

Measurement and Evaluation of Institutional Trust during Three Generations of Iranian People

Afshar Kabiri¹

Assistant Professor of Sociology, Oroumiyeh University, Iran

Reza Mojarab²

Ph.D. Student of Sociology, Payam-e Noor University, Iran

Bagher Hoseinpour³

Ph.D. Student of Sociology, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

Received 16 January 2014

Revised 20 February 2014

Accepted 14 March 2014

Abstract: Social trust is an important component of social development and modern development that has special significance in social science debate today. One of the main factors of social trust is the trust in organizations that are considered as institutional trust in social researches. This type of trust is analyzed in the present study and it has been tried to determine this kind of trust in the society by using the data from the "fifth wave of the World Values Surveys" in Iran. In fact, the goal is to recognize confidence in institutions in age grouping based on the sociological concept of "race". The findings of the present study show that the mean institutional trust among the people is "average" and erosion process of intergenerational comparisons (but less) can be seen, while there is a significant difference between the institutional trust of first generation (55 years or older) and third generation (15 to 29 years).

Keywords: Social capital, Institutional Trust, Generational, generational experience, age.

Introduction

Trust as one of the main components of social capital, has found a special place in the social sciences and in particular issues related to social capital theory today. The reason of this attention, especially in recent decades, is consistency issues such as globalization, increasing complexity, interaction and integration of social concerns and other factors. Trust is a social capital, and the most important aspect of human relations and collective social and essential for survival in the risky modern world. Lack of confidence causes delay in works and increases their costs, problems in relationships and interactions and in social participation, social orders and social health and overall development. Although uncontrolled trust is harmful, its reduction has more harmful effects in society (Ketabi et al, 1389, p 99). The importance of trust in society and its development turns the concept of development planning into consideration as far as the law of our development program is referred to (Mansour 1,384th., P. 144).

Trust as a product of each community's social, economic and historical situation shows itself in different ways and sociologists distinguish between types of trust. Giddens' is one of the theorists that distinguish between two trusts: trust in certain people, trust in people and abstract systems, while trust in certain people can be an important social capital. But abstract trust is an important feature of social capital at the national level (Sharee Poor, 1383, p 73).

It should be considered that trust in every shape and form, is not a genetic feature, it comes from historical, political, economic experiences in any society at any particular time. Several sociologists have different perspectives on this issue. "Fukuyama" believes that government is the most important factor in increasing social capital and trust (Fukuyama, 1384, pp. 193-195). "Patnam" knows dense horizontal networks associated with the creation and strengthening of civil society as an effective factor in trust (Patnam, 1992, p 162). And "Inglehart" relates different levels of trust between communities to different levels of socio - economic development of the people (Legislator Poor, 1383, p 83). Generational differences need to be noted in trust status along with historical, political, economic factors. In Mannheim's view, each generation, has its main period of social and political events, special formation seal (Young) on his forehead. Events during this experience are decisive with influence in determining differentiation and ideological determination of mental structure, culture and behavior and subsequent members of a generation (Mohseni Tabrizi et al, 1390, p 48.) As the society of Iran have experienced many political, social,

¹ Email: a.kabiri@urmia.ac.ir

² Email: Reza_mojarab@yahoo.com (Corresponding Author)

³ Email: Hoseinpour.b@gmail.com

... changes in the last century, it can be argued that along with the development of an atmosphere of trust and perceived generational relationships, groups and institutions have been changed. Present study is to confirm this issue and tries to evaluate institutional trust as an important dimension of social trust with emphasis on the generation of sociologists such as Mannheim during the last three generations of Iranian people. So the main question this paper seeks to answer is that how is the institutional trust status at a generation glance among Iranian people? And is there a difference between different generations of Iranian society in terms of this kind of trust? And if there is any, how is it?

