in Jamaica and not trusting the government. On the other hand, 72% of respondents reported that they do not trust the government and that corruption does not exist in Jamaica.

Multivariate analysis: Table 7 presents information on variables, which are significantly (or not) associated with political trust in Jamaica. Five variables emerged as statistically significant correlates of political trust – confidence in socio-political institutions; perception of justice in the society; governance of the nation; sex; political participation and interpersonal trust.

Logistic regression was conducted on the full sample, which consisted of all the respondents who answered the questions (i.e. completed data). Of the sampled population (n=1,338), 64.1% was used for the logistic regression model on trust in government. The observational data were used to test the general hypothesis (Eq. 1), and we found that of the 14 predisposed variables that were identified by the literature, only 6 were statistically significant as influencers of trust in government (Table 7). Before we commence a discussion on the model, we need to address the question of ‘What are the goodness of fits and the adequacy of the model’ (Table 8).

Testing for Goodness of Fit and the Adequacy of the Model: Before we are able to report on the findings of the multivariate model, we will evaluate whether or not the model fits the observational data. The ‘Classification Table’ was used to compare the predicted to the observed outcomes. The Table reveals that seventy respondents were incorrectly classified: 61 of these who reported trust in government, and 9 who did not. Overall, 91.9% of the 857 respondents were correctly classified: 12.9% of those with ‘trust government’ and 99.0% of those who placed no trust in the Jamaican government. (Table 8)

Having established the explanatory variables from the general hypothesis in Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) explains 0.273 or 27.3 percent (Nagelkerke R square is 0.273) of the variation in trust of the Jamaican government, based on confidence in socio-political institutions, governance of the country, sex of respondents, political participation, administration of justice and interpersonal trust - with the

Table 7: Logistic regression: Modelling Political Trust in Jamaica, n = 857

Variable:	Coefficient	Std. Error	Wald statistic	Odds ratio	95% C.I.	
					Lower	Upper
Wellbeing	-0.063	0.078	0.658	0.94	0.81	1.09
Confidence	1.198	0.322	13.863	3.31***	1.76	6.22
Secondary	-1.020	1.017	1.005	0.36	0.05	2.65
Post secondary	-1.248	1.063	1.377	0.29	0.04	2.31
Tertiary	-2.122	1.094	3.764	0.12	0.01	1.02
†Primary and below				1.00		
Religiosity	0.091	0.068	1.772	1.10	0.96	1.25
Justice	-0.818	0.313	6.822	0.44**	0.24	0.82
Class1	0.210	0.313	0.450	1.23	0.67	2.28
Class2	0.434	0.607	0.512	1.54	0.47	5.08
†Lower class				1.00		
Age	-0.013	0.012	1.254	0.99	0.96	1.01
Occupation	-0.295	0.385	0.588	0.75	0.35	1.58
Perceived corruption	0.482	0.350	1.898	1.62	0.82	3.21
Governance	-1.074	0.3141	1.706	0.34***	0.19	0.63
Sex	0.578	0.288	4.021	1.78*	1.01	3.13
Area of residence	0.618	0.337	3.358	1.86	0.96	3.59
Political participation	0.120	0.0371	0.412	1.13***	1.05	1.21
Interpersonal Trust	0.977	0.2901	1.363	2.66***	1.51	4.69

*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001

Table 8: 'The Classification Table of Trust in Government'

Observed	Predicted			Percentage correct
	0.00	1.00		
Trust In govt	0.00	779	8	99.0
	1.00	61	9	12.9
Overall Percentage				91.9

Table 9: Testing the predictive power of the Model

Parameters	Model		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
-4.263	-4.263	-4.263	-4.263
1.198'CFI ¹	73.078	93.444	105.424
-1.074'G	-1.074	-1.074	-1.074
0.578'Xi	0.578	0.578	0.578
0.120'PPF ²	0.84	1.56	2.28
-0.818'J	-0.818	-0.818	-0.818
0.077'Ti	0.077	0.077	0.077
Log {pi/1-pi} =	z = 68.418	89.504	102.204
pi/1-pi = e ^z	5.17'1029	7.43'1038	2.44'10 ⁴⁴
pi = e ^z / [1 + e ^z]	1	1	1

¹Low confidence in socio-political institution lies between a score of 0 and 61, and for this we will use the upper limit in Model 1; moderate ranges from 62 to 78, but we use the upper limit of 78, and high is between 79 and 88 and again we will use the upper limit (i.e. 88).

