Public Trust in the Homeland Security System: A Study on Public Perceptions of Combating Terrorism in Turkey

Toplumun İç Güvenlik Sistemine Yönelik Güveni: Toplumun Türkiye'deki Terörle Mücadelede Algısına Dair Bir Çalışma

Sefer YILMAZ
Dr., İçişleri Bakanlığı, (seferyilmaz1@gmail.com)

Keywords:

Trust, Organizational Trust, Public Trust, Homeland Security, Counter-Terrorism

ABSTRACT

Research aimed at understanding public attitudes towards homeland security organizations has been quite limited. This paper is an attempt to grasp public trust in the homeland security system of Turkey in combating terrorism at the organizational level. It was revealed that while the level of trust varies significantly by geographical region and educational level, 57.4 percent of all the participants pointed out that they did not trust in the system. In parallel with the literature, a positive and a strong relationship was observed between the public's performance evaluations of homeland security organizations and the public trust. "Belief in eradicating terrorism" and "commitment wish to contra-terror policies" were also understood to increase as the level of trust in homeland security system increases. This study not only delves into the nature of public distrust in homeland security system but also describes the ways in which this distrust could be repaired. It concludes that serious attention have to be given by security managers to public trust in order to maintain organizational effectiveness by providing public commitment and support to contra-terror policies and practices.

ÖZ

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Güven, Örgütsel Güven, Toplumsal Güven, İç Güvenlik, Kontra-Terör

İç güvenlik örgütlerine toplumun güveni anlamaya yönelik araştırmaların sayısı oldukça sınırlıdır. Bu makale, toplumun Türkiye'nin iç güvenlik sisteminin terörle mücadelesine dair güvenini örgütsel düzeyde anlamaya yönelik bir girişimdir. Bu çalışma sonunda, coğrafi bölgelere ve eğitim düzeyine göre güven düzeyi anlamlı şekilde farklılık gösterse de, katılımcıların %57.4'ünün sisteme güvenmedikleri anlaşılmıştır. Akademik yazına paralel bir şekilde, toplumsal güven ile toplumun iç güvenlik örgütlerinin performans değerlendirmesi arasında pozitif yönde güçlü bir ilişki gözlenmiştir. "Terörü sona erdirme inancı" ve "kontra-terör politikalarına katkı" tutumunun da iç güvenlik sistemine olan güven arttıkça arttığı anlaşılmıştır. Bu çalışma sadece toplumun iç güvenlik sistemine olan güvensizliğini değil, aynı zamanda bu güvensizliğin nasıl giderileceğinin yollarını da göstermektedir. Kontra-terör politika ve uygulamalarına toplumun katılımını ve desteğini sağlayarak örgütsel etkinliği sağlamak için, güvenlik yöneticilerinin toplumsal güvene ciddi önem vermesi gerektiği sonucuna varılmıştır.

1. INTRODUCTION

Trust is based on the public's perceptions of the organizations as to the goals, principles, actions and the manner that the organization prefers communicating with the public. It is regarded as an important tool for improving organizations' effectiveness. It not only helps build effective and healthy communications between the parties inside the organizations but also promotes relationships between the organizations and the stakeholders (Thomas et al., 2009). Organizational commitment is argued to be the major outcome of trust for the organizations (Cook and Wall, 1980).

Public trust at the organizational level refers to citizens' attitudes to specific organizations in terms of trust (Rampton and Stauber, 2001). This trust is acknowledged to be fragile and must be skilfully managed in order to be maintained and developed (Levi, 1998). Trust that was built over the course of years could easily be eroded almost instantly. Therefore, trust management come out to be a critical management area in order for the organizations to thrive.

Thus, one of the most challenging research area of academia come to forefront as the problem of public trust. However, relatively little is known about the causes and consequences of various types of public trust. Especially as for the public trust in homeland security organizations, the case is much more frustrating. Studies conducted for resolving the nature of trust in homeland security system is scarcely any. Therefore, this study provides a naval perspective for comprehending the

nature of public trust in the homeland security organizations of Turkey and lay concrete managerial options for preserving existing level of trust and even repairing damaged trust.

