

The Role of Open Government in Maintaining Trust in Public Administration

Songül Demirel Değirmenci¹ | Yurdanur Ural Uslan²

¹ Dr. Instructor., Hitit University, Çorum /Türkiye
ORCID: [0000-0003-0982-0796](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0982-0796)
E-Mail: songuldemirel66@gmail.com

² Asst. Prof. Dr., Usak University, Uşak / Türkiye
ORCID: [0000-0002-1721-0712](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1721-0712)
E-Mail: yurdanur.ural@usak.edu.tr

Corresponding Author:
Songül Demirel Değirmenci

November 2023
Volume:20
Issue:56
DOI: [10.26466//opusjsr.1296596](https://doi.org/10.26466//opusjsr.1296596)

Citation:
Değirmenci, D, S. & Uslan, U, Y. (2023). The role of open government in maintaining trust in public administration. *OPUS- Journal of Society Research*, 20(56), 1141-1152.

Abstract

The concept of trust has gained significance in the discourse surrounding traditional public administration, which has been questioned in various respects regarding its relationship with the public. The political, social, and economic changes that have occurred in recent times have led to numerous transformations in the understanding of public administration. It is crucial to maintain trust in relationships, and this is a topic that has been thoroughly discussed. Trust approaches are evaluated within public administration paradigms in this study. The objective of this research is to assess how government openness impacts citizens' trust in the government. To measure the influence of open states on public trust, European social research data and data from the open government index, developed by the World Justice Project, were utilized. To investigate whether the countries' level of open statehood alters trust in public administration, the study initially utilized the Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by the Mann-Whitney U test to identify the variance origin. The findings confirmed the positive impact of open statehood on trust.

Keywords: Public administration, trust, open government.

Öz

Her ilişkinin temelinde yer alan güven duygusu, devlet ve halk arasında geleneksel kamu yönetimi anlayışının birçok bakımdan sorgulanması sonrasında tartışılan kavramlardan biri olmuştur. Kamu yönetimi anlayışı dünyada siyasal, sosyal ve ekonomik değişimlere paralel biçimde çeşitli dönüşümler geçirmiştir. Güven kavramı da üzerinde tartışılan ve önem kazanan bir konu olmuştur.

Çalışmada kamu yönetimi paradigmaları çerçevesinde güven olgusu incelenmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı, devletin açıklığa dair uygulamalarının vatandaşın devlete olan güveni üzerindeki etkisini değerlendirmektir. Açık devletlerin halkın güveni üzerindeki etkisini ölçmek amacıyla; Avrupa sosyal araştırma verileri ile World Justice Project tarafından geliştirilen açık devlet indeksinin verileri kullanılmıştır. Ülkelerin, açık devlet olma düzeylerinin kamu yönetimine duyulan güveni etkileyip etkilemediğini incelemek amacıyla ilk olarak Kruskal Wallis testi uygulanmış, sonrasında elde edilen farklılığın kaynağını tespit etmek amacıyla Mann whitney-u testi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular sonucunda açık devletin güveni olumlu düzeyde etkilediği tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu yönetimi, güven, açık devlet

Introduction

There is currently no consensus among trust theorists regarding the definition of trust, despite its crucial role in regulating our daily lives. Broadly speaking, trust entails having an expectation and belief that the other party will honor their commitments.

How is trust formed? The perspectives on trust formation provide an answer. From a cultural perspective, trust is considered a permanent trait that is learned during early life, primarily from one's parents. Experiential theories of trust formation, on the other hand, argue that trust is formed by lived experiences. (Sønderskov & Dinesen, 2016, p. 180). From an experiential perspective, impartial and efficient government institutions that in some way influence citizen conduct also foster confidence. (Rothstein & Stolle, 2008, p. 21). Open data sharing by the government will enhance economic growth through transparency and accountability (Eroğlu, 2019, p. 435).

The Weberian paradigm is linked to the Identity-based Trust framework, whereas the New Public Management model is linked to the Calculus-based Trust regime and the New Public Governance model is linked to the Relational Trust regime. Schmidhuber, Ingrams and Hilgers (2020, p. 93) propose an additional approach to trust in open government.

The aim of this study is to assess the evolution of trust in public administration and explore the correlation between open government policies and trust regime. Can open state practices influence trust in public administration? This research seeks to provide an answer. The European Social Survey was utilized to obtain data on public institutions' trust, and the World Justice Project was consulted for the open state index.

Trust within the Framework of Public Administration Paradigms

The idea of trust in public administration was first introduced and thoroughly examined following the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989, through the publication of "Trust" by Francis Fukuyama; a conservative Japanese-American author (Örmeci,

2015, p. 1). Fukuyama claimed that a society's innate sense of trust is the cultural characteristic that determines its well-being and perception of competition in the economy. The adherence to moral values in society may foster the expectation of consistent and truthful conduct which, in turn, can cultivate a sense of trust within society (Fukuyama, 2005, p. 11).

