

Public Officials' Trust in Other Agencies and Citizens: The Role of Communication in Local Government in South Korea*

Jungho Park**·Seyeong Cha***·Tobin Im****

As the concept of trust becomes a full-fledged theme in various social sciences, confusion regarding its definitions, dimensions, and usages has also surged. Despite the increasing attention paid to the importance of trust in public organizations for effective public-service delivery in the context of complex interplay of multiple agencies, relatively little attention has been paid to the conceptual components and antecedents of trust at the level of the public official. Bearing this point in mind, this research begins from a question about how public officials' interactions with citizens and other agencies affect the level of trust at the individual level. Specifically, this research primarily aims to examine the effects of public officials' communication with various types of actors and organizations on trust. For this purpose, this study employs ordinary least squares and random effect models in order to control unobserved effects resulting from the characteristics of 213 different offices at the local government level. The analysis indicates that the more opportunities that public officials have to communicate with citizens and other agencies, the more they are able to build trust. Specifically, enhanced communication, both between the various layers of government agencies, and between government and citizens tends to play a positive role in building trust among parties. The findings therefore have practical implications for the building of constructive interactions between central and local government and between local governments. Moreover, public officials' interactions with citizens, as an antecedent of trust, can affect public officials' general attitudes toward citizen participation in various areas of public administration based on mutual trust.

Kwy Words: Inter-organizational trust, Public officials' trust, Communication, Local government

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2011-330-B00195).

* 제1저자, 서울대학교 정부경쟁력연구센터 전임연구원(fulled78@gmail.com)

** 교신저자, 서울대학교 행정학과 박사과정(chasy516@gmail.com)

제2저자, 서울대학교 행정대학원 교수(tobin@snu.ac.kr)

I . Introduction

Mounting literature about the effective governance structure has suggested that the role of government in society has begun to shift towards that of a coordinator as the level of complexity of a society increases due to various concurrent changes such as decentralization, e-governmentalization, globalization, and fiscal austerity (Rhodes, 1996; Stoker, 1998; Pierre & Ingraham, 2010; Kettl, 1993). For civil servants, such increasing complexity they are also likely to experience a shift in the nature of their work, as they are forced to cooperate more with non-government actors, such as citizens, private businesses and non-governmental organizations, as well as with areas of government outside of their own. Due to these developments a growing vein of literature has sought to understand the antecedents to and consequences of civil servants trust in other areas of government, as well as in various non-government actors (Braithwaite & Levi, 1998; Yang, 2005; Cho & Park, 2011; Porumbescu et al., 2013).

This literature argues that as different government and non-government actors grow interdependent in the production and delivery of public services and goods, formal coordination mechanisms become less functional, thereby requiring civil servants to increasingly rely on trust as a tool for coordinating action in these complex networks (Bouckaert, 2012; Oomsels et al., 2012). In light of such developments, the objective of this research is to examine and compare the antecedents of civil servants trust in (1) other areas of government, as well as in (2) citizens and private business. While the importance of trust in such networks has been acknowledged, there has been surprisingly little research that has attempted to examine factors that contribute toward civil servants' trust in non-government actors as well as in different areas of government. To address this void in the literature, this research will draw on survey data coming from the 2012 Korean Civil Service Survey.

What this study expects to find is that, while antecedents to civil servants' trust tend to vary according to the object (i.e., citizens or other areas of government), higher levels of communication consistently serve to positively influence civil servants' levels of trust in other areas of government, as well as in non-government actors.

II. Theoretical Framework

1. Conceptual Review of Trust

Trust has attracted from several disciplines within the social sciences, some have argued the concept of trust to be a “conceptual morass” (Carnevale & Wechsler, 1992, p.473). Despite the ambiguity associated with the concept of ‘trust’, there are components that are held in common among the various conceptualizations of trust (Kramer and Lewicki, 2010). Rousseau and colleagues (1998) noted that “trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon the positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (p. 395).

A central aspect of this definition is that of positive expectations of the behavior of another (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). Positive expectations are generally considered to result from an evaluation of a particular object’s (e.g., individual, organization) benevolence, ability, and integrity (Mayer et al., 1995). Benevolence refers to the notion that a particular entity cares about the wellbeing of the trustor and will not knowingly engage in an action that will negatively affect the trustor. Ability refers to the notion that a particular entity possesses the capacity to meet the demands of the trusting relationship. For example, the post office may possess the capacity to deliver a letter on time or a friend may possess the means to pay back a loan by the predetermined date. Integrity can be thought of as honesty, and implies that the object of trust will do their best to fulfill the obligations inherent to the trusting relationship. Some degree of conceptual overlap may be found between the integrity and benevolence dimensions of trust (Schoorman et. al., 2007).

Within the context of this research, trust of civil servants in citizens is extended when civil servants positively evaluate the benevolence, integrity and ability of citizens. Similarly, trust of civil servants in other agencies of government is more likely to exist when civil servants positively evaluate the benevolence, integrity and ability of other agencies of government. The following section outlines why studying these factors is relevant to the field of public administration today.