While providing a high degree of public trust is considered as crucial for all the organizations whether private or public, maintaining public trust is more requisite for homeland security organizations than any other public organization for trust plays an essential role in combating terrorism. Trust provides public support and commitment to homeland security services without which the organizational success would be a fancy. Therefore, it is vital for the homeland security organizations to put effort into building and managing the public's trust at all levels of the society.

Capturing organization-level trust repair for homeland security system, one need to identify what factors influence stakeholders' perceptions of the security organizations and on the contrary what factors contribute to trust failures. To date, no any research was conducted to provide such an understanding. This paper attempts to explore trust attitudes of public towards homeland security system regarding combating terrorism policies and practices. Whether socio-demographic factors influence stakeholders' preferences or not will be examined.

The questions whose answers will be investigated in this paper are as follows:

Do the public trust in homeland security system? Are there any significant differences by gender, geographical region and educational level of respondents? Is there any relationship between the trust level and public's performance evaluations of the homeland security system? Are there any correlations between public trust and "belief in eliminating terrorism"? Are there any correlations between public trust and "commitment wish to contra-terror policies"? What are the sources of public distrust? How this distrust affect to the attitudes of people? What are the ways in which this distrust could be repaired?

To be able to answer these questions, we surveyed about 516 participants from two distinct regions of Turkey namely South-east Anatolia and Middle Anatolia. South-east Anatolia is the geographical region where the terrorist activities mostly occur. Despite terrorist activities rarely take place in the Middle Anatolia, this region is included in the research in order to be able to make a comparison between the regions. Statistical techniques such as frequencies, standard deviation, mean, t-test, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis were used.

Factors promoting distrust and the steps that should be undertaken in trust formation and restoration will be identified. In other words, not only the level of public trust will be examined but also the causes that doom to trust failures and components that contribute to public trust in homeland security system will be scrutinized. In this way, on one hand a gap in the literature will be attempted to fill, on the other hand a constructive perspective for effective management of homeland security will be provided to practitioners.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Organizational Trust

Trust is defined as 'a psychological state agreeing to accept vulnerability based upon optimistic expectations of the purposes or behaviour of another' (Rousseau et al., 1998). It is regarded as a dynamic phenomenon of human attitudes and evolves over time (Schoorman et al., 2007; Inkpen and Curral, 2004). However, there is no any consensus among scholars in terms of the definition of trust (Hosmer, 1995). There exist many different trust definitions in the literature. For example, Mayer et al. (1995) defined organizational trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor". Gibbs (1972: 157) added these definitions a mutual relationship dimension pointing out that trust is "an atmosphere in which people have reciprocal feelings of confidence, warmth and acceptance". Hosmer (1995) extended the actors involved in the trust relationship. He argued that 'trust is the reliance by one person, group or firm upon a voluntarily accepted duty on the part of another person, group or firm to recognise and protect the rights and interests of all others engaged in a joint endeavour' (Hosmer, 1995: 392).

There are too many attempts to conceptualize trust in various perspectives. Some of the concepts that mostly took part in the trust definitions could be cited as 'willingness to be vulnerable' (Mayer et al., 1995), 'willingness to rely on', 'to be confident and holding positive expectations for others' (Hosmer, 1995; Lewicki and Bunker, 1995), and 'risk and level of interdependence' (Shephard and Sherman, 1998). Dimensions of trust are determined by scholars as competency, openness, care towards employees, trustworthiness, perfection, consistency, justice, integrity, loyalty, one's keeping word and respect risk of vulnerability, benevolence (Mishra, 1996: 265; Butler, 1991: 659; Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 1999: 186).

Organizational trust being a multi-faceted and ambiguous concept, can be both general, directed towards a social or organizational system or be more specific, directed towards an institution or an organization. The effective functioning of society depends on the extent to which people trust the organizations (Fukuyama, 1995). Many organization scholars (Cook and Wall, 1980; Dirks and Ferrin, 2001: 450) support the argument that trust is an essential element for effective organizations. Trust facilitates open communication and information sharing (Creed and Miles, 1996).