There appear to be discernible differences among various categories of typologies, models, theories and trust (Shapiro et al. 1992, pp. 366-376; Lewicki and Bunker 1996, p. 119; Rousseau et al. 1998, pp. 398-401; Muthusamy and White 2005, pp. 420-423). Bouckaert (2012, p. 17) differentiates three trust regimes, each with a distinct public approach. In addition, Schmidhuber, Ingrams, and Hilgers (2021, p. 93) suggest a trust regime approach bridging open government and trust.

Weberian Approach (Identity-based Trust)

The initial perspective presented is that of the Weberian or Neo-Weberian hierarchical system, which embodies the principles of traditional bureaucracy. The Weberian ideology advocates for the clear definition of rights and responsibilities, with bureaucrats being instrumental in shaping the public sector. This positioning of bureaucrats and their perceived identity are key factors in determining the level of trust within the system. Accordingly, the roles and responsibilities of public officials are key determinants of trust (Schmidhuber et al. 2021, p. 92).

The state is founded on the exercise of power and violence. Its sovereignty is grounded on three factors, namely, traditional, charismatic, and legal-rational authority (Weber, 1993, pp. 132-133). Legal-rational authority is underpinned by logically arranged sets of laws and regulations. In this context, bureaucracy represents the most sophisticated manifestation of legal-rational dominance (Duverger, 1998, p. 186).

Bureaucracy and legal-rational authority are contemporary methods of government and organization. Weber formulated three types of authority, yet it was the traditional authority that underpinned the traditional organizational framework; charismatic authority governed established systems like monarchies and rational-

legal authority governed bureaucratic organizational structures. The bureaucratic organizational structure operates within a framework of predetermined duties, rules, and filing systems. It is characterized by certainty, predictability, division of labor, hierarchy, standardization, continuity, specialization, merit, seniority, career, discipline, and control (Weber, 2005, pp. 44-49).

Weber proposed that the ideal bureaucracy comprises five elements: a hierarchical structure founded on functional specialization clearly defined powers and duties written records that enable predictive power; codes of conduct and informal relationships. Weber posited that the model of a bureaucracy should be anchored in tradition, continuous, disciplined and dependable, in contrast to other forms of organizations (Yeniçeri, 2002, p. 62). In bureaucracies, job descriptions are explicitly defined, and roles are assigned in accordance with the hierarchy, with each position being filled by an expert (Özkalp & Kirel, 2001, pp. 35-36). Powers and authority are rational and depend on legal rules and position (Peker, 1995, p. 87). Each employee is required to follow the instructions of their supervisor and only give orders to their subordinates. This results in a bureaucracy comprised of professional officers who advance their careers through vertical promotion. A person's career advancement, his/her discipline as long as he/she worked, the benefits and drawbacks of the profession and his/her departure from the profession would be determined in detail and take place under various conditions (Duverger, 1998, p. 187). Weber posits that the most rational approach to organizational management is one that aligns with hierarchical bureaucracy. Such a structure ensures that management adheres to pre-determined rules, resulting in a fair and proficient management system.

The notion that the bureaucratic operations of the state differ fundamentally from the management of private economic enterprises is unique to continental Europe, whereas in America, the opposite is the case. To manage departments or offices, a high level of specialized training is necessary - a requirement shared by both the private sector and civil servants. The primary

responsibilities of bureaucratic authority within public organizations and bureaucratic management in the private sector are to oversee compliance with established rules and regulations, ensure the appropriate selection, placement, and management of skilled personnel, and issue commands as necessary. Effective workplace management requires a stable and comprehensive understanding of learnable rules and specialized technical training for officials. Law, public administration, and business studies are the focal points of this educational course (Weber, 1993, p. 292). The primary responsibility of a civil servant who has undergone specialized training is to impartially manage their duties. Their obligation is to perform their tasks without any bias or prejudice. Secondly, it is expected of them to avoid conflicts. Thirdly, as the duties of a political leader differ greatly from those of a civil servant, the civil servant is obliged to follow the instructions of their superior, even if these instructions are incorrect (Weber, 1993, pp. 155-156).

Contemporary public administration is characterized by the pre-existence of abstract rules, rather than issuing orders on every matter. This is in stark contrast to the granting of personal privileges and the bestowal of absolute domination in patrimonialism. Accordingly, the system required to be a civil servant and to be established while carrying out this duty should be constructed as follows (Weber, 1993, pp. 295-296).