²Low political participation ranges from a score of 0 to 7, and for this we will use the upper limit in Model 1; moderate ranges from 8 to 13, so we will use the upper limit of 13, and high is between 14 and 19 and again we will use the upper limit (i.e. 19).

-2 Log likelihood being 377.05, with the overall model having a Wald statistic = 376.38, p = 0.001.

Of the 6 explanatory variables that explain trust in government in Jamaica – Eq. (2) - confidence in socio-political institutions contributes the most to the explanation of the power of trust in government, followed by governance of the country interpersonal trust, then political participation, with the others in descending order being justice and last, sex. Concurrently, we found a positive association between the following variables (i.e.

confidence in socio-political institutions; sex, political participation, and interpersonal trust), with justice and governance showing negative association with trust in government. Embedded in these findings are the interpretations of those directions. As the positive for sex denotes that males are more trusting in government than their female counterparts – the degree of this trust is approximately twice (OR = 1.782). Continuing, when people are confident in socio-political institutions, they are approximately 3 times (OR = 3.312) more likely to trust the government. When people participate in both conventional and unconventional political activities, they are 1.1 times (OR = 1.128) more likely to trust the government, whereas when people trust each other, they are approximately 3 times (OR = 2.656) more likely to trust in the government. On the other hand, we found an inverse association between justice and trusting in government, and governance of the country and trust in government. This means that if people were to perceive that governance of the country is favouring a few power interest groups or people, they would trust the government 0.342 times less than if they were to believe that the society is governed for all (Table 7). Similarly this was found to be the case when the perceived administration of justice favours the rich - people will trust the government 0.441 times less.

In the researchers' examination of Eq. (4), we will establish the models, with model 1 being low in confidence and political participation; model 2 – moderate confidence in socio-political institutions and political participation, and model 3 – high in confidence in socio-political institutions and political participation. In all 3 models, the individual used is a male, the person trusts other people, the individual perceives that the administration of justice favours the rich, and the perception is governance favouring only a few powerful interest groups (or people).

The values obtained for pi (Table 9) are a clear indication that the factors are predictive ones for trust in government. A probability of 1 (or 100%) speaks to the certainty that confidence in socio-political institutions (CFI), governance of the country (G), administration of justice (J), sex of respondents (X), political participation (PPI), and interpersonal trust (T) are all explanatory variables of trust in government. It should be noted that although those explanatory variables only explain 27% of the variance in trust in government, the model that we have built here does not claim to provide a complete explanation of why Jamaicans do not trust the government, because we were limited by the dataset (i.e. the observational data collected on various political issues) and so we did not explore many of those conditions that explain trust in government.

DISCUSSION

There is no doubt that corruption in many developing countries has been increasing, and especially in Jamaica (Transparency International, 1999-2007). Within the context of high extortion, crime and victimization, and the arrest of some public officials for corruption during the last year, corruption in Jamaica is undoubtedly a reality and not a perception. The literature has shown that trust in government and its related institutions has been low, and that this is equally so in high trust societies like the United States. Generalized trust in government in Jamaica is extremely low (i.e. 8 out of 100 people), and this should come as no surprise, as the crime rates continue to increase as well as corruption (Transparency International, 1999-2006). Notwithstanding the high level of corruption, crime and victimization in developing countries, the literature reveals that trust in government in the United States up to 2001 was 2 out of 10 Americans, and that this is coming from 7 out of 10 in the late 1950s to early 1960s (Nye, 1997). Outside of the geographic space of America, for example Italy and Germany, to name a few nations, trust in government is also low. And the trust in federal (national) government is even lower than that for local government across all the societies.