Although several studies have been done in the field of social trust, it seems that not enough intergenerational studies have been conducted to compare the area and there is a need for further investigation. In addition, identifying trends in social trust and institutional trust across generations can identify certain social and cultural developments contribute to Iran society.

Research Background

Conducted researches on institutional trust should be searched in the studies related to social trust or social capital. One of the researches about institutional trust is Nateghpour et al that analyses the factors of social capital and effective factors in Tehran. His research has concluded that the average institutional trust (on a scale of 0 to 8) is 4/05 and the most important variables influencing the generation (young / middle-aged) are migration, education and religious belief (Nateghpour and colleagues, 1384, p 83). Another study involving Shareepoor's (and his colleagues) research entitled "Exploring the relationship between social capital and tolerance among students of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Tehran University and Allameh Tabatabai". The findings show that institutional trust is the most effective variable among all (social, moral, political). Correlation coefficient for this variable tolerant total was 0/204, and confirms 21% of the variability of the dependent variables (Shareepoor et al, 1388, p 90). Mohseni Tabrizi in his study compared the effect of intergenerational social trust and refers that subjective experience (presence of people in war and revolution) makes no difference between different generations in the evaluation of institutional coherence (assessment of performance, integrity, institutions and organizations justice), but generational mindset towards war and revolution can affect the assessment of the impact of generations of society. (Mohseni Tabrizi and colleagues, 1390, p 62).

Ketabi's research entitled "Measurement of social trust and its influencing factors in Chahar Mahal Bakhtiari province centers" showed that 19/6% of the respondents have high trust and 62/5 percent have average confidence and 17/5% of respondents are distrusted in institutions and organizations (Ketabi et al, 1390, p 119). Along with the research, Aghili in his study stresses a strong correlation between institutional trust and approach to environmental protection (Aghili et al, 1388, p 112).

Despite these studies and other studies, it should be noted that notion of institutional trust in several studies is not distinguished as a social trust and is studied and evaluated as a global variable in addition to other types of trust (interpersonal trust, generalized trust). It seems that this topic to be dependent to researcher orientation rather than theoretical orientation. Here are some researches with no separation between institutional trust and other kinds of trust. In particular, we investigate Vossoughi et al that mentioned social trust in Ardabil study and its findings suggest that there is a strong relationship between shared values and social confidence (Vossoughi, 1388, p 150). It is also possible to study Abbas Zadeh research entitled "Factors Affecting Students' Trust" that refers to the role of the social security in trust (Abas Zadeh, 1383, p 283).

Theoretical Framework

Comments and schools of trust can be divided and examined in two general approaches macro and micro level.

Micro-level Theories of Trust

Micro-level theories relate to individual factors in trust analyzing, those factors that affect the attitudes, exchanges or biological features and psychological characteristics of the individual or individuals. Theorists such as Ericsson, Coleman, and Johnson have analyzed the concept of trust in micro-level. Micro-level theorists chose micro-level analysis and reaction studies to interpret the meaning of trust level. For example, James Coleman believes that trust is an expectation that can be obtained through calculating income by calculator and rational person about individual or group of individuals or organizations. (Coleman, 1377, p 287) or Johnson argues that trust forms in the early years of growth and is influenced by the individual. It means that trust primarily returns on how large the population growth and the formation of individual character in community in their Early Childhood (Golabi, 1383,

p 54). Although the approaches to the micro-level relates to reality aspects, they seem to represent the trust in such approaches have not had many occasions in intergenerational studies. It can be said that intergeneration studies take look to the social events and social systems properties and macro-levels become more important.

