MEASURING THE LEVEL OF TRUST, LEGITIMACY AND CIVIL AWARENESS AMONG TURKISH CITIZENS WITH AN EMPHASIS ON LEGAL PROCEDURES

MENSURAR O NÍVEL DE CONFIANÇA, LEGITIMIDADE E CONSCIÊNCIA CIVIL ENTRE OS CIDADÃOS TURCOS COM ÊNFASE NOS PROCEDIMENTOS LEGAIS*

Erhan Örselli
Assoc. Prof. Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Konya, Turkey
eorselli@erbakan.edu.tr

Yasin Taşpınar
Assoc. Prof. Selçuk University, Beyşehir Ali Akkanat Faculty of Management, Department of Management Information Systems, Konya, Turkey
yasintaspinar@selcuk.edu.tr

Erdal Bayrakcı
Assoc. Prof. Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Konya, Turkey
ebayrakci@erbakan.edu.tr

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to Measuring the level of trust, legitimacy and civil awareness among Turkish citizens with an emphasis on legal procedures. The study is quantitative field research, and the data has been collected through a survey method. Results show that, it has been revealed that there is a significant relationship between the demographical characteristics, perspectives on life, future expectations, religiosity level, political view, the social trust level of the individuals, and their level of trust in the institutions. According to the findings derived, it has been seen that the institutional and social trust levels of the citizens in Turkey are quite low. The most trusted institutions are "Army-Armed Forces and Presidency".

Keywords: Trust. Civil Awareness. Legitimacy. Legal.

Resumo: O objetivo deste estudo foi medir o nível de confiança, legitimidade e consciência civil entre os cidadãos turcos, com ênfase nos procedimentos legais. O estudo é uma pesquisa de campo quantitativa e os dados foram coletados através de um método de pesquisa. Os resultados mostram que, foi revelado que existe uma relação significativa entre as características demográficas, perspectivas de vida, expectativas futuras, nível de religiosidade, visão política, nível de confiança social dos indivíduos, e seu nível de confiança nas instituições. De acordo com os resultados obtidos, constatou-se que os níveis de confiança institucional e social dos cidadãos na Turquia são bastante baixos. As instituições de maior confiança são "Forças Armadas e Presidência".

Palavras-chave: Confiança. Conscientização Civil. Legitimidade. Legitimidade.

---

1.   INTRODUCTİON

Trust is a phenomenon that regulates human life and reduces and manages the tension of daily life. As a necessity of being human, we need to trust other people, systems, or institutions in our lives. Hence, we want to believe that others will reasonably keep their promises and act according to the rules. Thus, we can't continue our lives without trust. That is because a situation dominated by distrust will make life unbearable and will negatively affect human life. However, it should not be forgotten that every trust relationship includes a certain level of distrust. Therefore, rapid change may easily occur, and an atmosphere of distrust may be created instead of trust.

In addition to examining trust as "a cognitive guess, a feeling or a psychological attitude,"; it has not been possible to explain the concept in all its dimensions, despite many studies existing in the literature. That is due to the multidimensional concept of trust and each discipline trying to explain it from its perspective. In addition to this confusion in defining the concept, the difficulty in measuring trust or distrust is another issue to be addressed. That is a result of trust being an abstract concept, and it is not easy to measure. However, it can be mentioned that there are many studies in which personal trust, social trust, and institutional trust are measured and analyzed in the literature.

It is very important to deal with and examine trust in the state and institutions from the perspective of citizens to determine the level of citizens' trust; in the context of revealing the state's legitimacy, which is expressed as belief in the rightfulness of the state and the reason for its existence, and of examining the elements that damage or consolidate the foundations of that legitimacy. The decreasing trust negatively affects the perception of the state's legitimacy and its institutions. In modern states, questioned legitimacy is not a long-term sustainable situation. In this respect, not only is a lack of trust an undesirable situation, but building trust in the state and institutions is not an easy matter. Additionally, building trust in the state -in other words, ensuring citizens' trust, examining the causes of unreliability, and taking necessary precautions- is necessary for being a modern state. For a long time around the world in general and Turkey specifically, observations show that trust in the state and its institutions has declined. Although this situation is not unique to underdeveloped or developing countries, the erosion of trust negatively affects the legitimacy of the state and its institutions.

In this context: the main objective of the study was determined as replying the question of 'What is the level of citizens' trust in the state and its institutions in Turkey?' based on the issues of 'What does the declining trust herald?' and 'Why is it necessary to build trust in the

state?'. Another study examines how individuals' demographic characteristics, perspectives on life, future expectations, and political views affect institutional trust. In addition, measuring the social trust level of the Turkish people is another focused aim of the study. That is because there is a positive relationship between the level of social trust and trust in institutions, and also institutional trust promotes and reinforces social trust. In this context, first, the conceptual analysis of trust was made; then the phenomenon of state and trust in the state-citizen relationship were evaluated; and the importance of the trustworthiness of the state has been scrutinized under four headings: "in terms of (1) democratic values, (1) legitimacy, (1) order and functioning, (1) stability and continuity", in the theoretical part of the study. In the fieldwork section of the study, the findings and comments of the quantitative field research conducted to measure the trust in the state and its institutions are included. The trust scores of the institutions were determined through the eyes of the citizens by using the survey technique in the field research. The field study was carried out between the dates of 21.10.2020 and 15.11.2020. Within the scope of the sample, the data were obtained through face-to-face interviews with 2128 participants in 26 provinces, 66 districts, and 334 neighborhoods. The study contains important findings on the social trust level in Turkey and the citizens' level of trust in the state and institutions. In the light of the findings obtained, it has been concluded that the trust level of the Turkish people in the state and institutions is low.