The professional advancement of the elected official is not contingent on the superior manager, at least not primarily. The official who assumes the role through appointment by their superior, as opposed to by means of election, typically fulfils a more precise and discerning function. This is because, all other factors considered equal, it is more probable that solely functional reasons and qualities are the decisive factors in their appointment and future prospects. Determining senior executives and their political aides through elections can hinder their ability to perform their duties effectively and impede the smooth functioning of the bureaucracy. It also undermines the commitment of public officials to their superiors in the hierarchy. The existence of various legal guarantees in the case of dismissals and transfers due to arbitrariness will enable those

in the bureaucracy to function without worrying (Weber, 1993, pp. 297-298).

Officials frequently worked in return for nominal security. Salaries were measured by status, type of function, rank, and perhaps terms of service, rather than by job, which is the case with workers' remuneration. Civil servants desire a mechanized rise in promotion and salary, determined by the grades achieved in seniority or specialty examinations. They should be established based on the grade achieved in either the seniority or the specialty examination (Weber, 1993, pp. 298-300). The modern bureaucratic structure necessitates social and economic preconditions. Though the establishment of the monetary economy is a prominent prerequisite, it is not essential for bureaucratization. A fixed income is, however, required to sustain the bureaucracy as a permanent structure. The civil servant should also receive a regular salary (Weber, 1993, p. 307).

Specialized bureaucracy is superior to other forms of management in both its technical and non-technical aspects. Corrective measures can help decrease friction, financial and personal costs by increasing accuracy, speed, clarity, continuity, confidentiality, file information, similar measures and complete reliance whilst performing the task (Weber, 1993, p. 308). Weber argues that the issue with the German state bureaucracy is not rooted in the bureaucracy's cultural embodiment of instrumental rationality, but rather in its unlawful extension of administrative duties into the realm of political leadership (Gay, 2002, p. 76). Weber argued that the capitalist market economy was one of the institutions that desired official administrative affairs in Germany to proceed flawlessly during his time. Bureaucratization refers to conducting business in an impartial manner. The bureaucracy will develop perfectly to the extent that it becomes increasingly separate from humanity, a nature beneficial to capitalism. The peculiar character of bureaucracy is celebrated as its unique virtue. In fact, the implementation of a rational legal system is founded on bureaucracy (Weber, 1993, pp. 309-310). Capitalism is personality-free rationality (Weber, 1993, p. 127).

New Public Management: Calculus-Based Trust

The New Public Management approach, in contrast, employs an account-based trust system founded on financially defined change and accountability. Citizens provide data relating to their expectations, perceptions, satisfaction, and trust in government services, whilst the public sector presents quality models and financial data, along with making comparisons of budget performance. In this era of trust, the decline in confidence in public administration is a result of the government's inadequate performance. To reinstate faith in the government, the public sector must elevate its performance (Schmidhuber et al. 2021, p. 92).

Minnowbrook II differed from Minnowbrook I's assertion that public administration should take the lead on social issues. It encompassed a new vision that incorporated principles such as democracy, ethics, responsibility, philosophy and rational practices, including economics. The two main arguments that were highlighted were: firstly, the renewed emphasis on citizens, stressing interdependence over self-interest, and secondly, the significant role public officials play in the social system. Society should seek the assistance of public administrators to resolve persistent issues. Despite the stagnation of interest in social equality, a notable emphasis has been placed on prioritizing democratic values in public administration. A declaration regarding leadership, accountability, and ethics in public administration has been made, though the debate on normative and behavioral perspectives persists. The value of acknowledging societal and workforce differences remains a central tenet among all participants. Diversity was defined within the scope of multiculturalism, encompassing racial, ethnic, gender, and specialist diversities (Garcia, 2003, pp. 98-99).

Efficient, cost-effective and well-organized service management has always been the key to the ideal public administration. Moreover, budgeting, organization, management, system analysis, planning, personnel, and procurement are perceived as essential topics in high-level municipal management and basic support services. NPA enhances the conventional purpose and rationale by promoting social equality

(Frederickson, 1989, p. 97). In traditional or conventional public administration, the NPA criteria involve determining whether the service offered will aid in social equality by reducing expenses (being cost-effective) while also providing superior service (Frederickson, 1971, p. 283).

Frederickson asserts that pluralistic government discriminates against minorities who lack political and economic resources, such as temporary or permanent farm workers. Such discrimination results from the government's preference for established, fixed bureaucracies and their specialized minority clients, such as the Ministry of Agriculture and large-scale farms. The prevalence of high levels of unemployment, poverty, disease, lack of education and dependence is a negative outcome that can arise during a period of unparalleled economic expansion. This should be condemned on ethical grounds. If this condition persists over an extended period of time, it could jeopardize the viability of any political system. Self-restraint in times of plenty may lead to widespread conflict. Frederickson observed that the public administration has failed to find a solution to the deprivation of minorities. He defines all activities aimed at improving the economic welfare and political power of minorities as social equality (Frederickson, 1971, p. 283).