People's perceptions about the goals of an organization influence people's trust in the organization. For example, positive perceptions about an organization may lead people to trust this organization while negative perceptions may cause distrust

(Maeda and Miyahara, 2003). However, not only organizational goals are evaluated by the stakeholders but also some other features of the organization are also considered in the formation of organizational trust. Thus, organizational trust consists of common opinions of employees regarding trustworthiness of the goals, principles, strategies, managerial team and operations of the organization. This refers to the perception that all these organizational components are designed and implemented for the good of the public.

Some authors argued that the development of trust is the consequence of the existence of a specific context (Tyler, 1998; Levi, 1998). Control mechanisms, the transparency of the organization, the opportunities for participation, the universality of the organization's fundamental principles and the competence of organization's agents are some of which Levi (1998) counted as prerequisites for building public trust (Levi, 1998: 90).

Mishra (1996) contended that it is possible to repair broken trust in organizations. In order to repair trust the causes of distrust have to be determined first, since different causes of distrust are likely to require different reparative responses (Korsgaard et al., 2002; Schoorman et al., 2007). Then, effective responses should be developed to overcome the obstacles on the way to trust building. However, it is hard to assert that most organizations respond effectively to trust failures (Schwartz and Gibb, 1999; Robinson, 1996). Taking into account the seriousness of their consequences, failure in restoring broken trust become a critical management skill (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996). Steps recommended by Lewicki and Bunker (1996: 131) to repair the eroded trust are: to acknowledge that a failure in trust building has occurred, determine the causes of the failure and accept responsibility for the consequences.

Despite the increasing interest among scholars in trust building and repairing broken trust, there still exists room for improvement the subject. How trust develops and how weakening trust can be reinforced for trust in homeland security organizations are some of the questions whose answers will be investigated in this paper. In this study, in parallel with the literature, employees' evaluations of the performance of homeland security organizations and the processes required for repairing these perceptions once they are damaged by an organization-level failure will be examined.

2.2. Trust in Public Organizations

Trust is not merely important for private sector organizations. Rather, it is also critical in public organizations as well. For Fukuyama (1995), effective functioning of organizations in society depends on the extent to which people trust public organizations.

Trust in public organizations has been studied broadly in recent years (Rothstein, 2001). It refers to the public perception that the organization is competent, reliable, fulfils its obligations in line with the laws and regulations, provides quality services and acts in a responsible manner to serve the general interest. Thus, trust is not just having a positive or a negative stance towards institutions, but incorporates a set of beliefs or expectations (Devos et al., 2002: 484).

The public perceptions towards the public organizations attracted great focus in the literature on trust (Bouckaert and Van de Walle, 2003; Inglehart, 1999; Warren, 1999). These public opinions are regarded as one of the main driving forces behind initiatives to improving organizational performance. As a consequence of trust, commitment to the systems' capability and liability is increasingly recognized as crucial (Misztal, 1996: 74).

Authors such as Pollitt and Bouckaert (2000), Sims (2001), pointed out that failing performance is the basis of citizens' distrust in public institutions. In parallel with this consideration, there are arguments that satisfaction with public services will lead to increased trust in public organizations (Kampen et al., 2003). Authors have stressed the effects of quality of services on trust in public organizations (Christensen 2003; Kampen et al., 2003). In sum, trust in public organizations is argued to be strongly affected by how these organizations operate and how they deal with the stakeholders they serve.

Mayer et al. (1995)'s three dimensions of trustworthiness is worth mentioning here: They argued that the ability, benevolence and integrity of the organization are three factors affecting public trust mostly. Ability refers to the competencies of the organization to meet its goals and responsibilities. Benevolence points at the organizational responsiveness for the well-being of stakeholders. Finally, integrity implies a set of moral principles, which the stakeholders approve (Galford and Drapeau, 2003).