2. Importance of Trust in Recent Public Administration

Today, the environment in which public administration systems operate within is becoming increasingly complex. Trends such as globalization, austerity measures, the rapid expansion and growing sophistication of information and communications technology and decentralization reforms have all served to encourage government to look for more entrepreneurial means of meeting citizens' needs. Many times, in an effort to manage and function within this increasingly complex environment, the public sector has sought to shift away from formal mechanisms of coordination and control toward informal mechanisms (Oomsels et al., 2012).

In light of these changes, the work of the public sector has come to be increasingly characterized by 'governance' (Pierre & Ingraham, 2010), in the sense that much of the work of public officials relates to coordinating the networks, both within the public sector, as well as between government and actors in society, such as private business, non-government organizations, and citizens themselves, thanks to developments in the field of e-government (Rhodes, 1996; Porumbescu et al., 2012).

Within the governance literature, the idea of trust has emerged as one of particular importance for the reason that it constitutes a means of coordination in increasingly complex organizational environments. To explain, in environments that are increasingly marked by the use of formal, as well as informal networks to coordinate the production and delivery of public goods and services the functionality of formal coordination mechanisms diminishes (Rhodes, 2005). For example, hierarchies are blurred, traditional bureaucratic accountability mechanisms are rendered ineffective, and the capacity to implement also reduces (Crozier et al., 1975, p.12). Given these trends, and the proposed inadequacy of traditional bureaucratic mechanisms to satisfactorily meet the needs of citizens the importance of trust among various actors in coordinating action is argued to increase (Rhodes, 2005; Oomsels et al., 2012). To elaborate, trust has been associated with many positive benefits such as cooperative behavior, "adaptive organizational forms," conflict reduction, decreased transaction costs, and ability to organize (Rousseau et al., 1998). Moreover, according to Barber (1983), trust is essential to every social relationship or social system, because trust reduces disorder and facilitates goal attainment.

3. Administrators' Trust in Citizens for Better Participation

Yang (2005) has argued that the lack of research assessing civil servants' trust in citizens implies that scholars in the field of public administration have failed to recognize the importance of this vein of trust research. The author continues to argue that, while there are likely to be several useful aspects related to civil servants' trust in citizens, one of particular interest to the field of public administration is its ability to predict efforts to involve citizens into government processes.

Indeed, civil servants' trust in citizens is an important factor for encouraging the citizens' participation in the diverse stages of policy decision-making process. In great deal of public administration researches, citizen participation has been addressed as an essential topic for participatory democracy and policy learning (Lindblom, 1990; Crozier et. al., 1975). In spite of the consensus on the citizens' participation, a hurdle to the involvement of citizens in the processes of government relates to civil servants' unwillingness to alter existing organizational status quos or their tendency to abide by the traditional manner of decision-making process (Im et al., 2013, Oh et. al., 2013, pp. 330-331). While institutional devices for citizens' participation and participatory democratic system have been advanced over the last two decades, still some civil servants tend to prefer the traditional decision making process which less likely includes citizens' participation (Oh et al., 2013, pp.330-331). For the civil servant, active inclusion of citizens into public processes can potentially be troublesome for the reason that it will likely require the civil servant to cede some of their power.

Subsequently, a basic question raised by Yang (2005) is "Would public officials let go of their power and privileges?" Yang (2005) defines administrators' trust in citizens as "administrators' beliefs that the citizens who are affected by their work (or whom they are serving), when they are involved in the administrative (or governing) process, will act in a fashion that is helpful (or beneficial) to administrators' performance (or goal fulfillment)." This explanation implies something of an instrumental perspective regarding civil servants' trust in citizens such that civil servants will only extend their trust to citizens when they perceive doing so as enabling them to better meet some organizational objective.

However, an issue with this instrumental perspective on civil servants' trust in citizens relates to reciprocal interactions for collection of better information in diverse stages of decision-making

and policy-implementation stages. To explain, while developments such as e-government have served to increase participation between civil servants and citizens, direct interaction between these two actors remains limited (Brewer et al., 2006). Therefore, in order for a civil servant to gain insight into citizens' trustworthiness (i.e., ability, benevolence, integrity), civil servants must rely on some other form information, such as mass media which has been commonly considered to focus on the bad and underreport the good, whether it be related to citizens, government, or celebrities (Gordon, 2000). Presumably, the better informed civil servants are regarding the trustworthiness of citizens the more readily they will extend trust through mutual trust in between civil servants and citizens. Therefore, examining civil servants' trust in citizens at the level of local government can provide empirical findings for the initial conditions and antecedents for facilitating broader citizen participation in the long term.

4. Trust as a Catalyst for Better Collaboration

From the very beginning of the 1990s, many scholars have addressed challenges resulted from the lack of collaboration among government organizations embedded in multiple layers of structure in the manner of sharing power, limited resources, and critical information so as to make jointly coherent actions for resolving urgent problems and their performance improvement (Agranoff, 2001; Barabasi, 2002; Comfort, 1985; Milward & Provan, 1998; Schalk, et. al., 2010). In particular, this stream of study was also introduced and applied to the South Korean society due to the ongoing effort for decentralization in which the importance of relationships between local and central governments increased, and the central government was asked to change the mechanisms of coordination in the settings of government system.