2.   LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Trust: Definition and Analysis

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there is no agreed definition regarding the concept of trust. Trust is a complex concept that combines many different ingredients. Trust has different definitions emphasizing many aspects from psychological attitude to cognitive prediction; or vulnerability to cooperation (Mühl, 2014). On the other hand, taking trust from various points of view and emphasizing different aspects does not make it any less important. For example, trust can be defined as, between citizens (horizontal) or towards the state (vertical); based on a low level of knowledge (thin) or due to familiarity (thick); interpersonal or systemic, group-specific (customized) or social (generalized) (Maloy, 2009). These approaches should be viewed as making trust more measurable rather than ambiguous.

When the definitions related to trust are examined, it is seen that some definitions focus on the characteristics of the trusting party while some of them deal with that of the trusted party. One of the most important characteristics of the trusted party in the trust relationship is

competence. In other words, since the trusted party is competent/expert, it is trusted. Moreover, the complexity of today's world brings such needs to the fore even more (Solomon & Flores, 2001). And yet, ways to obtain information about the other party will be sought to minimize the risk caused by the unknown competence of the other party. Applying governance systems and structures seems the smartest method to overcome such a time-consuming and costly economic activity. The certificates of competence given to the deserving persons by various intermediary institutions and even the competencies of the said intermediary institutions -public institutions, government, universities, institutional intermediaries, etc.- become the trust commitments of today's world.

Maintaining mutual interactions makes it possible to see trust as; remaining faithful, keeping the promises given, and relying or depending on. In this type of relationship, X believes that the weakness they entrusted to them will not be exploited for their benefit by Y. Of course, different forms of the concept's definition rise on different foundations. However, the common point of many definitions that see the trust relationship as an exchange is "*not to exploit the entrusted weakness*" and the long-term reputation obtained by giving up short-term interests. Additionally, losing that reputation happens much faster than gaining it. Thinking that trust is under guarantee and risking it is one of the biggest mistakes that can be made. It is very difficult to replace the trust, which can be lost so easily. Moreover, in an environment of chaos created by mutual distrust, destruction may occur as everyone runs after self-interests and self-rescue (Töremen & Ersözlü, 2010).

2.2.   The Phenomenon of State and Trust in State-Citizen Relationship

State, which Aristotle based on the conditions of a good purpose, people who come together for it, and a partnership among them; had existed since the periods when people started to live in a permanent settlement. The state is based on the human beings' assumption of the externality of the dispossessing authority over society. Thus, the powerful power above all people, inaccessible to all but, makes all the rest equal. Since everyone will be subjected to the same justice or injustice in this situation of equality, the transcendent authority will preserve its legitimacy (Gauchet, 2013). Consenting to the power of a transcendent authority that treats everyone the same way allows people to be subject to it without fear of each other's abuse. In other words, the state's asymmetric position in terms of people and the identical one at the point of interpersonal comparison is free from the interpersonal risks of trust.

There are reasonable objections that the search for concrete yet transcendent structure spontaneously creates the state. For example, according to Baradat (2012), the state is a planned

and rational human invention. The "Social Contract" idea refers to a conscious decision. Rousseau (1997) emphasizes that power alone cannot sustain the state and put forward that the state owes its existence to consent. The consent mentioned depends on the use of the collective will entrusted to the state in equal and fair practices against everyone. Otherwise, a situation that makes the erroneous judgments made by the humans considering their interests in the state of nature preferable; will arise. So, just like the contracts people make to get their work done, the state, which is a party to a social contract, is expected to fulfill its commitments and not disappoint trust. As Bodin stated, it has to properly manage families and their common things (Ağaoğulları, 2009).

Therefore, the state, which Weber (2004) defines as a "monopoly of the legitimate use of violence on a certain land", owes the continuity of its power and its legitimacy to common consent. Another reason for renouncing the right to use individual violence in favor of the state against the abuse of self-interest is the belief in potential human selfishness. According to this point of view, the state undertakes the duty of protecting selfish individuals against the damages they may inflict on each other. In this context, while the state is a structure that needs trust, on the one hand, it also acts as the guarantor of trust relationships on the other.

One of the questions that can be asked at this point may be how the modern state can function as a trusted bearer in all types of communities. Indeed, trust and familiarity seem to complement each other in most cases. Many societies place the family as the basis of their social relations and attach importance to an acquaintance in relationships of trust. In these societies, trust is associated with an acquaintance, insecurity is associated with unfamiliarity, and it becomes difficult to develop a relationship of trust without establishing a connection through past experiences or acquaintances. The way the institutional structure of the modern state copes with such situations is through the artificial communities and intermediary partnerships that Fukuyama praises for highly trusting, prosperous societies (Solomon & Flores, 2001). Thus, the institutional artificial communities and intermediary partnerships of the modern state, which replace the connections established through family ties and acquaintance, serve the state's role in establishing trust.

How will citizens' trust in executive power affect the government's attitudes? In other words, how will the behaviors of a government that thinks it has gained the trust of its citizens and a government that has concerns at that point differ? Although the retrospective motivation of trust relationships has been covered in the psychology literature, some forward-looking behavioural patterns may also develop when the issue is trust. In this context, it is quite reasonable to expect that the government's positive expectation on this issue encourages

behaviors in favor of citizens. Its negative expectation causes the interests of groups close to the government to be protected. A government worrying about the consequences of the next election might be likely to focus on retaliation or short-term interests rather than investing in trust, which is difficult to gain in a short time. Moreover, the source of such an orientation may be the existence of enclosed groups based on trust (Woolcock & Narayan, 2010). In this case, the only power in the hands of distrusting citizens, who are outside such a circle of that kind, will be the law to protect social interests.