In democratic regimes, while the public has the right to monitor and assess the public organizations' activities and performances, public organizations have to monitor the public trust and perceptions regarding their strategies and activities as well. This will enable these organizations to tidy up their policies and to come in line with the public preferences and consent.

Organizations need to maintain the public trust not only in the objectives but also in the policies, strategies and processes being implemented (Johnson, 1999). The communication established with the public should be open, two-way, honest and constant (Shepard and Sherman, 1998). The impacts that the organizations' interactions have on the public should always be monitored and the level of trust have to be measured.

In our analysis, trust in homeland security system of Turkey is measured. As noted before, public trust in homeland security is important for successful implementation of counter terrorism measures. Homeland security organizations today are faced with the challenge of making their activities more transparent, effective, interactive and customer-oriented. They have to implement required timely changes, improve citizens' quality of life, adopt modern technology, reduce bureaucracy and deliver high standards of quality services concurrent with the preferences of the public.

On one hand citizens look forward to homeland security organizations to provide solutions to terror and security problems, on the other hand they increasingly distrust these organizations. Therefore, the core question is how security organizations can change the perceptions of their stakeholders and provide their commitment to security services in a most effective way.

Maintaining public trust in homeland security organizations would add significant advantages to combating terrorism and providing security. Trust stimulates altruistic behaviours, and increases voluntary compliance to organizational performance (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001). Studies have revealed that citizens' support for incumbent officials and willingness to make commitment to solve problems living in society increase as trust in public organizations rises (Chanley et al., 2000; Hetherington and Nugent, 2001).

Positive attitudes towards security services are thought to make police work easier and more efficient. Trust in police would followed by the cooperation in preventing crime and fighting terrorism. Therefore, the homeland security organizations need to establish public trust and operate in close co-operation with the public.

Consequently, trust in the homeland security system is considered to be a central issue for effective counter-terrorism efforts. However, the nature of this trust is unclear and the literature is lack of sufficient studies, which will throw light on the debate. Therefore, 'what factors affect public trust' and 'to which direction they affect' are need to be clarified for the homeland security organizations.

3. METHOD

We have developed three hypotheses to analyse public trust in the Turkish homeland security system in terms of combating terrorism. Our first hypothesis was that there exist a general distrust among people in contra-terror policies and strategies regardless of where the people live in. This hypotheses implies that not only the people living in South-eastern Anatolia where the terrorist activities usually occur, but also the people living in other regions of Turkey such as Middle Anatolia are also of the opinion that homeland security system is inadequate to meet the needs of the country regarding combating terrorism.

Our second hypothesis was that there exist a strong relationship between the public perceptions of homeland security system's performances and the public trust in the homeland security system. The third hypothesis of this study was that public belief in eliminating terrorism and public desire for commitment to combating terrorism both has positive correlations with the level of trust. That is, belief in eradicating terrorism and commitment to contra-terror policies increase as the level of trust in the homeland security system increases.

In order to test these hypothesis, a questionnaire consisted of 32 items was developed. Respondents were asked to evaluate the homeland security policies and practices in terms of combating terrorism. Questions regarding the performance of the security organizations, level of trust, roots of distrust and the ways in which distrust could be repaired were forwarded. The survey questions were presented as both five point Likert ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with a neutral midpoint and optional items. Cronbach's Alpha of the items was revealed as ($\alpha =0.76$) which could be regarded as quite reliable.

The population of this study consist of the people living in two geographical region of Turkey namely South-eastern Anatolia and Middle Anatolia. Participants were all chosen from the two biggest cities of the regions, Diyarbakır from South-eastern Anatolia and Kayseri from Middle Anatolia. While the population was quite large, we had only had the opportunity to include 516 of them. The questionnaires were sent to the chambers of commerce of the two cities in the fall of 2011. The chambers distributed these hard copies to 750 people, 516 completed surveys were returned yielding a response rate of 68 %.