NPA conducts a systematic investigation into policies and structures that impede social equality. The commitment to social equality not only encompasses the pursuit of change, but also seeks to identify organizational and political models capable of ongoing resilience and habitual change. Traditional bureaucracy has demonstrated a proven capacity for stability. NPA intends to promote and test transformed bureaucratic-organizational models in the analysis of variable structures. Localization, delegation of authority, projects, contracts, sensitivity/awareness training, organizational development, increasing responsibility, confrontation and customer dependence are all defining characteristics of NPA and differ from bureaucratic concepts. Concepts are developed to enhance the potential for social equality, administrative transformation and policy change (Frederickson, 1971, pp. 283-284). The

implementation of a plan-program-budget system, managerial inventory, and social indicators can contribute to the necessary reforms within public administration, and encourage social equality (Frederickson, 1971, p. 284).

Conventional public administration places emphasis on the development and strengthening of institutions to tackle social problems. However, the focus of public administration often strays from institutional concerns. NPA aims to shift the focus back to problems and considers alternative institutional approaches to address these issues. Monetary and manpower investment issues plague institutions responsible for addressing persistent public issues such as urban poverty, widespread drug use, and high crime rates. Public administrators are therefore exploring transforming institutions or developing changes designed to introduce novel and effective solutions (Frederickson, 1971, p. 284).

Lambright's definition of public administration is "public policymaking." Therefore, public administration encompasses both policy and management, drawing upon and shaping orientations across numerous disciplines and specialisms. The historical demarcation between politics and management, however, is eroding, though its spectra still linger. It is widely acknowledged that public administration operates within a political context, necessitating that managers negotiate with the surrounding forces. The manager is involved in the political process; however, their role is not restricted to this. They undertake crucial tasks that entail utilizing personnel, funds and other resources to attain organizational objectives. Nonetheless, research studies have not formulated a model that encompasses both of these roles. The segregation of practice and discipline into two branches results in pessimism. If a public administrator does not function as both an operator (manager) and a politician, they would be unable to formulate public policy. The public administrator cannot focus solely on program direction, otherwise effective management will be neglected. To be an effective public official, it is necessary to fulfill both policy-making and managerial duties, which are essential and honorable tasks. The public

administrator failed due to not performing both roles (Lambright, 1971, pp. 332-334).

New Public Governance: Relational Trust

One additional category of trust regime conceptualizes public trust primarily as a subjective evaluation of government performance information interpreted by individuals (Welch et al. 2005, p. 387). This is a trust regime based on shared knowledge, values, and goals, as described by Bouckaert (2012, p. 16) in the context of new public governance. Within the scope of public governance, there are five different branches, the first of which is socio-political governance. The study of governance can be categorized into three major schools, namely corporate governance, good governance, and public governance. Scholars in this area argue that a comprehensive understanding of the relationships involved in the formulation and execution of public policies is essential. Governments must comprehend that they lack superiority in public policy and depend on other social actors for the legitimacy of practices and the effects they bring about. The second part involves the interaction between policy elites and networks. "Meta-governance" is a recent example of a multi-stakeholder governance network. The third part is administrative governance. It is argued that the disorder will be eliminated through the repositioning of public administration, implementation of public policies, and delivery of public services. This can be achieved if it keeps up with the contemporary world. The fourth aspect is the management of contractual relationships in public service provision under the new public governance. Although modern contracted agencies have limited control, this can be attributed to the fact that the public has become more accountable. The fifth pillar concerns network governance. It has a specific focus on networks that provide public services. It deals with how self-organizing networks function to provide public services both with and without government (Osborne, 2010, p. 6-7).

Open Government

The idea behind "open government" is the capacity to access and consistently employ the resources held by the state without any limitations for the first time (Tauberer, 2014, p. 1). The notion of "open government" denotes individuals' unrestricted access to state-held resources for continuous use. The publicity of government data refers to the availability of legal information for open access. It also includes the idea that government data ought to be available to the public, a belief that can be traced back to Ancient Greece, though its precise origins are unclear. The open accessibility of government data to the law is what is meant by the term "publicity (Tauberer, 2012, p.1). The concept of open government gained widespread use in 2009 when the Open Government Directive was published as part of the policies amended by President Barack Obama in the United States. The concept of open government was defined, and the state application "data.gov" was launched to further this objective (Tauberer, 2014, p. 8). Subsequently, many governments embarked on similar applications through various web portals (Ubaldi, 2013, p. 11). Transparent and accountable open government management requires accessible data generated by the public administration during business processes. This, on the other hand, is expected to promote innovative services and economic growth (Ayers, 2007, p. 95). The open government trust regime is a fourth iteration (Schmidhuber et al. 2021, p. 92). Making state-owned data accessible through a variety of applications is an approach that strives to enable the frequent use of this data, thus providing economic, social, and political advantages in this regard (Eroğlu, 2018, p. 462).