The literature has already established that there is a reciprocated relation between corruption and trust, and so within this context Jamaica is expected to be a low trusting society. The low trusting society that Jamaica is began from as early as its slavery past, as the plantation society was built on distrust between the plantocracy and the slave class (Beckford, 1999), and further complicated by distrust being encouraged between slaves, as this was the approach used by the slave owner to monitor his slaves.

Although slavery was officially abolished in 1838 (August 1) and the nation achieved its independence in August 1962, successive governments in Jamaica have not sought to establish themselves based on credulity,

good intent, consistent results from a good track record, character, practicing accountability, creating transparency, using justice, equality, equity, and fair play in its operations, and avoiding the manipulation and distortion of facts for personal gain. Hence, public trust continues to be low and the citizenry of the nation cannot believe in their 'good' intent and motive because government's past performance has left a 'bad' track record that the people have come not to trust. We have empirical information that has revealed the level of distrust in national and local governments as well as some of its related institutions (such as the police, customs, political parties, courts and parliament, to name those organizations with which the public has the least trust – Powell *et al.*, 2007) as being very high. But, what are the factors that determine trust in government?

The literature that informs this study shows that corruption, civic engagement (i.e. political participation), the justice system, religious involvement, and confidence in social institutions (i.e. schools) are predictors of trust in government. This study concurs with most of the factors identified by the literature – political participation, the justice system and confidence in social institutions – as having an influence on trust in government. In addition to the aforementioned variable, we also expanded the literature by this research as we found that governance, interpersonal trust and gender of respondents are also predictors of trust in government. Although it is well established that corruption is reciprocated with trust in government, this variable was not a predictor (or factor) of trust in government for Jamaicans.

In this study we refined previous work by examining the impact of the predictor variables on trust in government. We found that political participation increases trust in government by 1.1 times, interpersonal trust by some 2.7 times, and confidence in social institutions by 3.3 times. The justice system and the governance of the nation were reducing the perceived trust in government – by 0.4 times and 0.3 times respectively. The findings revealed that governance of the society is a more significant variable than the justice system. Hence, the actions (or inactions) of government and its related institutions do more damage to trust in government than the judiciary system. An additional factor that this study adds is sex. Males are approximately twice more trusting of government in Jamaica compared to their female counterparts. Of the factors identified in this study as predictors of trust in government, the most influential is confidence in socio-political institutions, followed by governance, interpersonal trust, political participation (i.e. civic engagement), the justice system, and lastly by the sex of the respondents.

In this study not only did we expand on the number of variables that can be used to predict trust as well as refining the effect of each variable, but we also had an

explanatory power that was more than twice that of many studies identified that have examined trust in government. The R-square (Nagelkerke R-square) for this research was 27.3%, compared to those found in the literature. Furthermore, not only are the variables significant, but they are also predictors of trust in government.

In summary, governments in Jamaica have been suffering from a deficit in trust, just like the nation's budget. And any building of trust in government must first begin by accepting the factors that affect trust and secondly by being aware that their actions (or inactions) coupled with those of their related institutions affect public confidence, cooperation from the citizenry and civic engagement. The building of trust goes beyond increasing political participation, to include the paying of taxes, cooperation with state agencies (for example customs, police, judiciary), the fostering of credibility and 'good' intent and motives, inspiring trust in life, providing a collective vision that is sellable, lowering bureaucracy, reducing the transactional cost of doing business, and providing a society where people have trust in the other person's motives and intent. It follows that in order for the society to address the scourge of crime, we need to look at the tenets of trust as well as to address issues of inequality, dishonesty, inconsistent results, character, low transparency, the lack of accountability and 'taking of people for granted' in decision making. Trust is crucial to peace, stability, and development in any society; and so, democracy relies on this phenomenon. Hence, trust is a primate factor in cooperation, confidence and stability, without which crime, corruption, dishonesty and anarchy are the resulting by-products. Even though perceived corruption does not affect trust in government, it should be noted here that cooperation with government and its related institutions is not expected to be high, as perceived corruption affects the perception that governance in the country favours the rich. This explains the low