The sample consisted of 516 participants from various backgrounds such as worker, merchant, businessman, tradesman and farmer (Table-1). There were also civil servants among the sample population.

Table 1. Occupations of sample

	Frequency	Percent
Civil Servant	85	16.5
Worker	64	12.4
Merchant	265	51.4
Businessman	29	5.6
Tradesman	14	2.7
Farmer	44	8.5
Other	14	2.7
Total	515	99.8
System	1	.2
	516	**100.0**

Respondent ranged from 20 to 67 years of age with an average of 38 years age. 79.8 percent of the participants were male, while 20.2 percent were female. 94.2 percent of the sample had a graduate or a post graduate degree. Remained 5.8 percent had either high school degree or equivalent. 63.8 percent of the participants were from South-eastern Anatolia. Those living in the middle Anatolia were 36.2 percent (Table-2).

Table 2. Demographic overview of sample

Age	Gender	Education	Region
Mean: 38.55	Male: 79.8 %	Undergraduate: 59.5 %	Southeastern Anatolia: 63.8 %
Minimum: 20	Female: 20.2 %	Graduate: 34.7 %	Middle Anatolia: 36.2 %
Maximum: 67		Post graduate: 5.8 %	

The data was analyzed by the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software. Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, and the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used in order to investigate public trust according to variables of various demographic features. Regression and correlation were calculated to find out the relations between the factors. Significance level for analysing the data was determined as .05.

4. FINDINGS

We asked to the respondents whether they trust in homeland security policies and strategies regarding combating terrorism. 42.6 percent of the respondents indicated that they trust in homeland security system while on the hand 57.4 percent stated they did not (Table-3).

Table 3. Trust in homeland security system

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	220	42.6
No	296	57.4
Total	**516**	**100.0**

We tested the same attitude by Likert type questions. Three questions were directed to the participants regarding their trust level in the homeland security system. The mean value of the factor A (Trust in homeland security system) revealed as (mean=2.37, SD=1.20). In order to find out the question of "*Is there a significant difference by region in the public's level of trust?*" we conducted (t test). It was observed that there is a significant difference in the public's level of trust by region. While both levels of trust were corresponding between 2 and 3 points of Likert scale implying a position between

"disagree" and "neutral", the trust level of respondents from South-eastern Anatolia indicated a more strong stance of distrust (Table-4).

Table 4. Organisational trust level of public by region (*t test*)

Geographical Region	n	Mean	Sd	t	p
Southeastern Anatolia	327	2.10	1.01	-7.185	.000*
Middle Anatolia	182	2.85	1.33		

*p<0.05

Differences by education level of the respondents were also come out to be significant. ANOVA test conducted to examine the differences revealed that there are significant differences among groups (p=.000<.05). It was found that mean values of those post-graduate have the highest scores. Graduate scores were lower than post-graduate but still more than under-graduate. Undergraduate scores were the lowest among all (Table-5).

Table 5. Organisational trust level of public by education level (*One way ANOVA*)

Education Level	n	Mean	Sd	F	p
Under-graduate	301	2.20	1.10	11.881	.000*
Graduate	178	2.51	2.51		
Post-graduate	30	3.20	3.20		

*p<0.5

There were no differences by gender in respondents' level of trust in homeland security. Whether there is a relationship between the public's performance evaluations of homeland security organizations and the public trust, we conducted correlation analysis (Table-6). It was revealed that there is a positive and a strong relationship between the public's performance evaluation of homeland security organizations and the public trust (r=.937, p<.01).

Table 6. The relationship between the public's performance evaluations of homeland security system and public trust (*Correlation*)

Variables	Performance evaluation	Public Trust
Performance evaluation	1	,937(**)
Public Trust	,937(**)	1

** p< 0.01

We directed the respondents who distrust in homeland security system (57.4 %) the question of "*Is this distrust reflect to your citizenship behaviors?*" 50.1 percent pointed out that the attitude of distrust reflected their citizenship behavior either as "disbelief in the solution" or "not to contribute to the solution" while 6.4% stated that it did not reflect to their behaviors (Table-7).