Although the concept of open government shares some similarities with new public governance, such as focusing on citizen engagement and cooperation in state work, it also diverges significantly from traditional governance. Open government is closely linked with technological advancements, including internet platforms and mobile connectivity. Open governments aim to involve citizens as active participants and co-producers in the political system by extensively utilizing the opportunities

presented by digitalization. Open government reformists strive to incorporate citizens' input into policy solutions and fulfill their right to information by disclosing government data online (Schmidhuber et al. 2021, pp. 92-93).

Method

Data Collection Tools

The study is based on the core premise that open government enhances citizens' trust in public institutions and organizations. The null hypothesis, H0, posits that open government has a positive impact on such trust. The study aimed to address the following research questions.

H1: The level of openness of states has a significant positive effect on citizens' trust in Parliament.

H2: The level of openness of states has a significant positive effect on citizens' trust in the rule of law.

H3: The level of openness of states has a significant positive effect on citizens' trust in the police.

H4: The level of openness of states has a significant positive effect on citizens' trust in politicians.

H5: The level of openness of states has a significant positive effect on citizens' trust in political parties.

Data from various sources were used to test hypotheses. Open government data from the "World Justice Project" (WJP) were utilized to access country-level data. The "European Social Project" (ESS) was used as a point of reference to obtain data at the individual level.

The World Justice Project (WJP) is a self-governing organization that seeks to generate, mobilize and promote knowledge and awareness to assure the rule of law. The WJP was established in 2006 with the backing of the American Bar Association (ABA) and 21 additional strategic partners. According to the WJP, the rule of law is defined as the collection of codes, institutions, norms and community commitments that guarantee the principles of responsible conduct, equitable justice, transparent governance, ease of access and unbiasedness. Based on the four

fundamental principles outlined in the WJP definition, the Rule of Law Index for countries is structured around eight primary factors. Open Government Factor (OGF) is a component of WJP's Rule of Law Index that assesses a country's structural openness (The World Justice Project, 2022). The Open Government Factor assesses the accessibility of fundamental laws and legal rights information to the public and evaluates the quality of information the government publishes. It is comprised of four distinct dimensions: laws and government data, the right to information, civil engagement, and grievance mechanisms. The study employs OGF, which was introduced in 2022, and scores range from 0 to 1. As the scores attained by the countries near 1, it is acknowledged that the country is more open (The World Justice Project 2022).

The European Social Project is an academic research program that has been international in scope since its establishment in 2001. As a comprehensive survey research initiative, it provides data on a wide range of indicators that the data obtained through the research program can be compared on the basis of different countries (European Social Survey, 2022).

Within the framework of the European social initiative, participants are interviewed face-to-face every two years. To date, ten research stages have been completed, and the 2020 data from the tenth stage are employed in this analysis. This initiative seeks to gauge the level of trust that European citizens place in their country's parliament, legal system, police force, politicians, and political parties. The study considers five variables as a trust scale across countries. Each variable's confidence level was rated on an 11-point Likert scale, where "0" represents "no trust at all" and "10" represents "full trust" (European Social Survey Round 10, 2020). Trust in public administration is highly linked to trust in political institutions, according to Van de Walle, Van Roosbroek, and Bouckaert (2008). Therefore, trust in these five institutions implies trust in public administration.

Data Classification and Analysis

The analysis incorporated responses from participants in European countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Finland, Netherlands, Croatia, Italy, Lithuania, Hungary, Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Greece) with available data in the European Social Project, based on the open government index scores specified in the World Justice Project.

The European countries¹ included in the study, in this study underwent a triple classification based on the ranking of their open state index scores. As per the classification, countries such as Norway, Finland, Netherlands, Estonia, France, and Lithuania, which have open state scores of 0.75 and above, are categorized as “Level 1 Open Government”; since the open government scores of “Czechia, Slovakia, Portugal, Slovenia, Italy, Croatia” are between 0.74-0.61, these states are named as “Level 2 Open Government”; and since the open government scores of “Greece, Bulgaria, Hungary and North Macedonia” are in the range of 0.60 and below, these states are named as “Level 3 Open Government”. Table 1 demonstrates the sample distributions of the countries included in the analysis (European Social Survey Round 10, 2020), including the number of participants and the percentage of samples, which varies by country due to the ESS’s sampling approach.

Table 1. Number of samples by country

Countries	Sample Number
Bulgaria	2,718
Czech Republic	2,476
Estonia	1,542
France	1,977
Finland	1,577
Netherlands	1,470
Croatia	1,592
Macedonia	1,429
Italy	2,640
Lithuania	1,659
Hungary	1,849
Norway	1,411
Portugal	1,838
Slovakia	1,418
Slovenia	1,252
Greece	2,799

¹Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Finland, Netherlands, Croatia, Italy, Lithuania, Hungary, Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Greece.