An assessment of citizens' trust in the state has to be generalized rather than private interpersonal trust, which is relatively narrow-scoped. Every positive experience generated by the trust relationships gained in small groups will promote and expand the generalized trust. This expanded understanding will also influence citizens' trust in the state. This trust will become resistant due to the experiences gained from the same field. In the context of trust, what citizens will need the state to promote them will be to prepare the environment in which private trust will develop and increase positive experiences in which their generalized trust will gain resistance. Trust in state-citizen relations developing in such an environment will serve results that will satisfy both sides.

2.3. Trustworthiness of The State and Its Importance

Rather than seeing the state as a divine power that emerges spontaneously and handles the administration of the society with its own will, the idea of a social contract, which claims that the will and consent of individuals reveal it, seems to complete the deficiency in this matter. The idea of transferring some of the rights, freedoms, and powers at the basis of the idea of the social contract makes the state the trusted party in the trust relationship. The security of the investments made by citizens to improve their well-being depends on the state's not violating this trust-based contract. The contracts put forward by thinkers like Hobbes and Locke contain this expectation of order and protection (Hardin, 1999).

When considered within this framework, it is also possible to evaluate trust in the state in intra-organizational trust. Because individuals, who are in a relationship with the state, are, on the one hand, opposite to it, on the other hand, they are a part of its transcendent existence. Therefore, forming a trusting relationship between the state and the citizens is also subject to some organizational requirements. First, the pure pragmatist perspective should be abandoned for both sides. The second important point is to exhibit positive contribution indicators towards continuing the mutual relationship and avoid negative attitudes. Third, institutional policies that will foster trust should be put in place. Ultimately, in addition to all these, the predisposition

acquired by the trusting party from other narrow-scale trust relationships and the perception of the corporate culture of the broad-based organization are also important (Trcek, 2018).

Hence, the consolidation of trust in the state; depends on the mutual abandonment of self-seeking behaviour by the state and citizens. Both parties make the other party feel the desire to contribute to this relationship, institutionalize trust-building policies, and support an atmosphere of trust. The benefits of their behaviour and the risks of opposite trends; can be discussed under "democratic values, legitimacy, order, and functioning, stability, and continuity".

2.3.1. In Terms of Democratic Values

When democracy is seen as an order that depends on the existence of people willing to leave their fate in the hands of society (Wuthnow, 2002), the importance of trust becomes even more evident. Elements such as participation, communication, and interaction, which have become a necessity of modern democracy, need an atmosphere of trust. Individuals' positive expectations for each other's decisions and actions that are the concrete reflection of those decisions will encourage virtuous behaviour for living and sharing by facilitating the respect for decisions and actions together. In this way, people whose positive expectations from life have increased and who can look to the future with confidence will be able to perform social and economic activities, which are the most basic elements of their daily lives.

Those who live in democratic systems will trust the state and democratic values to the extent that they make the most of this order. However, if the situation is disadvantaged for the members of the society, the level of trust also changes, and even distrust begins to prevail. This situation often becomes apparent when the opinions of disadvantaged individuals become trivial as themselves and their expectations. In other words, being unable to see that these rational preferences of disadvantaged segments of society in the direction of distrust are based on a certain level of wisdom and that their ideas about the solution of their problems are valuable refers to another problem in the relationship of trust. Therefore, there is a "mutual" problem of trust between the state and those who distrust it due to their disadvantages, and it is necessary to increase the trust of the state in the citizens to increase the trust the citizens in the state as well (Yang, 2005).

2.3.2. In terms of Legitimacy

While social capital will contribute positively to the functioning of the state, participation, and trust will also create a high level of social capital (Eşki Uğuz, 2010). Trust relations that make up social capital are shaped according to certain cooperation norms. Positive externalities

obtained from the circle of people where these collaborations are carried out determine the magnitude of the trusted coverage. The trust coverage produced by the collaborations that produce more positive externality will be wider than the group itself. The trust scope of the collaborations with less positive externalities will be narrower (Fukuyama, 2010). When the relations between the state and citizens are evaluated within this framework; It is possible to argue that as the activities in the interests of citizens increase, the scope of trust in the context of citizens and, therefore, the legitimacy of the state in a democratic society, will get wider (Perruci & Perruci, 2009). However, these positive externalities need to occur within predetermined rules. The extent to which these rules called law are effective and shared determines the difference between the "*state of law*" and the "*rule of law*". While concepts such as obedience and prohibition are at the forefront in the state of law, where force is used more, the concepts of freedom, responsibility, and equality make the rule of law clear based on legitimacy and consent.

2.3.3. In terms of Order and Functioning

It is possible to define trust as a socio-cognitive action based on the following three basic components (Castelfranchi & Rino, 2010): (i) A mental attitude that includes guessing and evaluation towards the other party (trusted), (ii) An intention to rely on that puts the trusting party in a vulnerable position, (iii) a deliberate act of faith and a declared and practical relationship between the parties. The situation where the trusting party realizes this prediction, intention, and action, indicates that they are in an expectation. This expectation is a predictable and positive environment when it is to the state. As long as the expectations of the individuals in this direction are met, they will not hesitate to contribute to this system. Trust is needed even in the simplest issues of the daily routine.

Public policies are the concrete reflection of order and functioning. In addition, although they are seen as a monopoly of the state in the classical understanding based on top-down functioning; they are based on citizen participation as a result of democratization and governance (Friedman, 2006) and are affected by the complex relationship of national and international level (Kennett, 2008). In addition, on some issues such as environment and economy, it is becoming an area where governments often remain intermediaries between external orientations and national initiatives (Hveem & Nordhaug, 2002). Nevertheless, political participation, social relations, and trust networks of participants are getting more important for public policies. At this point, the combination of these three elements is particularly important in terms of not creating an obstacle to democratization (Tilly, 2011). Therefore, in a democratic system based on participation, trust networks must ensure participation by producing social relations that

positively contribute to order and functioning. Narrow-scoped trust groups that feed on individual mutual expectations, sacrifices, and risk-taking tendencies of individuals should serve the common interests of the society. Otherwise, this tangle of tight relationships has the potential to become a focus that fosters self-interest, free-riding, corruption (Fukuyama, 2010), and even social hostility.