Table 7. The effect of distrust on the behaviors of the public

		Frequency	**Percent**
Valid	Disbelief in the solution	200	38.8
	Not to contribute to solution	63	12.2
	No impact	33	6.4
	Total	296	57.4
Missing	System	220	42.6
Total		**516**	**100.0**

After determining the public trust level and the reflections of this attitude to the citizenship behavior, we investigated the causes of distrust. We directed to the participants various questions searching the underlying factors leading distrust. Public perception of homeland security system's "failure in developing analytical approaches" comes out to be the first in the list of factors causing distrust. "Disregarding public opinion" was the second perception respondents pointed out to affect trust adversely (Table-8).

Table 8. Causes of distrust

		Frequency	**Percent**
Valid	Failure in developing analytical approaches	105	29.0
	Inability of security organizations	75	14.5
	Disregarding public opinion	93	18.0
	Negative attitudes of public employees	23	4.5
	Total	296	57.4
Missing	System	220	42.6
Total		**516**	**100.0**

In order to test our third hypothesis, we again conducted correlation analysis. Our hypothesis was that public belief in eliminating terrorism and public desire for commitment to combating terrorism both has positive correlations with the level of trust.

Table 9. The relationship between "belief in success", "commitment wish" and "public trust" (*Correlation*)

Variables	**Public Trust**	**Belief**	**Commitment wish**
Public Trust	1		
Belief	.787**	1	
Commitment wish	.413**	,338**	1

** $p < 0.01$

Correlation results regarding whether there are any significant relationships among public trust, public belief in success and public commitment wish to homeland security are given in Table-8. Results show that there are strong and positive relationships both between "public trust" and "belief in success" (r=.787, p<.01)., and between "public trust" and "commitment wish" (r=.413, p<.01).

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this research, we examined the public trust in homeland security system regarding combating terrorism. This paper revealed that the level of public trust in homeland security system was quite law (mean=2.37, SD=1.20). Significant differences by geographical region and education level of respondents were detected among the groups (p=.000<.05). The mean trust level of those living in South-eastern Anatolia was significantly lower than those living in the Middle Anatolia. This finding could be explained by the fact that terrorist activities mostly do occur in South-eastern Anatolia. Therefore, these people are much more suffering from terrorism than the people from other parts of the country. In addition, the time span reaching nearly 30 years of intense suffering might have deeply affected the people's level of trust negatively.

As to the differences by educational level, it was understood that the level of trust increases as respondents' educational level increases. Those having a post-graduate degree have the highest trust scores while those under-graduates have the least. This implies that educational level has a positive effect on the attitudes of people regarding public trust towards homeland security.

However, there was no significant difference by gender in the public's level of organizational trust (p=.197>.05). These finding are consistent with Scott (1983), Gilbert and Tang's (1998) researches. Scott (1983) found that there were no trust differences between men and women towards organizations. Gilbert and Tang (1998) asserted that organizational trust did not differ by gender.

In searching whether the attitude of distrust reflect to the respondents behaviors, it was revealed that 64.1 percent reflected the distrust to their behaviors either as "disbelief in the solution" or "not to contribute to the solution". This finding come out to be consistent with the results of the correlation analysis setting forth the "belief in eliminating terrorism" and "public desire for commitment to combating terrorism" had positive correlations with the level of trust. This means that, belief in eradicating terrorism and commitment wish to contra-terror policies increase as the level of trust in the homeland security system increases. This finding is also consistent with the literature asserting that trust stimulates altruistic behaviours, and increases voluntary compliance to organizational performance (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001).

A further correlation analysis conducted to analyze the relationship between the public's performance evaluations of homeland security organizations and the public trust, revealed that there was a positive and a strong relationship between the public's performance evaluation of homeland security organizations and the public trust. This finding supports the existing literature stressing that failing performance is the basis of citizens' distrust in public organizations (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000; Sims, 2001). Positive perceptions about an organization's performance may lead people to trust this organization while negative perceptions may cause distrust (Maeda and Miyahara, 2003).