Findings

The data obtained was analyzed using the SPSS 21 program. In order to determine which statistical technique could be used to test whether the level of trust citizens have in public institutions, specifically public administration, differs depending on the level of open government, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was employed. For testing normality in large samples, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is often preferred. Statistical analysis showed that the data did not follow a normal distribution ($p < 0.05$) and thus, the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was used to answer the research questions. Table 2 presents the statistical results obtained.

Table 2. Results of Kruskal-Wallis test assessing citizen trust in public administration by the level of open government.

	Country	N	Mean Rank	X (Chi-Square)	p	Significant Difference
Trust in Parliament	Level 1 (A)	9636	18017,19	2193,768	,000	A-B: A-C: B-C
	Level 2 (B)	11,216	14002,54			
	Level 3 (C)	8,795	12373,05			
Trust in the rule of law	Level 1 (A)	9636	18458,19	2611,680	,000	A-B: A-C: B-C
	Level 2 (B)	11,216	12914,72			
	Level 3 (C)	8,795	13277,14			
Trust in police department	Level 1 (A)	9636	17877,71	1952,835	,000	A-B: A-C: B-C
	Level 2 (B)	11,216	13897,54			
	Level 3 (C)	8,795	12659,78			
Trust in the politicians	Level 1 (A)	9636	18182,96	2235,414	,000	A-B: A-C
	Level 2 (B)	11,216	13274,37			
	Level 3 (C)	8,795	13120,04			
Trust in political parties	Level 1 (A)	9636	17932,70	1918,991	,000	A-B: A-C: B-C
	Level 2 (B)	11,216	13456,80			
	Level 3 (C)	8,795	13161,59			
Public trust in general ²	Level 1 (A)	9636	18531,03	2710,546	,000	A-B: A-C: B-C
	Level 2 (B)	11,216	13334,91			
	Level 3 (C)	8,795	12661,49			

According to the results of the analysis, the scores of participants’ trust in parliament ($X=2193,768$; $p < 0.05$), trust in the rule of law ($X=2611,680$; $p < 0.05$), trust in police department

² Average of trust in Parliament, the rule of law, the police, politicians and political parties.

($X=1952.835$ $p<0.05$), trust in politicians ($X=2235,414$; $p<0.05$), trust in political parties ($X=1918.991$; $p<0.05$), and public trust in general ($X=1918.991$; $p<0.05$) differ significantly.

Upon analysis of the average rank data, it is evident that the highest rank (18531.03) for the public trust in general belongs to the Level 1 open governments, while the lowest rank (12661.49) belongs to the Level 3 open governments. Level 1 open governments have the highest rank average of trust in parliament, trust in the rule of law, trust in police department, trust in political parties and politicians. Level 3 open governments have the lowest average rank for trust in parliament, trust in police department, trust in politicians and political parties. The countries with the lowest average rank in terms of trust in the rule of law are Level 2 open governments.

Mann Whitney U test was applied for each type of trust in order to determine the source of significant differentiation in all dimensions. Table 3 presents the test results, indicating that participants in “Level 1 open government” demonstrated higher trust levels in the parliament, rule of law, police department, political parties, politicians, and the general public than their counterparts in Level 2 and 3 governments. Participants within the “Level 2 open government” category demonstrate higher levels of trust than those in “Level 3 open government” towards the parliament, rule of law, police department, political parties, and public in general. The test results indicate no significant difference in levels of trust towards politicians between the two categories. It has been determined that individuals in states with a higher degree of openness exhibit greater trust towards public institutions.

Table 3. Results of Mann whitney u test on the effect of governments on public trust by the level of open government

	Country levels	N	Mean Rank	U	z	p	Significant Difference
Trust in Parliament	Level1 (A)	9636	11966,49	39189298,5	-34,463	,000	A-B
	Level2 (B)	11216	9103,44				
	Level1 (A)	9636	10869,20	26444077,0	-44,424	,000	A-C
	Level3 (C)	8795	7404,72				
	Level2 (B)	11216	10507,59	43696487,5	-13,972	,000	B-C
	Level3 (C)	8795	9366,33				
Trust in the rule of law	Level1 (A)	9636	12557,79	33501577,0	-47,669	,000	A-B
	Level2 (B)	11216	8595,45				
	Level 1 (A)	9636	10718,90	27892347,5	-40,384	,000	A-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	7569,39				
	Level 2 (B)	11216	9927,78	48445027,5	-2,175	,030	B-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	10105,75				
Trust in police department	Level 1 (A)	9636	11962,38	39238987,0	-34,486	,000	A-B
	Level 2 (B)	11216	9106,98				
	Level 1 (A)	9636	10733,83	27748501,0	-40,899	,000	A-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	7553,03				
	Level 2 (B)	11216	10399,05	44913874,0	-10,948	,000	B-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	9504,75				
Trust in the politicians	Level 1 (A)	9636	12281,42	36164676,0	-41,553	,000	A-B
	Level 2 (B)	11216	8832,88				
	Level 1 (A)	9636	10720,04	27881366,0	-40,467	,000	A-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	7568,14				
	Level 2 (B)	11216	10049,99	48828953,0	-1,229	,219	-
	Level 3 (C)	8795	9949,90				
Trust in political parties	Level 1 (A)	9636	12117,81	37741258,0	-37,885	,000	A-B
	Level 2 (B)	11216	8973,45				
	Level 1 (A)	9636	10633,39	28716343,0	-38,136	,000	A-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	7663,08				
	Level 2 (B)	11216	10091,85	48359441,5	-2,397	,017	B-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	9896,52				
Public trust in general ³	Level 1 (A)	9636	12409,76	34928002,0	-44,112	,000	A-B
	Level 2 (B)	11216	8722,67				
	Level 1 (A)	9636	10939,77	25764073,5	-46,052	,000	A-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	7327,40				
	Level 2 (B)	11216	10220,79	46913328,5	-5,942	,000	B-C
	Level 3 (C)	8795	9732,09				