2.3.4. In terms of Stability and Persistence

It is now very difficult to use familiarity, which is an important part of building trust, in today's risk society in a functional way (Eşki Uğuz, 2010). In the complexity of modern relationships, individuals will often want to feel that the concrete structures behind the system have the required level of expertise, competence, and determination, even though they do not directly interact with them. Trust in this direction ensures the continuity of the system because there is a mutual link between trust and social order. Institutional-systemic trust, built on shared rules, laws, and traditional practices and automatically relies on them, also provides the spontaneous and informal social order functionality. In other words, the thought that the uncertainties in daily life will produce results compatible with the normal perception also feeds the perception of stability. Thus, the belief that others will comply with shared rules, laws, and traditional standards, prevents individuals from actions involving vigilance or avoidance when they face acute irregularities. While members of the society postpone such reactive behaviors, they become committed to the order by interpreting the new situations that arise within a framework that is prone to normalization (Castelfranchi & Rino, 2010).

The continuation of democracy is closely related to the consolidation of social capital and the establishment of social networks used effectively. Trust networks are one of the most important tools for popularizing trust on the social ground. These interpersonal connections, which are strong ties that can resist human abuse, mistakes, and failures, and are worth risking various resources and initiatives, are also key to the democratization of regimes. However, the integration of trust networks with the regime is essential for stability and continuity because mutually binding consultations and positive consent of the members will support the system. The opposite situation - the separation of trust networks from the regime- will constitute an obstacle to democratization and members' commitment to democratic collective initiatives (Tilly, 2011). In this respect, keeping trust networks in the system and ensuring their compatibility is essential for the continuity and stability of a democratic system.

2. METHODOLOGY

Although the trust in the state and institutions has a graphic of ups and downs, it is well known that there has been a downward trend in the level of trust in the state during the last years (Akgün, 2001). The decrease in trust brings along some problems; it adversely affects the state-citizen relationship, causes corruption, threatens social peace, and causes the legitimacy of the state and the reason for its existence, to be discussed. The state's future is closely related to citizens' belief in the state's legitimacy. Legitimacy is the citizens' belief in the righteousness of the state. Legitimacy perception is directly proportional to the trust towards the state and institutions. In this respect, building trust in the state is important in terms of the legitimacy of the state and the establishment and implementation of public policies.

When the studies about trust in the state and institutions in the literature are examined, it is seen that the focus is on the importance of trust, how it can be measured and which factors affect it. This study aims to measure the citizens' trust in the state and institutions in Turkey and determine which factors affect institutional trust.

In line with the purpose of the study, a quantitative field study was planned, and the survey technique was used to measure institutional trust; the cross-sectional survey method was preferred as the model. A pilot study was carried out between 16.09.2020 and 18.09.2020 to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. When the reliability rate of the scale was determined to be at the desired level, the implementation phase of the questionnaires was started. The survey study was carried out from 21.10.2020 to 15.11.2020 within the scope of the determined sample.

In order to measure the accuracy of the data, it was checked by phone whether the questionnaire was conducted with the participants, in each settlement where the interviews were made; and whether the desired form and order of questions were followed. When the field study was completed, it was determined that 2344 questionnaires were completed; however, 180 of these surveys were canceled after phone controls, and 36 were canceled due to errors in GPS coordinates or for various reasons.

The data obtained were loaded into SPSS 22.0 program and then analyzed. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was determined to be 0.91. This result shows that the answers given to the questions are highly consistent.

The universe of the study was identified as Turkey. In the sample selection, provinces were taken as a basis. The survey's provinces were determined according to the "Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics" (NUTS). The field study was conducted in 26 provinces, 66 districts, and 334 neighborhoods by face-to-face interviewing 2128 participants.

Table 1. Distribution of the sample

Region No	Regions	Provinces	N	Total	%
1	İstanbul	İstanbul	439	439	20,6
2	West Marmara	Tekirdağ	50	100	4,7
		Balıkesir	50		
3	Aegean	İzmir	120	284	13,3
		Aydın	83		
		Manisa	81		
4	East Marmara	Bursa	103	198	9,3
		Kocaeli	95		
5	West Anatolia	Ankara	167	232	10,9
		Konya	65		
6	Mediterranean	Antalya	78	258	12,1
		Adana	104		
		Hatay	76		
7	Middle Anatolia	Kırıkkale	40	102	4,8
		Kayseri	62		
		Kastamonu	22		
8	West Black Sea	Zonguldak	28	123	5,8
		Samsun	73		
9	East Black Sea	Trabzon	70	70	3,3
TRA	Northeast Anatolia	Erzurum	27	55	2,6
		Ağrı	28		
TRB	Middle east Anatolia	Van	44	89	4,2
		Malatya	45		
TRC	Southeast Anatolia	Mardin	45	178	8,4
		Şanlıurfa	73		
		Gaziantep	60		
Total		26	2128	2128	100,0

The neighborhoods with the highest population density were selected as samples, and the streets, households, or workplaces to be surveyed in these neighborhoods were determined using a random method. Gender and age quotas were applied while determining the sample.