Macro-level Theories of Trust

Macro-oriented theories know trust as a characteristic of social interaction and general features of social systems and overall conceptualized it as a collective attribute. Macro-oriented theorists are Tönnies, Myztał, Zetomka, Inglehart and Fukuyama. Tönnies said that terms of relationships based on trust are only in the community. He believes that trust cannot be created artificially. Trust is the basis of social cohesion and religious and moral values boost it to facilitate relationships. Self-oriented individuals of modern age cannot be trusted (Myztał, 1380, p 59). Myztał refers to three types of trust based on appropriate social order: the first type of trust is based on habit and according to an appropriate fixed and permanent order. The second type is based on knowledge and faith and is in accordance with the order, and the third type of trust is the trust in bonding and discipline for solving team problem. Robert Pattam believes that public trust is facilitated by the government and has the advantage that it can increase by using and it can reduce if they are not used (Pattam 1992, p. 166).

"Zetomka", in discussions on the structural conditions, suggests five conditions as the default which provides the action and could be the origin of a culture of trust and confidence and can direct towards a culture of mistrust. The first condition is the normative unity and the opposite of the normative confusion. Second structural condition is the stability of social order and its opposite is radical transformation. The third condition is social organization transparency, and the opposite of secrecy and mystery surround the organization. The fourth condition is being familiar or its opposite strangeness. The last structural condition is respondent persons and institutions and its opposite is being rogue and irresponsible (Zetomka, 1384, pp. 143-146). Inglehart believes that trust is important in creating a shared sense and cooperation. He argued that the high degree of development provides better and cheaper economic security to individuals and society and decreases the cost of risks related to trust to unfamiliar people. Lower level of trust in societies and periods of stagnation in Inglehart thoughts is the result of a misplaced confidence which can have irreparable damage to someone confiding into it (Vossoughi, 1388, p 143). Fukuyama affirms the factors such as expectations, norms and shared values and cooperative networks (kinship, friendship, community...), in his comments about the trust (ibid., p 144).

The views expressed in the comments section of "generation" indicates that a complete consensus about the concept of "generation" does not exist. Anthropologists know its meaning as "relative proportions" and its demographic meaning is "movement of crowd". Sociologists have described the generation with generational experiences (Qumi, 1384, p 88). Mannheim recognized three dimensions for generations:

1. Generational status,
2. Generation, as a fact,
3. Generation units.

Position of a generation determines the experience field and with people which is linked to those who were born in the same time with social - culture space, the people who shared the experience of historical events. So generation is a reality that recognizes common experiences of those with same historical-social culture relates to their current generation because historically they have a common destiny. So a generation as a reality will only include people who are historically in a same period (Diepstvaten, 1999, p 55). Generation unit is intended to be an age – biological group (Qummi, 1388, p 89).

"Daity" is also offers definition that influenced by Mannheim. He stressed the importance of experience as subjective and intellectual elements, and stresses their imprint on adolescence or early formation years. According to his theory, generation is a fact that appears in terms of generation units. Generation units in his idea are interconnected representations of the same generation and develop shared vision of social events (ibid., p 90). According to "Baker" a "generation," is a group of people who were born in a certain time interval and particular historical situation and the particular interests of individual and systemic level segregate generations (Baker, 1377, p 118). Generally, overview of conceptual issues about the generations will allow us to analyze the difference between the generations. If the basis of criteria such as age, shared experiences, socialization, historical events and important generational experience are used to apply for differentiate between generations, we can now separate it into three generations with reference to the Islamic Revolution:

1. 55 years and above (the generation before the Revolution): socialization in the early 1330s and 1340s.

2. 30-54 years and above (generation of war and revolution): Socialization in 1350s and the experience of revolution and war.
3. 15-29 years (the third generation): Socialization After years of revolution

It can be said that they represent three generations now, the younger generations, middle-aged, and old generation in the country.

Research Hypotheses

In this study, while evaluating of moderate levels of institutional trust (Average), the main hypothesis is posed and that there were significant differences between the average institutional trust in the community for generations.