³ Average of trust in Parliament, the rule of law, the police, politicians and political parties.

Conclusion

Trust is an essential element in interpersonal relationships. However, Fukuyama argues that various types of trust exist among different cultures, which can impact economic and political relations. Weber suggested predetermined rules and appointment criteria for public employees to establish a specialized bureaucracy that can engender high levels of trust through clearly defined roles and responsibilities. In the context of Public Administration, government performance has a direct impact on trust. Criteria such as efficiency, effectiveness, social justice, and equality of government activities can determine the level of trust placed in the government. In the context of evaluating relational trust, the reliability of trustworthiness is examined through socio-political relationships, interactions among policy elites and networks, administrative governance, governance of contractual relationships and network governance within public governance. Trust in open government has a symbiotic relationship. Governments trust citizens by providing them with data access and the opportunity to influence politics. In turn, citizens have faith in public institutions. Positive attitudes towards public institutions are linked to a beneficial view of citizen influence. Governments should publish data, establish a legal infrastructure for information access, and enable access to institutional processes for citizens. Trust based on expertise will evolve into mutual trust over time. Open governance is more than just a transient phenomenon. It has the potential to fundamentally alter the comprehension of the political-administrative system, affecting the core of constitutional and democratic governing structures. Following years of initial testing and technical piloting in specific regions, it is vital to categorise data and types of openness that can generate public benefit by increasing innovation potential, optimising performance and reinforcing legitimacy. For both public institutions and private sector enterprises, it is imperative to establish strategies for openness and initiate their implementation. This necessity's emergence appears to be a matter that the political sphere,

administrative practice, and scientific community should not underestimate.

The research presents evidence that citizens have greater confidence in the public sector, namely public institutions, within nations where there is a high level of government transparency. Although empirical studies suggest that transparency does not always have a positive impact on trust in the government (Mabillard & Pasquier, 2016, p. 87), the presented data argue the opposite. The research illustrates how citizens' trust towards parliament, the rule of law, the police department, politicians, and political parties fluctuates depending on the degree of openness within the government. Overall, it is inferred that public institutions are more trusted in states with higher scores in the open government index. Additionally, the investigation signifies a beneficial correlation between citizens residing in open governments and their trust levels.

Limitations of the study: The data utilized in this article were obtained from two indices, the European Social Survey and the World Justice Project. Moreover, mediating variables that may have an impact on trust in public administration were not taken into account in this study.

References

- Ayers, D. (2007). Evolving the link. *IEEE Internet Computing*. 11(3). 94–95. doi: 10.1109/MIC.2007.53
- Bouckaert, G. (2012). Reforming for Performance and Trust: Some Reflections. Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe. *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 5(1), 9–20
- Duverger, M. (1998). *Political sociology*. İstanbul: Varlık Publications.
- Eroğlu, Ş. (2019), Socio-economic Value of Open Government Data and Barriers to Use: Türkiye in International Indicators, Yalçınkaya, B., Ünal, M. A., Yılmaz, B. ve Özdemirci, F.(Ed.), *Information Management and Information Security in the Industry 4.0 Process: eDocument-eArchive-eGovernment-Cloud Computing-Big Data Artificial Intelligence*. (pp. 431-449), Ankara: Ankara University Information Management