4.   RESULTS

4.1.   Demographic Characteristics

The demographical characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic information of the sample

	Replies	N	%
Gender	Female	1058	49,7
	Male	1070	50,3
Age	18-24	348	16,4
	25-34	513	24,1

	35-44	443	20,8
	45-54	362	17,0
	55 and older	462	21,7
	Literate (without diploma)	52	2,4
	Primary School	541	25,4
Education	Secondary School	504	23,7
	High School	619	29,1
	University	375	17,6
	Postgraduate	37	1,7
	Worker	436	20,5
	Housewife	398	18,7
	Private sector employee	260	12,2
	Tradesman	257	12,1
	Retired	231	10,9
Job	Unemployed/Looking for a job	169	7,9
	Public official	149	6,9
	Student	146	6,9
	Self-employed	68	3,2
	Trader/businessman/industrialist	8	0,4
	Farmer	6	0,3
	0-2000 TL	753	35,4
Income	2001-4000 TL	583	27,4
	4001-6000 TL	589	27,7
	6001 TL and higher	203	9,5
Total		2128	100

When the demographic characteristics of the participants are analyzed, the sample is observed to have a balanced distribution in terms of gender, age, education, income, and occupational status. It reflects the universe of Turkey with a very small margin.

Table 3. Political position, religiosity level, life satisfaction and future expectations of the sample

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	$\bar{X}$	SS
Position on the Ideological Spectrum*	2128	0	10	5,20	2,45
Religiosity Level**	2046	1	5	2,88	1,28
Satisfaction with Life**	2105	1	5	2,73	1,27
Future Expectation**	2106	1	5	2,74	1,23

Note: (i) *0 means Left, and 10 means Right on the scale. (ii) **The replies were organised from positive to negative in the Scale.

When the findings are examined, it can be stated that although the participants seem to have positioned themselves on the left and right on the ideological spectrum almost at the same rate, the rate of those who position themselves on the right is slightly higher. The participants portrayed a religious image according to their level of religiosity (44.4% defined themselves as religious, 32.1% stated that they were not religious); The percentage of those who are satisfied

with their lives (49.2% are satisfied with their lives) and those who have positive future expectations (48.7% are hopeful for the future) is almost half.

4.2. Level of Social Trust in Turkey

In the literature, it has been stated that social trust is affected by several factors, such as the perception of corruption, the rule of law, and income inequality. Trust in institutions has a positive effect on social trust. The need for the state to solve problems that may arise among the society and between individuals encourages social trust. In the case of high social trust, there is no need for individuals to protect themselves or be careful in their relationships with the people they do not know (Aytaç, et al, 2017). When the earlier studies are examined, the level of public trust in Turkey is considerably low due to Turkish society being closed and the trust being associated with familiarity and unfamiliarity. Indeed, most people in Turkey believe that one should be careful about other people. As a result, citizens mostly limit their social relations to family, friends, relatives, etc. (Cenker Özek, 2019).

In this direction, to determine the general trust levels of the participants, being inspired by the World Values Survey, a question was asked: "When you think about your relationships with other people, can you tell whether you trust them or not?"

Table 4. Interpersonal trust in Turkey

Replies	N	%
Yes, I do.	427	20,1
No, I don't trust, I think that I must be careful	1696	79,7
No Reply	5	0,2
Total	2128	100,0

Findings show that 79.7% of the participants do not trust other people. The rate of those who stated that they trust others is 20.1%. World Values Survey's the most recently published survey covering the years 2010-2014, the percentage of the Turkish people stating to have trust in others is 11.6%. In other countries, those who reply to this question as "Yes, I trust" are higher (http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org). According to the World Values Survey, Turkey is, unfortunately, one of the world countries where social trust is at the lowest levels. That means that individuals in Turkey do not trust the people except their families, relatives, and acquaintances.

In the study of Eşki Uğuz et al (2011), which covered Turkey as the research universe, the proportion of the people indicating that they could trust other people was determined to be 14.7%. Also, in the study conducted in Turkey universe by Örselli (2016), the percentage of Turkish people trusting in others was 16.2%. Similarly, the rate in the study by Aytaç et al (2017),

was 9.7%. Although the results obtained are slightly higher than the findings of other studies on the same issue in Turkey, such as Esmer (2012) states, these results show Turkey to be among the countries with low levels of social trust.

Table 5. Trust in family members and relatives

Replies	N	%
Trust so much	514	24,2
Trust	807	37,9
Neither trust, nor distrust	400	18,8
Do not trust	254	11,9
Completely distrust	131	6,2
No idea	22	1,0
Total	2128	100,0
$\bar{X}$ / SS	2,37	1,16

In addition to the question aimed at measuring the level of social trust, the participants were asked a question such as "How much do you trust your family members/relatives?" According to the answers, the trust level of the participants in their family members and relatives was found to be 62.1%. Characteristic of traditional societies such as Turkey, next to giving importance to family members and close relatives relationship there is also the strong ties between them. Indeed, these results are the most important factors affecting public confidence in Turkey, being acquainted with the family and kinship ties shows the situation (Eşki Uğuz, et. al., 2011; Örselli, 2016). In societies that place the family at the basis of social relations and place importance on an acquaintance in relationships of trust, trust is associated with "being acquainted" and insecurity is associated with "not being acquainted". In other words, a relationship of trust does not develop without a connection through past experiences or acquaintances.