For the question of effective collaboration, indeed, scholars have attempted to explore various antecedents and conditions enhancing the performance of intergovernmental relations in the frame of network theory. Enumeration of such a various factors in this study may be beyond the scope of the purpose of this research, but effective collaboration in the sense of intergovernmental relations, at least, requires 1) sharing the common goals of diverse actors and organizations to make coherent actions for newly emerging complex social problems (Comfort, 2007; Saz-Carranza & Ospina, 2011), 2) sharing strategic resources essential for achieving the overall values and goals of network governance (De Wever, et al., 2005; Goldsmith, & Eggers, 2004), 3)

closeness of political interest among organizations (Krueathep, 2010), 4) supportive environments for policy network (Percival, 2009), and 5) managerial skills for balancing unity (i.e., order) and diversity (i.e., flexibility) of participating units (i.e., organizational entities) (Comfort, 2005; Saz-Carranza & Ospina, 2011).

As stated, more of diverse antecedents including structural characteristics of interactions has been arduously examined by scholars. Among such a various antecedents, trust in the settings of intergovernmental relations has received considerable attention due to its role in improving the coordination between different organizations and subsequently its positive relationship to organizational performance (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010). In addition, previous research has also demonstrated that low levels of trust between different public organizations tend to result in poor performance due to the increase of conflict and the lack of resource sharing (Bunchel, 2003). In a similar line of thought, Fang et. al., (2008) has empirically demonstrated that managing and building trust between multiple levels of public organizations as well as diverse types of actors are a crucial factor for the success of collaborations.

Given the positive association proposed to exist between performance and interorganizational trust, Behn (1995) has reasoned that distrust between different government organizations is likely to lead to a decrease in government performance in various aspects. Therefore, interorganizational trust can be considered as an important ingredient not only for improving the performance of government, but also for meeting the needs of citizens in the face of increased decentralization reforms. To explain, in a situation where relationships between central government and local government are marked by low trust, it is likely that the needs of citizens will not be met in a satisfactory manner.

In this article, we particularly focus on civil servants' perception about the trust in other agencies at the level of local governments and central government. Due to a series of decentralization reforms that have been carried out in South Korea over the course of the past decade (Yoo and Kim, 2012) the role of this level of government in the delivery and production of public services has rapidly increased. In addition, the surge of interactions within the different layers of local governments require further understanding for effective collaboration given the enhanced autonomy of each local government.

5. Fostering Trust through Communication

As reviewed in previous section, trust in between individuals (i.e., citizens and civil servants) and in between organizations (i.e., local and central governments) is claimed to be emerged from positive expectations of future behavior of counterpart (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). Such positive expectations are manifested through individuals' perception (i.e., belief about honesty and ability of another) and emotional feelings (i.e., benevolence) (Mayer et al., 1995). Due to the nature of perceptual and emotional aspects of trust, communication should be considered one of most central elements in shaping and managing the level of trust in different settings and interactions.

The underlying reason why communication plays an important role in any relationship is because its influence on expectations and belief through information and revision of previous perception about the counterpart (e.g., citizens, other agencies). Through communication, actors are able to exchange information that may serve to influence and re-adjust expectations related to the dimensions of trustworthiness. Moreover, communication empowers actors to foster a shared interest in achieving organizational objectives and also promotes perceptions of procedural justice, as actors' perception of alienation is likely to decrease whereas their understanding of organizational processes and outcomes is likely increase. In the public sector in particular, which is characterized by features such as goal ambiguity and red tape, communication can be considered as particular important for the reasons that are outlined in the sentences above.

Moreover, a large body of evidence can be found suggesting a critical effect of communication on diverse types of trust. Nyhan (2000) suggests that building trust in the relationships of public organizations require strategies such as participation, feedback, and empowerment, with all of these notions being premised upon communication per se. According to Suh and Ham(2009), communication, shared values, and autonomy are important factors that serve to positively impact interorganizational trust. Similarly, Porumbescu et. al., (2013) provides evidence that suggests communication strategies an effective tool for building trust in public organizations. In many empirical researches conducted in the settings of public and private organizations, the effectiveness of communication has positively related to overall level of trust and their performance, in which effective communication is manifested as frequency and perceived quality. In addition to the overall trust, communication has been claimed to affect the levels of subordinates' performance, attitudes like work motivation, commitment, empowerment,

job satisfaction, and interpersonal and institutional trust (Cho & Park, 2011; Porumbescu, 2013).

Given the expanding need for greater collaboration between various actors and organizations in the production and delivery of various public goods and services, communication between civil servants at the local level of government and citizens is essential for fostering more trusting relationships and subsequently enhancing performance of the public sector of local governments. In this study, communication is assessed in terms of how frequently local government officials come into contact with citizens and other areas of government.