- Systems Certification and Information Center.
- Eroğlu, Ş. (2018). Open government and open government practices: An evaluation of public institutions in Turkey. *DTCF Dergisi*, 58(1), 462-495.
- European Social Survey (ESS). *About the European social survey european research infrastructure* <https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/about/> [accessed November 15, 2022].
- European Social Survey Round 10 Data (ESS-10). 2020. *Integrated file, edition 2.2 10.18712/ess10e02_2*. <https://ess-search.nsd.no/en/study/172ac431-2a06-41df-9dab-c1fd8f3877e7> [accessed December 29, 2022].
- Fukuyama, F. (2005). *Trust (social virtues and creation of prosperity)*. (Trans. Buğdaycı, A.). Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bank Publications.
- Frederickson, H. G. (1971). Organization theory and new public administration, in F. Marini (Ed.). *Toward a New Public Administration - The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Philadelphia: Chandler Press.
- Fredericson, H. G. (1989). Minnowbrook II. changing epochs of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 49(2), 95-100.
- Gil Garcia, J. R. (2003). Toward a public administration: Minnowbrook III. a reflection and proposal. *Ciencia Ergo Sum*, Marzo. 10(1). 98-99.
- Gay, P. D. (2002). *Praise for bureaucracy (Weber-Organization-Ethics)*. Istanbul: Değişim Publications.
- Lambright, W. H. (1971) The Minnowbrook perspective and the future of public affairs: public administration is public-policy making. F. Marini (Ed.). *Toward A New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. (pp.332-346).
- Lewicki, R.J and B.B. Bunker (1996), Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. M Kramer, Roderick and T.Tyler, Rom (Ed), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, (pp.114-139), London: Sage Publications.
- Mabillard, V., and Pasquier, M. (2016). Transparency and trust in government (2007–2014): A comparative study. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 9(2), 69-92.
- Marini, F. (Ed.) (1971). *Toward a new public administration- the minnowbrook perspective*. (3. Thrd). Cleveland USA: Chandler Press.
- Muthusamy, Senthil K., and Margaret A. White. (2005). Learning and knowledge transfer in strategic alliances: a social exchange view. *Organization Studies*, 26(3), 415–441.
- Osborne, S. P.(2010). *The new public governance?*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Özkalp, E. & Kirel, Ç. (2001). *Organizational behavior*, Publication Nu: 149. Eskişehir: Anadolu University Education, Health and Scientific Research Foundation.
- Peker, Ö. (1995). *Continuity of management improvement*. Publication Nu: 258, Ankara: TODAİE Publications.
- Rothstein, B., & Stolle, D. (2008). The state and social capital. An institutional theory of generalized trust. *Comparative Politics*, 40(4), 441–460.
- Rousseau, D., Sitkin, M., Burt, S.B. vd. (1998), Not so different after at all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23, 393-404.
- Schmidhuber, L., Ingrams, A. and Hilgers, D. (2021). Government openness and public trust: the mediating role of democratic capacity. *Public Administration Review*. 81(1), 91-109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13298>
- Shapiro, D.L., Sheppard, D.H. and C. Cheraskin (1992). Business on a handshake. *Negotiation Journal*. 8(4), 365-377.
- Sønderskov, K.M., Dinesen, P.T. (2016) Trusting the state, trusting each other? the effect of institutional trust on social trust. *Polit Behav* 38, 179–202.
- Örmeci, O. (2015). *Francis Fukuyama, Star Kıbrıs*, <http://starkibris.net/index.asp?haberID=218475> [accessed December 12, 2022].
- Tauberer, J. (2012). *Ancient Origins of Open Access to Law*. <https://opengovdata.io/2014/ancient-origins-open-access-to-law/> [accessed May 1, 2023]
- Tauberer, J. (2014). *Open government data: the book*. <https://opengovdata.io> [accessed November 10, 2022].
- Weber, M. (1993). *Sociology articles*, (Trans. Parla, T.). Istanbul: İletişim Publications.
- Weber, M. (2005). *Bureaucracy and authority*, İstanbul: Adres Publications.

- Fişek, K. (1975). *Management*, Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences Publications.
- Ubaldi, B. (2013). *Open government data: towards empirical analysis of open government data initiatives*. Paris: OECD. 15, <https://www.oecdilibrary.org/docserver/5k46bj4f03s7en.pdf?expires=1671182585&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=0B32CE73102F43BF4ECC676138B6C20E> [accessed November 15, 2022].
- The World Justice Project (2022). *Overview, what is the rule of law?*, <https://worldjusticeproject.org/about-us/overview/what-rule-law> [accessed November 11, 2022].
- The World Justice Project (2022). *Rule of law index, countries scored by open government*. <https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/global/2022/Open%20Government> [accessed November 13, 2022].
- Welch, Eric W., Charles C. Hinnant, and M. Jae Moon. (2005). Linking citizen satisfaction with e-government and trust in government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 15(3), 371–391.
- Van de Walle, S., Roosbroek S.V., and Bouckaert G. (2008). Trust in the public sector: is there any evidence for a long-term decline?. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 74(1), 47–64.
- Yeniçeri, Ö. (2002), *Management of organizational change*, Ankara: Nobel Publications.