Table 6. Feeling oneself safe secure

Variables	Highly Secure	Secure	Neither Secure, Nor Insecure	Insecure	Highly Insecure	$\bar{X}$	SS
Security Level of the Environment	104 (%4,9)	601 (%28,2)	558 (%26,2)	526 (%24,7)	307 (%14,4)	3,16	1,14
Security Felt, When Outside Alone at Night	96 (%4,5)	552 (%25,9)	589 (%27,7)	542 (%25,5)	295 (%13,9)	3,19	1,12
Satisfaction with the Public Security	236 (%11,1)	666 (%31,3)	441 (%20,7)	418 (%19,6)	321 (%15,1)	2,96	1,26

The participants were asked to reply to a series of questions for determining whether they felt safe/secure. The first of them was, "How far do you think your environment is safe from crime and violence?" 33.1 percent of the participants were seen to qualify their environment secure, while 39.1 of them evaluated their environment as insecure. In other words,

the rate of those who find their environment safe is lower. It is impossible to explain this result by linking it to a single factor, and other studies should be done on its causes.

Another question related to feeling safe is "Do you feel safe when you go out alone at night?". 30.4% of the sample stated that they feel safe outside/on the street at night, while 39.4% of them stated that they do not feel safe. A question was posed, "How safe do you feel yourself in terms of the state protecting you, your family, and your assets?" to measure the satisfaction with public security. When the findings were examined, 42.4% of the participants were satisfied with public security, and 34.7% of them stated that they were not satisfied at that point.

4.3. The Level of Institutional Trust in Turkey

Measuring citizens' institutional trust is more complex and difficult than measuring their social trust. Because this kind of trust is affected by several factors such as the belief in the legitimacy of the state, the performance of institutions, experiences and the level of personal satisfaction with the institutions and the services provided, the intensity of the needs for institutions, the relationships of the citizens with the institutions, the perception of the society on corruption, life satisfaction, future expectations and demographic characteristics of individuals (Adaman & Çarkoğlu, 2000). In addition, stereotypes formed in the minds of citizens with the effect of their highly variable attitudes and perceptions about the institutions (Christensen & Lægreid, 2002) also make it difficult to measure trust.

The participants were asked to reply to the question, "How much do you trust the institutions?" to determine the level of institutional trust.

Table 7. Institutional trust in Turkey

Institutions	Average	SS
Army/Armed Forces	6,13	2,49
Presidency	5,09	2,21
Cops	4,92	2,6
Courts	4,89	2,4
Hospitals	4,86	2,5
Religious Affairs Directorate	4,69	2,8
Customs	4,53	2,4
NGOs	4,24	2,5
TBMM (National Parliament)	4,24	2,3
Land Registry Offices	4,23	2,7
Educational Institutions	4,12	2,6
Tax Offices	4,11	2,5
Province/District Governorship	4,08	2,3
ÖSYM (Student Selection and Placement Centre)	4,01	2,8
Universities	3,93	2,6

Mayors	3,92	2,4
Political Parties	3,82	2,5
Televisions	3,08	2,7
Newspapers	2,91	3,0

Note: In the scale 0 means 'distrust' and 10 means 'trust'.

According to the findings, the most trusted institution in Turkey is the army/armed forces. In many studies conducted over the years (Adaman & Çarkoğlu, 2000; Gökçe, 2007), the army has ranked first as the most trusted institution. It can be stated that some socio-cultural and even strategic factors play an important role in the armed forces being the most trusted institution. First, the superior value given to Mehmetçik and military service in Turkish social and cultural structure; second, the military is seen as an important factor in defending the country against external threats; thirdly, the superiority of the army arising from religious values (prophet's home, martyrdom, homeland defense, etc.); the fourth factor, the army is seen as the guarantee of the country and is not easily censurable, strengthens the trust in the army (Can, 2015). In addition, the fact that the army has completed its institutionalization ensures its being in the first place in the trust ranking. The level of trust in institutions is also affected by cyclical events. In addition to these factors, it is possible to say that the cross-border operations carried out in Syrian territory on the dates of the fieldwork are a factor that positively increases/reinforces the trust of the Turkish people towards the Turkish Armed Forces.

The second most reliable institution in the institutional trust ranking is the Presidency. In the studies dealing with trust in Turkey, if not, the first Presidency takes the second or third place. As mentioned, the level of trust in the Presidency is affected by conjunctural events. As is known, a process of transition to the Presidential Government System was experienced in 2018. The relatively lower score, when compared with the previous years' institutional trust studies, may depend on some related factors. For instance; in the new system, the absence of the responsible wing of the executive, such as the prime ministry and the council of ministers, in the parliamentary system, and the fact that the president takes all responsibility as the main actor of the executive, the polarization of the society during the transition process to the presidential government system and the criticisms against the new government system. However, the impact of the change in the government system on the trust ranking needs to be examined separately.

Other institutions with low scores in the trust ranking were unfortunately included in the unreliable institutions' classification. It is quite a thought-provoking situation that many institutions that were trusted by society in previous years were now described as 'untrustworthy' or less trustable.

In addition to determining the level of institutional trust in the study, an answer was sought to the question of which characteristics of the individuals to which it was affected. There are some findings in the studies in the literature that there is a significant relationship between institutional trust and the demographic characteristics of individuals.

First of all, in the analysis (t-test) to what extent the institutional trust is affected by the gender of the sample, it was determined that there is a significant relationship between institutional trust and gender (p <0.05). According to this relationship, men trust institutions more than women. This is because men are more visible and active in public life than women, resulting in closer relationships with institutions; on the other hand, women may have a more skeptical approach to institutions (Akgün, 2001). In addition, the level of institutional trust varies according to the income level of the sample. As the income level increased, the level of institutional trust got higher (p <0.05; ANOVA test). In other words, individuals with lower income levels trust institutions less than individuals with higher income levels. It can be argued that the concern of more wealthy individuals in terms of income level to maintain their current position and status quo prompts them to trust the current order more. Additionally, it was concluded that age and educational level did not affect institutional trust. These study results are in parallel with the research results of Aytaç et al. (2017).