Authors argued that it is not possible to repair broken trust in organizations unless adequate efforts have been exerted to determine what factors affected trust failure since different causes of distrust are likely to require different reparative responses (Mishra, 1996; Korsgaard, et al., 2002; Schoorman et al., 2007). Therefore, causes of distrust were also examined in this paper. It was understood that "*failure in developing analytical approaches*" and "*disregarding public opinion*" were the two most cited factors weakening trust. This finding implies that people regard homeland security system's capability of developing appropriate solutions as inadequate and that people are of the opinion that they are disregarded in search of right options for the solution. In face of these findings, homeland security managers should turn their faces to public opinion in strategy building and have to provide public support and commitment in implementing these strategies.

Public trust in homeland security is crucial for successful implementation of counter-terror measures. The core question is how security organizations can change the perceptions of their stakeholders and provide their commitment to security services in a most effective way. At this point, it is required for the homeland security managers to respond to these challenges effectively in order to overcome the obstacles on the way to trust building. Failure in restoring broken trust in homeland security would cause serious setbacks in successfully conducting contra-terror policies. Maintaining public trust in homeland security organizations would add significant advantages to combating terrorism and providing security.

This paper was an attempt to illuminate the nature of public trust in homeland security system of Turkey regarding combating terrorism. Significance of the study is to be the first research in this area. It would help security managers comprehend the importance of public trust in their policies and practices and show the ways in which the broken trust could be repaired. However, it is also worthy of note that this study was conducted in the fall of 2011, when the peace process for the terrorism in Southeast Anatolia has not been launched yet. Therefore, the findings of this study do not reflect the attitudes of people towards the peace process that have been launched in the wake of 2013.

REFERENCES

BOUCKAERT, G. and VAN DE WALLE, S. (2003). Quality of public service delivery and trust in government. In A. Salminen (Ed) Governing networks (pp. 299-318). Brussels: IOS Press.

BUTLER, J.K. (1991). "Towards understanding and measuring conditions of trust: evolution of a condition of trust inventory". Journal of Management, 17(3): 643-663.

CHANLEY, V.A., RUDOLPH, T.J. and RAHN, W.M. (2000). "The origins and consequences of public trust in government: A time series analysis". Public Opinion Quarterly, 64: 239-256.

CHRISTENSEN, T. (2003). Trust in Government—The Significance of Modernism, Political Cynicism and Integration. In EGPA Annual Conference, Workshop on Quality, Satisfaction, and Trust in Government: Reassessing Trust in a Reinvented Government, September 3–6, Portugal: Oeiras.

COOK, J. and WALL, T. (1980). "New Work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non fulfilment". Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53: 39-52.

CREED, W.E.D., and MILES, R.E. (1996). Trust in organisations: A conceptual framework linking organisational forms, managerial philosophies, and the opportunity costs of controls. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.) Trust in organisations: Frontiers of theory and research. (pp.16-38), Thousand Oaks' SAGE Publications.

DEVOS, T., SPIN, D. and SCHWARTZ, S.H. (2002). "Conflicts among Human Values and Trust in Institutions" British Journal of Social Psychology, 41: 481–484.

DIRKS, K.T., and FERRIN, D.L. (2001). "The role of trust in organizational settings", Organization Science, 12(4): 450-467.

FUKUYAMA, F. (1995). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. New York: Free Press.

GALFORD, R. and DRAPEAU, A.S. (2003). "The enemies of trust". Harvard Business Review, 81(2): 89–93.

GIBBS, J.R. (1972). TORI theory and practice. In J. W. Pfeffer, & J Jones (Eds.), The annual handbook for group facilitators . San Francisco: CA: Pfeffer/ Jossey-Bass.

GILBERT, A.J., and TANG, T.L.P. (1998). "An examination of organizational trust antecedents". Public Personnel Management, 27(3): 321-336.