6. Research question and hypotheses

The research question that this study addressed in particular is; ‘does communication, as an antecedents to local government public officials’ trust vary according to the object?’ As reviewed above, definitions of the trust, while different tend to emphasize shared components, irrespective of the discipline. Therefore, can we also assume that the effect of communication would also be shared across different objects?

As mentioned above, this study will focus on communication of local government civil servants with citizens and other areas of government. Communication is assessed in terms of how often civil servants contact the actors of interest to this study. Based upon the explanations provided above hypothesis 1 is outlined as follows: Higher frequency of contact between civil servants and other actors is positively associated with trust.

Additionally, we are also interested in local officials’ attitudes with respect to the policy implementation process. Suh and Ham (2009) suggest that not only communication but also autonomy is important to interorganizational trust. When local officials believe that they are not disturbed by outside objects and have autonomy from them, they will trust those actors more. Autonomy is defined as the extent to have a major say in scheduling their work, selecting the equipment they will use, and deciding on procedures to be followed (Turner & Lawrence, 1965). Considering this definition, Suh and Ham (2009) say that freedom from auditing controls and operating expenses can be understood as political and managerial autonomy, then, they include practice operation to make variables ‘autonomy’. Referring to their study, we can expect that if local officials think an actor interrupts local policy implementation in participatory process, they would tend to distrust the object. So we include a variable, obstacle to policy implementation as a

control variable, as this factor is also likely to heavily influence the relationships of interest to this research.

We apply our hypothesis to each object (upper government and citizen) in order to make two models. Table 1 shows variables and hypothesized effects.

Table 1 Variables

	Independent Variable(effect)	Control	Dependent Variable
Model1	Upper government	Obstacles to Policy Implementation(OPI)	Upper government
		Grade	Trust
	Communication(+)	Sex	
Model2	Citizen	Education	Citizen
		Tenure	

III. Method

1. Data & Sample

Table 2 Sample Design

Population	Public Officials in Local Government		
	- Wide-Area Local Government : 16		
	- Fundamental Local Government : 228		
Sample N	1,403		
Research Subjects	Public Officials in Administrative Positions		
Quota Sample	30 Sample	16 of WLG and 9 of FLG (Proration)	
	3 Sample	FLG(1 of grade 5, 1 of grade 6, 1 of etc. job group, 1 of female)	
Survey Method	Face-to-Face	Interview(Structured Questionnaire)	

The 2012 Korean Local Government Officials Survey was conducted until August 9, 2012 for one thousand four hundred in two hundred thirty four local governments. The survey was designed by the Knowledge Center for Public Administration & Policy in Seoul National University, and administered by Research Lab. The questionnaire included 158 structured

questions and was presented in face-to-face interviews. For most questions, the respondents must answer on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. Table 2 is an introduction of the data set.

Table 3 Profile of Study Sample

		Freq.	Percent	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Sex				0.668799	0.470813	0	1
	Female	466	33.12				
	Male	941	66.88				
	Total	1407	100.00				
Job Grade				6.345416	1.091193	4	9
	4	30	2.13				
	5	322	22.89				
	6	416	29.57				
	7	447	31.77				
	8	155	11.02				
	9	37	2.63				
	Total	1,407	100.00				
Education				2.745	0.769303	1	4
	High School	157	11.21				
	Junior College	167	11.93				
	College	952	68				
	Graduate School	124	8.86				
	Total	1,400	100.00				
Tenure(year)				20.06187	9.936468	0	39
	0~4	76	5.46				
	5~9	213	15.33				
	10~14	97	6.97				
	15~19	229	16.48				
	20~24	317	22.80				
	25~29	117	8.42				
	30~34	248	17.84				
	35~39	93	6.69				
	Total	1390	100.00				

The proportion of female respondents was about 33%. Job grade, which are hierarchical rank in the Korean civil services, 4~9 officials were included in the data¹⁾. Job grade 4~5

respondents(25%) are high ranked officials than grade 6~9 respondents(75%), and working as managers.

2. Measures

The question for trust is “How much do you trust following objects?” The objects given in questions are central government (central ministries), upper local government, other local governments in same level, specialized local administrative agency, local council, expert, policy customer group, press, civic group, and religious group. Among these objects, we chose several objects and divided into two categories (upper government and citizen) in order to concentrate on these objects.

To measure the extent of communication, the question is used: “How often do you contact with following objects? Please answer with taking all of the available contact means (phone, email, face-to-face meeting, and etc.) into consideration.” The officials answer on a scale with 1(little), 2(annually), 3(every month), 4(every week), and 5(everyday contact). Given objects are same with the trust question, that’s the reason why we divide those into same two categories.

The question for one of control variables, Obstacle to Policy Implementation is “How often do the following obstacles appear in the process of policy implementation?” (from 1(little occur) to 5(very often occur)). The question contains each objects: limited manpower and budget, conflict or noncooperation with other ministries, insufficient applicable act, irrational system, lack of interest and leadership of policy director, over-bearing intervention of local council and politician, insufficiency of incentives for public officials, low degree of adaptability of policy target group, and too much interest of press and the public. Likewise, we chose several objects and categorized among the objects in each questions.