In addition to the demographic characteristics of the participants, analyses were also made on whether the institutional trust was affected by their perspective on life, their hope for the future, their political views, and their level of religiosity.

Table 8. Factors affecting institutional trust

Institutions	Life Satisfaction	Future Expectation	Political Viewa	Religiosity Level
Presidency	,045*	,104**	,396**	,229**
TBMM (National Parliament)	,042	,070**	,275**	,129**
Army/Armed Forces	,017	,067**	,277**	,066**
Political Parties	,076**	,059**	,179**	,112**
Cops	,104**	,050*	,264**	,108**
Courts	,115**	,060**	,261**	,113**
Educational Institutions	,087**	,072**	,210**	,115**
Province/District Governorship	,111**	,068**	,214**	,083**
Mayors	,046*	0,024	,156**	,097**
Hospitals	0,040	,065**	,268**	,097**
Newspapers	,045*	,019	,105**	,072**
Televisions	,080**	,025	,113**	,067**
NGOs	,077**	,025	,101**	,064**
Tax Offices	,064**	,073**	,166**	,103**
Land Registry Offices	,081**	,074**	,160**	,104**

Customs	,094**	,090**	,116**	,087**
Religious Affairs Office	,021	,030	,232**	,117**
Universities	,031	,044*	,204**	,065**
ÖSYM (Student Selection and Placement Centre)	,043*	,074**	,170**	,023

Note: (i) *p<0,05; **p<0,01 (ii) Higher rates indicate that political view is more dominant. (iii) Pearson correlation coefficient.

According to the findings, it has been determined that there are "low and medium level" positive relations between life satisfaction, future expectation, level of religiosity, and institutional trust. In this context, as the participants' life satisfaction, future expectations/hopes, and religiousness levels increase, their trust in institutions also increases. In addition, it has been determined that when the right-wing political view is more dominant, trust in institutions increases. It is normal for those satisfied with their lives and hopes for their future to have high trust. Individuals who approach life positively are more likely to approach it positively when evaluating institutions. However, no definite results indicate that a high level of religiousness always leads to a higher level of trust (Ertan et al., 2019).

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Researchers working on the issue of trust have demonstrated with their studies that trust erosion has been experienced in the world for a long time; this is also the case for Turkey. Both the results of the long-standing studies such as the worldwide conducted World Values Survey and that of the studies conducted in Turkey universe indicate that the social and institutional trust of the Turkish people is at very low levels. Although the Turkish people exhibit a fluctuating sense of trust by being affected by cyclical events, it turns out that they are at the level of distrust when an assessment is made at the point of trust assessment. The results of this study indicate that the Turkish people's social trust level is at a low level. In countries where trust is generally low such as Turkey, levels of social trust are associated with 'acquaintance'. In other words, familiar ones are found to be trustworthy, and unfamiliar ones are untrustworthy. According to the study results, the Turkish people do not feel a sense of trust without establishing a connection through past experiences or familiar ones. In terms of feeling secure, the answer sought in the study in connection with the sense of social security, the Turkish people do not find their surroundings very secure and do not feel safe when they go out alone. However, they are moderately satisfied with the protection of the state, which can be called public security.

Feeling secure in the social sense is directly related to the legitimacy perception and capacity of the state. Because only states; which make their citizens feel that they are with them when they face an unfavorable situation formulate and implement the necessary public policies for this, protect the rights and obligations of the citizens, and at the same time protect the life and property security of their citizens; can establish trust. States can establish trust only if the state itself is found reliable' by its citizens (Eşki Uğuz et al., 2011). In this context, the findings derived from the questions related to the feeling of security, neither members of the sample group seem to feel safe, nor the level of social trust in Turkey is high.

Declining trust is not desirable at all for modern states. That is because; if the trust in the state falls below a certain level, it may cause a political system crisis, as well as the erosion of the belief in the necessity of the state in establishing contracts, preparing and implementing public policies, and in its justification, thus questioning its legitimacy. In addition, distrust in the state encourages individuals to settle their business by introducing familiar, intermediary, or illegal groups instead of seeking their rights through law when a negative situation occurs. This situation is not something any modern state that adopts the rule of law can accept. Because such a situation endangers the state's existence in the eyes of the citizen, the world becomes only the world of the powerful.

Establishing institutional trust, namely building trust in the state, is a very difficult process, and losing trust can occur quickly. This difficulty in providing sustainable trust is actually because the trust relationship always includes the feeling of distrust at a certain amount. This study shows that the sense of distrust outweighs the trust-distrust assessment of the Turkish people. In addition, it was also found that institutional confidence is facing serious erosion in Turkey. The Turkish people consider the army/armed forces and the Presidency the two most trustworthy institutions, as they have been for years. Apart from these two institutions, it is clear that the trust scores of all other institutions are not at the desired level, and they are considered untrustworthy by society.

It has been found that the men in Turkey trust institutions at a higher level when compared to women. Men may be more active in public life than women can increase their trust. In a sense, this situation can be associated with the familiarity that determines the trust relations of the Turkish people. Another demographic factor affecting institutional trust is the income levels of individuals. It has been determined that the higher income levels cause the higher levels of institutional trust. In addition, it was observed that the individuals; who have a positive view of life and are hopeful for the future position themselves politically on the right and have a high level of religiousness and high levels of institutional trust.

Politically and administratively, a crisis of trust is not a situation that states can endure for a long time. When citizens' trust is lost, it does not seem likely that things will go smoothly. The study results related to institutional trust in Turkey indicate that Turkish society's institutional trust level is considerably low. There are certainly many reasons for this erosion of trust.