HETHERINGTON, M.J. and NUGENT, J.D. (2001). Explaining public support for devolution: The role of political trust. In J. R. Hibbing & E. Theiss-Morse (Eds.) What is it about government that Americans dislike? (pp. 134-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

HOSMER, L.T. (1995). "Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics." The Academy of Management Review, 20(2): 379– 403.

HOY, W.K., and TSCHANNEN-MORAN, M. (1999). "Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools". Journal of School Leadership, 9: 184-208.

INGLEHART, R (1999). Postmodernization brings declining respect for authority but rising support for democracy. In P. Norris (Ed.), Critical citizens: Global support for democratic government (pp. 236-256). Oxford: Oxford University Press,

INKPEN, A.C., and CURRAL S.C. (2004). "The coevolution of trust, control, and learning in joint ventures". Organization Science, 15(5): 586–599.

JOHNSON, B.B. (1999)." Exploring dimensionality in the origins of hazard-related trust". Journal of Risk Research, 2: 325–54.

KAMPEN, J.K., MADDENS, B. and VERMUNT, J. (2003). Trust and satisfaction: A case study of the micro-performance theory. In A. Salminen (Ed.), Governing networks (pp. 319-326). Brussels: IOS Press,

KORSGAARD, M.A., BRODT, S.E. and WHITENER, E.M. (2002). "Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context". Journal of Applied Psychology, 87: 312–319.

LEVI, M. (1998). A state of trust. In V. Braithwaite & M Levi (Eds) Trust and Governance (pp. 77–101). New York: Russell Sage Foundation,

LEWICKI, R.J., and BUNKER, B.B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler (Eds) Trust in organization: frontiers of theory and research (pp.114-139). California: Sage Publications,

MAEDA, Y. and MIYAHARA, M. (2003). "Determinants of trust in industry, government, and citizen's groups in Japan". Risk Analysis, 23: 303–310.

MAYER, R.C., DAVIS, J.H. and SCHOORMAN, F.D. (1995). "An integrative model of organizational trust". Academy of Management Review, 20(3): 709-734.

MISHRA, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.) Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research (pp. 261– 287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage,

MISZTAL, B.A. (1996). Trust in modern societies. Cambridge: Polity Press

POLLITT, C. and BOUCKAERT, G. (2000). Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

RAMPTON, S. and STAUBER, J. (2001). Trust Us, We're Experts! New York: Penguin Putnam Inc.

ROBINSON, S.L. (1996). "Trust and breach of the psychological contract". Administrative Science Quarterly, 41: 574–599.

ROTHSTEIN, B. (2001). "Social Capital in Social Democratic State. The Swedish Model and Civil Society". Politics and Society, 29(2): 209–240.

ROUSSEAU, D.M., SITKIN, S.B., BURT, R.S., and CAMERER, C. (1998). "Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust". Academy of Management Review, 23: 393—404.

SCHOORMAN, F.D., MAYER, R.C. and DAVIS, J.H. (2007). "An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future". Academy of Management Review, 32: 344—354.

SCHWARTZ, P. and GIBB, B. (1999). When good companies do bad things: Responsibility and risk in an age of globalization. New York: Wiley

SHEPARD, B.H. and SHERMAN, D.M. (1998). "The grammars of trust: a model and general implications". Academy of Management Review, 23: 422–37.

SIMS, H. (2001). Public Confidence in Government and Government Service Delivery. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre for Management Development.

THOMAS, G.F., ZOLIN, R. and HARTMAN, J.L. (2009). "The Central Role of Communication in Developing Trust and Its Effect on Employee Involvement", Journal of Business Communication, 46: 287-310.

TYLER, T. (1998). Trust and democratic governance. In V. Braithwaite and M. Levi (Eds) Trust and Governance (pp. 269–294). New York: Russell Sage Foundation,

WARREN, M. (Ed.) (1999). Democracy and trust. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ZUCKER, L.G. (1986) "Production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure, 1840-1920". Research in Organizational Behavior, 8: 53-111.