willingness of people to cooperate with the paying of taxes, voting, and other civic engagements, as trustworthiness is one of the pillars upon which democracy rests, and the different typologies of civic engagement are based on trust, which explains the stability of a nation's democracy.

Limitation of the study: This study was a cross-sectional one. And so, the model that we have developed herein provides us with information for a snapshot in time. Trust is continuous. Hence, the data from 2006 from a static study, although it provides a basis from which we can understand the phenomenon, is already outdated. Ergo it is not measuring the variability in trust. Within the context of increasing corruption and crime, the confession from a state officer that he had fabricated results in order for the court to convict an individual of wrongdoing needs a study pre-and-post the fact. In addition to the issues raised earlier, the research did not examine some of the variables that the literature identified as being significant predictors of trust in government. Nor did we consume a measure for corruption, as the one that was used herein is the people's perception of corruption in the society. Although perception of corruption may be a proxy for corruption, it is not the same.

RECOMMENDATION

Within the limitations of this study, the researcher recommends that a longitudinal study be conducted with the same set of variables, as well as those identified in the literature but which were not used in this paper. Secondly, corruption should be calculated using Transparency International's Corruption Index approach, as this is the benchmark which is used to evaluate corruption in the world.

Appendix I

The researcher used all the questions listed below to proximately a measure for political participation in Jamaica. These were taken from questions that relate to both conventional and unconventional political participation. Thus, political participation index is the summation of the 19-questions with which respondents were asked to indicate a choice. Each of the questions had two options, (1) yes and (2) no.

- Did you vote in the last general elections?
- Have you ever joined a political party?
- Worked for a party or a candidate in an election?
- Attended a political meeting or an election rally?
- Attempted to persuade other to vote?
- Written a letter to a newspaper on a political issue?
- Phoned in to contribute your comments to a radio or television talk show, on political issues?
- Contributed your comments to an internet "blog: on a political issue?"
- Personally sent a letter or message of protest, or support, to a political leader?
- Contacted a local governmental official or politician, to seek help with a personal problem you or your family had?
- Contacted a central governmental official or politician, on some general community problem?
- Contacted a central governmental official or politician, to seek help with a personal problem you or your family had?
- Contacted a local governmental official or politician, to seek help on some general community problem?
- Signed a petition?
- Blocked traffic in protest?
- Participated in an organized 'strike'?
- Participated in an organized 'boycott'?
- Participated in a peaceful march or public demonstration?
- Were you enumerated to vote when the last national elections were held for Parliament back in December 2002?

Appendix II

Confidence in sociopolitical institutions

I am going to read to you a list of major groups and institutions in our society. For each, tell me how much CONFIDENCE you have in that group or institution. For each, do you have?

- NO CONFIDENCE
- A LITTLE CONFIDENCE
- SOME CONFIDENCE
- A LOT OF CONFIDENCE

-
- Q121. "Police"
 - Q122. "Would you say you have a lot, some a little or no confidence in "trade union"
 - Q123.in "political in parties"...
 - Q124.in "churches"
 - Q125."Large companies corporation"
 - Q126.
 - Q127.school"
 - Q128."Families"
 - Q129."Universities"
 - Q130."Private sector"
 - Q131."Bank"
 - Q132."Prime minister"
 - Q133."Judiciary Courts"
 - Q134."Armed forces"
 - Q135."Parliament"
 - Q136."Governor General"
 - Q137."Local government council"
 - Q138."News paper"
 - Q139"television"
 - Q140.radio"
 - Q141.the people national party - PNP"
 - Q142."The Jamaica labour party - JLP"
-