1) Grade 1 is the highest level and grade 2 is the second-highest level in hierarchical rank, and they are politically appointed or elected. Grade 3 is the highest level except elected official.

Table 4 Configuration of Variable

Category	Contained objects	
	Trust(DV)	Obstacles to policy implementation(CV)
Upper government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Central government · Upper local government (10 scale)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limited manpower and budget · Conflict or noncooperation with other ministries (10 scale)
Citizen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Policy customer group · Civic group (10 scale)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Low degree of adaptability of policy target group (5 scale)

Based on these measures, we test the empirical hypotheses with the following regression equation:

$$trust_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (communication) + \beta_2 (obstaclestopolicyimplementation) + \beta_3 (grade) + \beta_4 (sex) + \beta_5 (education) + \beta_6 (tenure) + \delta_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

where $trust_{ij}$, for example, is the trust measure of individual i in office (department, bureau, and etc.) j ; δ_i is the office random effect. Besides, we set this equation for two each models (upper government, citizen).

As Table 4 shows, trust (dependent variable) on upper government and citizen have a 10-point scale by aggregating two indicators that were 5-point scales respectively. Due to the continuous nature of the dependent variable, we use random effect model as an analysis methodology: we estimated OLS regression model with random effect model applied the upper government and citizen models.

3. Data Analysis Procedure

We attempt to rule out the effects derived from the characteristics of offices. We cannot find out what are the characteristics which can come from the task or the level of offices' features. Since we need to separate the effects of offices, we apply specific methodological model which can be Fixed Effect Model or Random Effect Model. We conduct Hausman test because it is hard

to notice which model has better explanation power owing to almost same result. After conducting Hausman test on trust in upper government model as well as trust in citizen model, we can distinguish which model is more appropriate for our research. In our analysis, both Prob>chi2 are larger than 0.05(former is 0.4067, latter is 0.2901) so that the random effect model was chosen for our analysis so as to control the effects of offices.

IV. Result

1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Latent Variables

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Upper government	Trust	1367	6.551573	1.310537	2	10
	Communication	1348	4.816024	2.040855	2	10
	OPI	1404	6.926638	1.125561	3	10
Citizen	Trust	1404	5.867521	1.170241	2	10
	Communication	1394	4.555954	2.132061	2	10
	OPI	1404	2.957977	0.665042	1	5

Table5 presents means and standard deviations for all of the continuous variables which are measured separately depending on each object. On average, the results show that local officials relatively more trust upper government (Mean=6.55) than citizen (Mean=5.87) comparing both means. On average, respondents reported slightly more contact with upper government (Mean=4.8) than citizen (Mean=4.56).

2. Results of REM

Table6 shows the results of upper government model. From first to third columns represent the result of OLS without any concern about office characteristic effect. Fourth column shows the result of regression with random effect model in order to control unobserved random effect of

each 213 offices. With comparing these four models, the table4 offers that (1) the effects of independent and control variables are consistent regardless of adding some variables, (2) there are not any significant differences between column (3) and (4). It means unobserved differences or random effects of offices are not responsible for the results.

Table 6 Dependent Variable = Trust in Upper Government²⁾

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Communication			0.0660*** (0.0177)	0.0658*** (0.0182)
OPI		-0.0909*** (0.0314)	-0.1009*** (0.0319)	-0.1025*** (0.0326)
Grade	0.0023 (0.0558)	0.0044 (0.0558)	0.0198 (0.0569)	-0.0093 (0.0585)
Sex	0.0319 (0.0857)	0.0177 (0.0855)	-0.0142 (0.0863)	-0.0205 (0.0886)
Education	-0.0512 (0.0487)	-0.0443 (0.0487)	-0.0432 (0.0491)	-0.0478 (0.0505)
Tenure	0.0135** (0.0060)	0.0139** (0.0060)	0.0164*** (0.0061)	0.0148** (0.0062)
Constant	6.3795*** (0.5195)	6.9795*** (0.5674)	6.6009*** (0.5843)	6.8290*** (0.6012)
Observations	1,344	1,341	1,313	1,249
R-squared	0.0139	0.0201	0.0300	
Random effect (Number of Offices)	N	N	N	Y (213)

Table7 represents the results of citizen model. As same as upper government model, from first to third columns show the OLS results without random effect of offices. I can see the result of regression with random effect model in column (4). With the result of table6, similarly with table5, I can notice that unobserved differences random effects of offices are not responsible for the results.

2) Coefficients reported in Table 6 indicate unstandardized coefficient.