The important point is that all the factors that cause distrust should be determined, and the necessary measures should be taken and put into effect as soon as possible. The way to build trust in the state and institutions goes through the state's establishing the trust climate and seeking to gain the trust of its citizens. It should not be forgotten that to increase the citizens' trust in the state, the state's trust in the citizens should also be increased.

In building trust in the state, improving the performance of public institutions, establishing ethical understanding in public, preventing unethical behaviour, increasing accountability and transparency, establishing the rule of law, increasing the importance given to democratic values, establishing justice, and spreading the beliefs of citizens that justice is manifested will affect the feeling of trust in a positive direction. In addition, it should not be known that the only way to survive in the geography we live in is through trusting each other and the state more.

REFERENCES

Adaman, F., & Çarkoğlu, A. (2000). *Devlet reformu: Türkiye'de yerel ve merkezi yönetimlerde hizmetlerden tatmin, patronaj İlişkileri ve reform*. TESEV.

Ağaoğulları, M. A. (2009). Jean Bodin: Egemen devletin belirmesi. In M. A. Ağaoğulları & L. Köker (Eds.), *Kral Devlet ya da Ölümlü Tanrı* (pp. 9-64). İmge.

Akgün, B. (2001). Political trust in Turkey: Causes and consequences. *Ankara University SBF Journal*, *56*(4), 1–23. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/36232

Aytaç, E., Çarkoğlu, A., & Ertan, G. (2017). Interpersonal social trust in Turkey and its individual-level determinants. *METU Studies in Development*, *44*, 1–25. https://open.metu.edu.tr/handle/11511/58170

Baradat, L. P. (2012). *Siyasal İdeolojiler kökenleri ve etkileri*, Trans. Abdurrahman Aydın. Siyasal.

Can, İ. (2015). *Türkiye'de siyasal güven: Liderler, kurumlar, Süreçler*. Açılım.

Castelfranchi, C., & Rino, F. (2010). *Trust theory*. John Wiley & Sons.

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2002). *Trust in government-the relative importance of service satisfaction, political factors and demography*. Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies Bergen University Research Foundation.

Ertan, G., Aytaç, S. E., Çarkoğlu, A. (2019). Trust in political institutions in turkey: cultural and institutional explanations and the "home team" effect. *Hacettepe University, Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 37*(1), 65–88 https://doi.org/10.17065/huniibf.363402.

Eşki Uğuz, H. (2010). *Kişisel ve kurumsal Gelişmeye farklı bir Yaklaşım: Sosyal sermaye*. Orion Book Company.

Eşki Uğuz, Örselli, E., Sipahi, E. B. (2011). Measurement of social capital: Turkey experience. *Journal of Academic Inquiries*, *6*(1), 8-40 https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/akademikincelemeler/issue/1549/19026

Esmer, Y. (2012). *Türkiye Değerler Atlası*. http://www.bahcesehir.edu.tr

Friedman, B. L. (2006). Policy analysis as organizational analysis. In R. E. Goodin, M. Moran & M. Rein (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public policy* (pp. 482-496). Oxford University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2010). Sosyal sermaye ve sivil toplum. In M. M. Şahin & A. Z. Ünal (Eds.), *Sosyal sermaye: Kuram-Uygulama-Eleştiri* (pp. 143-170). Değişim.

Gauchet, M. (2013). Anlam borcu ve devletin kökenleri: Ilkelerde din ve siyaset. In C. Bali Akal (Ed.), *Devlet kuramı*. Dost.

Gökçe, G. (2007). *Güçlü ve zayıf devlet Tartışmaları Bağlamında Türkiye*. Çizgi.

Hardin, R. (1999). Do we want to trust in government? In M. E. Warren (Ed.), *Democracy and Trust* (pp. 22-41). Cambridge University.

Hveem, H., & Nordhaug, K. (2002). Summary and conclusions: Adjusting trade liberalization and environmental protection demands in an era of globalization. In H. Hveem & K. Nordhaug (Eds.), *Public policy in the age of globalization: Responses to environmental and economic crises* (pp. 198-225). Palgrave.

Kennett, P. (2008). Introduction: Governance, the state and public policy in a global age. In P. Kennett (Ed.), *Governance, globalization and public policy*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Maloy, J. S. (2009). Two concepts of trust. *Journal of Politics*, *71*(2), 492–505. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381609090410

Mühl, J. K. (2014). *Organizational trust: Measurement, impact and the role of management accountants*. Springer.

Perruci, R., & Perruci, C. (2009). *America at risk: The crisis of hope, trust and caring*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

Rousseau, J. J. (1997). *Toplum anlaşması*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (Trans.). V. Günyol.

Solomon, R. C., & Flores, F. (2001). *İş dünyasında, politikada, ilişkilerde ve yaşamda güven yaratmak*. MESS.

Tilly, C. (2011). *Demokrasi*, Trans. Ebru Arıcan. Phoenix.

Töremen, F., & Ersözlü, A. (2010). *Eğitim Örgütlerinde sosyal sermaye ve yönetimi*. İdeal Kültür.

Trcek, D. (2018). *Trust and reputation management systems: An e-business perspective.* Springer.

Weber, M. (2004). Sosyoloji Yazıları, Trans. Taha Parla. *İletişim.*

Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2010). Sosyal sermaye: Kalkınma teorisi, araştırması ve politikası için öneriler. In M. M. Şahin & A. Z. Ünal (Eds.), *Sosyal sermaye: Kuram-Uygulama-Eleştiri* (pp. 265-306). Değişim.

World Values Survey. (n.d.). http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org

Wuthnow, R. (2002). Bridging the privileged and the marginalized? In R. D. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 59-102). Oxford University Press.

Yang, K. (2005). Public administrators' trust in citizens: A missing link in citizen involvement efforts. *Public Administration Review*, *65*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00453.x