REFERENCES

- Almond, G.A. and S. Verba, 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Baier, A., 1986. Trust and antitrust. *Ethics*, 96: 231-260.
- Beckford, G., 1999. *Persistent poverty. Underdevelopment in Plantation Economies of the Third World*, 2nd Edn., Kingston: The University of the West Indies Press.
- Berman, E.M., 1997. Dealing with cynical citizens. *Public Admin. Rev.*, 57: 105-112.
- Boxill, I., B. Lewis, R. Russell, A. Bailey, L. Waller, C. James, P. Martin and L. Gibbs, 2007. *Political culture of democracy in Jamaica: 2006*. United States: The United States Agency for International Development.
- Bourne, P.A., 2008. *Public Confidence in Organization: Using Sample Survey Research for July-August, 2006*. (MS Submitted).
- Covey, S.M.R. and R.R. Merrill, 2006. *The Speed of Trust. The One Thing That Changes Everything*. New York: Free Press. pp: 5, 29, 34,
- Edward, D., 2000. *Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and a Proposal for a National Index*. American Psychological Association, 55: 34-43. http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/conferences/socialcapital/Happiness%20Readings/Diener_2000.pdf (Accessed: April 6, 2006).
- Edward, D., 1984. Subjective wellbeing. *Psychol. Bull.*, 95(3): 542-575.
- Easterlin, R.A., 2003. *Building a Better Theory of Well-Being*. Prepared for Presentation at the Conference "Paradoxes of Happiness in Economics", University of Milano-Bicocca, March 21-23, 2003. <http://www-rcf.usc.edu/~easterl/papers/BetterTheory.pdf> (Accessed: August 26, 2006).
- Easterlin, R.A., 2001. Income and happiness: Towards a unified theory. *Econ. J.*, 111: 465-484. <http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/specialarticle/s/ecej644.pdf> (Accessed on: August 26, 2006).
- Espinal, R. and J. Hartlyn, 2006. Performance still matters explaining trust in government in the dominican republic. *March, Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 39(2): 20-23.
- Fukuyama, F., 1995. *Trust. The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press. pp: 26.
- GALLUP, 2008. *Trust in government*. Retrieved on: May 21, 2008, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/5392/Trust-Government.aspx>.
- Garske, J.P., 1976. Personality and generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. *Psychol. Rep.*, 39(2): 649-650.
- Gurtman, M. and C. Lion, 1982. Interpersonal trust and perceptual vigilance for trustworthiness descriptions. *J. Res. Pers.*, 16(1): 108-117.
- Hardin, T., 1993. The street-level epistemology of trust. *Polit. Soc.*, 21: 505-529.
- Hazan, P., 2006. *Morocco: Betting on a Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, United States Institute of Peace Paper. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace. July, pp: 1-16.