Table 7 Dependent Variable = Trust in Citizen

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Communication			0.0757*** (0.0150)	0.0812*** (0.0153)
OPI		-0.1455*** (0.0478)	-0.1680*** (0.0478)	-0.1745*** (0.0490)
Grade	-0.0425 (0.0490)	-0.0440 (0.0490)	-0.0167 (0.0490)	-0.0129 (0.0499)
Sex	0.0044 (0.0761)	0.0123 (0.0760)	-0.0018 (0.0759)	0.0275 (0.0777)
Education	0.0801* (0.0435)	0.0836* (0.0436)	0.0899** (0.0434)	0.0946** (0.0444)
Tenure	0.0005 (0.0052)	-0.0011 (0.0053)	-0.0002 (0.0052)	-0.0001 (0.0053)
Constant	5.9080*** (0.4555)	6.3646*** (0.4770)	5.8829*** (0.4828)	5.8058*** (0.4922)
Observations	1,381	1,378	1,366	1,301
R-squared	0.0040	0.0107	0.0292	
Random Effect (Number of belongto_n)	N	N	N	Y (219)

Finally we can offer the comparing table (table8) of random effect models estimating regression result. Model (a) estimates OLS with random effect model including trust in upper government as a dependent variable, model (b) estimates in same way of model (a), including trust in citizen as a dependent variable.

First, independent variable, communication, in both models has statistically significant effects on trust in each two objects positively. This result supports our hypothesis: Higher frequency of contact (communication) is positively associated with trust, which means the higher frequency of communication with upper government (or citizen), local officials more trust in upper government (or citizen). Second, the results of OPI in both models are statistically significant, having negative effect on each dependent variable. It means that local officials less recognize the degree of strong obstacle to policy implementation, they more trust upper government or citizen.

Table 8 Comparison between Upper government and Citizen Models

	(a)	(b)
	DV=Trust in Upper Gov't	DV=Trust in Citizen
Communication	0.0658*** (0.0182)	0.0812*** (0.0153)
OPI	-0.1025*** (0.0326)	-0.1745*** (0.0490)
Grade	-0.0093 (0.0585)	-0.0129 (0.0499)
Sex	-0.0205 (0.0886)	0.0275 (0.0777)
Education	-0.0478 (0.0505)	0.0946** (0.0444)
Tenure	0.0148** (0.0062)	-0.0001 (0.0053)
Constant	6.8290*** (0.6012)	5.8058*** (0.4922)
N	1,249	1,301
Random Effect (Number of Offices)	Y (213)	Y (219)

Therefore, we can find out the effects of communication on trust are constant regardless of what the object (trustee) is in spite of existing an antecedent of distrust such as perception of obstacles.

Moreover, there are the important things to be referred which are tenure in model (a) and education in model (b). First of all, tenure in model (a) has a positive significant effect. Also, there is a change of effect direction between model (a) and (b) although the effect of tenure in model (a) only has statistically significant effect on trust. The direction of tenure effect is positive to trust upper government in model (a), while model (b) shows opposite direction representing negative effects on trust in citizen. Based on this result, it would be possible to be regarded that longer tenure, more trust in central or upper government but less trust in the citizen. Second, vice versa, education in model (b) has positive effects to trust in citizen whereas the direction of education effect in model (a) is negative.

V. Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of this study are interesting in that they offer evidence that suggests that greater communication between local government officials is essential to (1) building more trusting relationships between local government civil servants and central government and (2) increasing civil servants' trust in citizens.

Regarding the first point, given the large number of decentralization reforms that have been implemented over the course of the past decade, relationships between central and local levels of government have emerged as an increasingly important determinant of government's capacity to satisfactorily meet the needs of citizens. Previous literature was visited, which suggested that in the public sector, interorganizational trust, such as that between local and central government, was an important determinant of performance. Yet, research that has attempted to understand the antecedents to interorganizational trust, particular between local government and central government, is sparse. This research addressed this dearth in the extant literature and found that an important factor that serves to positively influence levels of trust between local government and central government is communication, which as measured by frequency of contact. While this study is not in a position to make particular arguments as to why frequent contact creates higher trust, some clues are presented as to why. First, the strong consistent negative influence of OPI suggests that local government officials value some degree of autonomy from the central level of government in carrying out their tasks. This suggests that officials at the local level of government may be sensitive to their perceptions of equal relationships between local government and central government. From this perspective, higher levels of communication between these two levels of government can be seen as demonstrating a degree of concern or interest in understanding what is occurring at the local level of government. Second, increased contact between these two levels of government can lead to more positive perceptions of procedural justice. As communication between these two levels of government increases, local government officials become better aware of their demands and responsibilities from the perspective of central government and are also imbued with a better understanding of why things are happening the way they are. Put differently, communication may reduce perceptions of local government civil servants of arbitrary actions taken by those at the central level of government.

Regarding the positive relationship between communication and local government officials'

trust in citizens, the findings of this study suggest that civil servants' trust in citizens may move beyond the instrumental perspective as proposed by Yang (2005). Instead, civil servants may be concerned that citizens are not capable of fulfilling the obligations that are inherent to higher levels of participation in public processes. Yet, greater levels of interaction between these citizens and public officials appear to reduce such concerns and result in higher levels of trust. These findings offer important insight into ways by which citizens can be further integrated into public administration processes and overcome civil servants' pessimistic attitudes toward the expanding citizens' participation.

Finally, this study is not without its limitations. There are several methodological problems in this paper. First, one source bias (or mono-method bias) problem can be raised as a limitation of this paper because both antecedents and outcomes of our analytical model were from a single survey data. In this case, respondents could have a biased tendency to select similar options in different questions during answer. Second, measurement error of trust could exist due to only small number of survey questions were used to measure the level of trust, though the most important variable in this paper. Since the limitation of the number of trust question, we could not conduct factor analysis and also could not check Cronbach's alpha.

In addition, it is necessary to acknowledge that various antecedents reviewed in previous literature with the cases of US and other societies were not incorporated into our model due to the limitation of data, which can result in specification error (Davidson & MacKinnon, 1981). Among the variety of antecedents, we primarily focus on the role of communication in increasing civil servants' trust because myriad researches have demonstrated the crucial role of communication, as the catalyst of trust, in achieving effective collaboration. It is also worth to note that our research's limitation cast a light on the direction of future research in that examination of more antecedents suggested through different social contexts is required to perform with more cases of South Korea given the paucity of empirical examination.

References

- Agranoff, R. (2008). Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers. *Public Administration Review*. 68-1. 56-65.

- Ahn, T.K. and Ostrom, E. and Walker, J.M. (2003). Heterogeneous preferences and collective action. *Public Choice*. 117-3-4. 295-314.
- Barber B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.
- Barabasi, A. L. (2002). *Linked: The New Science of Network*. Mass. Cambridge Perseus Publishing.
- Behn, R.D. (1995). The big questions of public management. *Public Administration Review*. 55-4. 313-324.
- Boukaert. G. (2012). Trust and Public Administration. *Administration*. 60-1. 91-115.
- Braithwaite.V. & Levi. M. eds. (1998). *Trust and Governance*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Brewer, G. A., Neubauer, B. J., & Geiselhart, K. (2006). Designing and Implementing E-Government Systems Critical Implications for Public Administration and Democracy. *Administration & Society*. 38-4. 472-499.
- Bunchel, B. (2003). Managing Partner Relationships in Joint Ventures. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. 44-4. 91-95.
- Camevale DG and Wechsler B. (1992). Trust in the Public Sector: Individual and Organizational Determinants. *Administration & Society*. 23-4. 471-494.
- Cho, Y. J., & Park, H. (2011). Exploring the relationships among trust, employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Public Management Review*. 13-4. 551-573.
- Comfort, L. K., & Cahill, A. (1985). *Increasing Problem-Solving Capacity between Organizations*. Colorado: Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center.
- Comfort, L. K. (2005). Risk, Security, and Disaster Management. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 8. 335-356.
- Comfort, L. K. (2007). Crisis Management in Hindsight: Cognition, Communication, Coordination, and Control. *Public Administration Review*. 67(Special Issue). 189-197.
- Crozier, M., Huntington, S. P., & Watanuki, J. (1975). *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*. University Press.
- Davidson, R., & MacKinnon, J. G. (1981). Several tests for model specification in the presence of alternative hypotheses. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*. 49-3. 781-793.
- De Wever, S., Martens, R., & Vandenbempt, K. (2005). The impact of trust on strategic resource acquisition through interorganizational networks: Towards a conceptual model. *Human Relations*. 58-12. 1523-1543.
- Dodgson. (1993). Learning, trust, and technological collaboration. *Human Relations*. 46-1. 77-95.
- Fang, Palmatier, Scheer, L.K. and Li, Nang. (2008). Trust at Different Organizational Levels. *Journal of Marketing*. 72-2. 80-98.

- Goldsmith, S., & Eggers, W. D. (2004). *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Gordon, M.T. (2000). Public Trust in Government: the US media as an agent of accountability? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 66. 297-310.
- Grimmelikhuijsen. (2010). Transparency of Public Decision-Making: Towards Trust in Local Government?. *Policy & Internet*. 2-1. 5-35.
- Kettl, D. F. (1993). *Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private Market*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kramer RM and Lewicki RJ. (2010). Repairing and enhancing trust: Approaches to reducing organizational trust deficits. *The Academy of Management Annals*. 4-1. 245-277.
- Krueathap, W., Riccucci, N. M., & Suwanmala, C. (2010). Why Do Agencies Work Together? The Determinants of Network Formation at the Subnational Level of Government in Thailand. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 20-1. 157-185. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mun013
- Lee. SJ, Kim. HK, Choi. JK. (2008). Social Capital and Formation of Policy Governance: Statistical Analysis of Perceptions of Government Officials and NGO Staffs. *Korean Public Administration Review*. 42-1. 149-170.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1990). *Inquiry and change : the troubled attempt to understand and shape society*. New Haven Conn: Yale University Press.
- Mayer RC., Davis JH. and Schoorman FD. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*. 20-3. 709-734.
- Milward, B. H., & Provan, K. G. (1998). Principles for Controlling Agents: The Political Economy of Network Structure. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 8-2. 203-221.
- Nyhan. RC. (2000). Changing the Paradigm: Trust and its role in Public Sector Organizations. *The American Review of Public Administration*. 30. 87-109.
- Offe, Claus. (1999). How Can We Trust Our Fellow Citizens? In *Democracy and Trust*, edited by Mark E. Warren, 42-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oh, S. D., Lee, M. J., Kang, J. S., and Yim, Y. J. (2013) *Public Management Theory*. South Korea, Seoul: Daeyoung.
- Oomsels, P., Porumbescu, G., Bouckaert, G., Im, T. (2012). Trust is good but control is always better? Paper presented at the 1st annual IIAS Trust study group, Seoul, South Korea December 12th.
- Ospina, S. M., & Saz-Carranza, A. (2010). Paradox and Collaboration in Network Management. *Administration & Society*. 42. 404-440.