- Hibbing, J.R. and E. Theiss-Moore, 2002. What is it about Government That Americans dislike? Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, R., 1997. Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- James, H.S.Jr. and M.E. Sykuta, 2004. Generalized and particularized trust in organization. Symposium Conducted at the Meeting of the International Society for New Institutional Economics meetings in Tucson, Arizona, USA.
- Jones, J.M., 2007. Low trust in Federal Government rivals Watergate era levels. Gallup. Retrieved on May 21, 2008 from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/28795/Low-Trust-Federal-Government-Rivals-Watergate-Era-Levels.aspx>.
- Jones, K., 1996. Trust as an affective attitude. *Ethics*, 107(1): 4-25.
- Kramer, R.M., 1999. Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 50: 569-598.
- La Porte, T.R. and D.S. Metlay, 1996. Hazard and institutional trustworthiness: Facing a deficit of trust. *Public Admin. Rev.*, 56: 341- 347.
- Levi, M. and L. Stoker, 2000. Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 3: 475-507.
- Lipset, S.M. and W. Schneider, 1987. *The Confidence Gap: Business, Labor, and Government in the Public Mind*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Klingemann, H., 1999. Mapping support in the 1990's: A Global Analysis. In: Norris, P. (Ed.), *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp: 40-44.
- Miller, A.H. and O. Listhaug, 1990. Political parties and confidence in Government: A comparison of Norway, Sweden and the United States. *Br. J. Polit. Sci.*, 20(3): 357-386.
- Munroe, T., 2002. *An Introduction to Politics. Lectures for First-Year Students, 3rd Edn.*, Kingston: Canoe.
- Munroe, T., 1999. *Renewing democracy into the Millennium. The Jamaican Experience in Perspective*. Kingston: The University of the West Indies Press.
- Newton, K. and P. Norris, 2000. Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture, or Performance? In: Pharr, S.J. and R.D. Putnam (Eds.), *Disaffected Democracies: What's troubling the Trilateral Democracies?* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, pp: 52-73.
- Niemi, R. and J. Junn, 1998. *Civic education: What Makes Students Learn?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- NPR, 2000, The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, John F. Kennedy School of Government. *Americans Distrust Government, But Want it to do More*. Retrieved on May 21, 2008 from <http://www.npr.org/programs/specials/poll/govt/summary.html>.
- Nye, J., 1997. Introduction: The Decline of Confidence in Government. In: Nye, J., S. Joseph, P.D. Zelikow and D.C. King (Eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Patterson, O., 1999. Liberty Against the Democratic State: on the Historical and Contemporary Sources of American Distrust. In: Warren, M.E. (Ed.), *Democracy and Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp: 151-207.
- Powell, L., Bourne, P. and L. Waller, 2007. Probing Jamaica's political culture. Main Trends in the July-August 2006 Leadership and Governance Survey. Kingston: Centre of Leadership and Governance, the University of the West Indies at Mona. 1: 26-27, 126.
- Rahn, W. and T. Rudolph, 2002. A multilevel model of trust in local government. Paper Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Rotter, J.B., 1967. A new scale of measurement of interpersonal trust. *J. Pers.*, 35: 651-665.
- Rotter, J.B., 1980. Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *Am. Psychol.*, 35(1): 1-7.
- Schlenker, B.R., B. Helm and J.T. Tedeschi, 1973. The effects of personality and situational variables on behavioral trust. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 25(3): 419-427.
- Stone, C., 1974. *Electoral Behaviour and Public Opinion in Jamaica*. University of the West Indies, Kingston: ISER.
- Stutzer, A. and B.S. Frey, 2003. Reported Subjective Well-Being: A Challenge for Economic Theory and Economic Policy. <http://www.crema-research.ch/papers/2003-07.pdf> (Accessed: August 31, 2006).
- Transparency International, 1990-2007. *Transparency International Annual Report*. Berlin: Transparency International.
- Torney-Purta, J., Richardson, W. Klandl and C.H. Barber, 2004. Trust in government-related institutions and civic engagement among adolescents: Analysis of Five Countries from the IEA civic education study, Circle Working Paper 17. August, The Centre of Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. ERIC: ED484045.
- Uslaner, E.M., 2005. *Trust and Corruption*. Global Corruption Report, 2005 Transparency International. London: Transparency International. pp: 262
- Uslaner, E.M., 2002. *The moral foundations of trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- United Nations, 2007. Building Trust through Civic Engagement. New York, <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN/UNPAN028357.pdf>
- Waller, L., P. Bourne, I. Minto and J. Rapley, 2007. A Landscape Assessment of Corruption in Jamaica. Kingston: Capri, pp: 14-15.
- Webster's, 1913. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: Merriam Company.
- Wheless, L.R. and J. Grotz, 1997. The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. *Hum. Commun. Res.*, 3(3): 250-257.
- Yamagishi, T., M. Kikuchi and M. Kosugi, 1999. Trust, gullibility, and social intelligence. *Asian J. Soc. Psychol.*, 2(2): 145-161.