- Percival, G. L. (2009). Exploring the Influence of Local Policy Networks on the Implementation of Drug Policy Reform: The Case of California's Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 19-4. 795-815. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mun035
- Pierre, J. and Ingraham, P. (2010). *Comparative Administrative Change and Reform*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Porumbescu, G., Park, J. and Oomsels, P. (2013). Building Trust: Communication and Subordinate Trust in Public Organization. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*. 38. 158-179.
- Rhodes, R. A. (1996). The new governance: governing without government1. *Political studies*, 44-4. 652-667.
- Rousseau DM, Sitkin SB, Burt RS, Camerer C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*. 23-3. 393-404.
- Saz-Carranza, A., & Ospina, S. M. (2011). The Behavioral Dimension of Governing Interorganizational Goal-Directed Networks—Managing the Unity-Diversity Tension. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 21. 327-365.
- Schalk, J., Torenvlied, R., & Allen, J. (2010). Network Embeddedness and Public Agency Performance: The Strength of Strong Ties in Dutch Higher Education. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 20-3. 629-653. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mup018
- Schoorman FD, Mayer RC, Davis JH. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management*. 32-2. 344-354.
- Stocker, G. (1998). Governance as Theory : Five Propositions. *International social science journal*. 50-155. 17-28.
- Suh. HJ and Ham. YS. (2009). Analysis on Affecting Factors to Trust between Local Government and Local Public Enterprises. *Korean Local Government Review*. 21-4.
- Turner A.N. and Lawrence PR. (1965). *Industrial jobs and the worker: an investigation of response to task attributes*. Harvard Univ, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Yang.K. (2005). Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens : A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts. *Public Administration Review*. 65-3. 273-285.
- Zaheer. A., McEvily, B., and Perrone. V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization science*. 9-2. 141-159.

공무원의 타기관 및 시민에 대한 신뢰에 관한 연구: 의사소통의 역할을 중심으로 한국 지방정부 사례

박정호·차세영·임도빈

신뢰는 사회과학 분야에서 엄청난 관심을 받고 있는 개념이면서 동시에 너무 많은 정의와 용례들로 그 이해에 혼란을 겪기도 한다. 많은 행위자가 참여하는 네트워크 형태로 공공서비스가 전달되는 현대사회에서 신뢰(trust)는 중요한 사회적 자본이자 도구로 인식되고 있으나, 공무원들이 다른 행위자들에게 갖는 신뢰는 그 개념이나 선행요인 등에 대한 관심은 부족하다고 할 수 있다. 본 연구는 공무원들이 다른 행위자들, 특히 상위기관의 공무원들과 일반 시민들에 대해 갖는 신뢰가 어떻게 형성되는지에 관심을 가지고 이에 영향을 미치는 선행요인으로써의 커뮤니케이션의 효과를 살펴보고자 하였다. 2012년 지방공무원들을 대상으로 한 서베이 결과를 분석한 결과, 커뮤니케이션을 많이 할수록 상위기관의 공무원들과 일반 시민들에 대한 신뢰가 높아지는 것을 확인할 수 있었다.

상위 정부기관과 지방정부 공무원들 간의 신뢰가 커뮤니케이션에 의해 향상될 수 있다는 점은 다음과 같은 함의를 갖는다. 첫째, 상위기관과의 동등하지 않은 관계에 민감한 지방정부 공무원들이, 상위기관과의 접촉을 통해서 지방 정부 수준의 어려움들을 이해받고 있다고 여기면서 신뢰가 높아지는 것으로 보인다. 둘째, 또한 이러한 커뮤니케이션을 통한 신뢰 향상으로 중앙정부 시각에서 보는 지방정부의 역할과 책임에 대한 이해도가 높아지는 것을 기대할 수 있다. 또한 공무원들은 시민들의 능력에 대해 회의적이라는 기존의 연구결과를 고려할 때, 시민들과 접하는 빈도가 높아질수록 이들을 신뢰하게 되면서 시민 참여의 폭을 넓히는 데 일조할 수 있을 것이라는 함의도 도출할 수 있을 것으로 보인다.

[주제어: 조직간 신뢰, 공무원 신뢰, 커뮤니케이션]