Research Objectives

- The level of institutional trust in Iran society
- Knowledge of institutional trust in generations
- Analyzing the difference or lack of difference between the generations about institutional trust

Research Methodology

Type of Study: This article is documentary and is based on the available data. In other words the present study is a secondary analysis. The present data are based on data from the fifth wave of the World Values Survey project (WVS). International Group "World Values Survey" from the mid-1980s has begun its work and its outcome has provided rich data that enables a variety of studies, both at the national and supranational level. The project already implemented in five phases, but Iranian crude data is collected only in the last stage of fourth wave (2001-2000) and the fifth wave (2007-2005). Studied samples in the fifth wave "World Values Surveys" in Iran were 2638 of which 1322 were male and 1316 were female. Noteworthy in connection with the use of globally survey data in this study is that the existed items related to institutional trust in a questionnaire survey of world but generation variable) was created by three categories of age (first generation 55 years or older) second generation (30 - 54 years) and third generation (15-29 years) age of respondents (recode command using SPSS software).

Variables Definition

Organizational trust: Anthony Giddens defined trust in the abstract systems or institutional trust as a relationship for distancing extended time - place that was attendant for modernity (Giddens, 2001, p 112). To measure this variable, the dependent variable in this study represented as a 14-item measure of trust such as mosques, military, press, television, police, courts, government in organizations. Response range was between 1 (not at all) and 4 (very much) and the scale alpha value was calculated as 0/903, which represents highly desirable level of its validity. Generations: Karl Mannheim believed that the formation of social generation is not the result of the similarity of the date of birth, but can be understood in terms of historical events and shared experiences. These events make shared history of a generation. Based on such incidents, people reach a particular stage of development and perfection of consciousness and mind and this knowledge makes shared ideology and mentality of a generation. The ideology of the generation can impact attitudes, generation's behaviors and interpretation (Mohseni Tabrizi et al, 1390, p 53).

The "generation" in this study is those who are divided into three categories: elderly, middle-aged and young people and yet have the same socialization and shared historical experiences. In this way they are "pre-revolutionary generation," "War and post-war generation," and "after war generation".

Table (1): Generations' Separation components

after war: third generation	War and revolution generation	pre-revolutionary: first generation	Components
15 to 29 years	30 to 54 years	55 years and above	Age
1360s and 1370s - developments and processes of war	1340s and 1350s of revolution and war management	1320s and 1330s of governance and experienced of 15 Khordad	Socialization process and the unique experiences of each generation

Method of data analysis: descriptive statistics methods, percentage, mean have been used in statistical methods and F test (ANOVA) and Scheffe test have been used to determine the relationship between institutional trust and the generation.

Research Findings

However, statistical analyses of institutional trust shows that general mean of institutional trust in one scale was between 1 and 4 and was 2.45 among studied population that shows the average rate of institutional trust in organizations, while the highest institutional trust in the scale relates to the mosques with 3.1 and then to the charitable organizations, police and armed forces, with the average of 2.7. The least amount of trust relates to the political parties, with a mean of 2.1. Table 2 shows Institutional trust status to each of the studied organizations.

Table (2): Trust level in institutions and organizations among Iranian people

General mean	Average trust on a scale of 1 to 4	never	Not very high	high	Very high	Name of organization or institute	Row
2.45	3.1	0.02	0.22	0.31	0.44	mosques	1
	2.7	0.04	0.39	0.37	0.19	charitable organizations	2
	2.7	0.05	0.39	0.34	0.21	police	3
	2.7	0.03	0.39	0.36	0.21	armed forces	4
	2.6	0.05	0.45	0.32	0.17	government	5
	2.5	0.04	0.51	0.30	0.14	television	6
	2.5	0.07	0.50	0.27	0.15	court	7
	2.5	0.04	0.51	0.31	0.13	Environmental Protection Agency	8
	2.4	0.06	0.52	0.28	0.13	Parliament	9
	2.4	0.06	0.57	0.25	0.10	Women agency	10
	2.3	0.07	0.62	0.22	0.08	Public offices	11
	2.3	0.05	0.66	0.20	0.08	press	12
	2.2	0.05	0.69	0.18	0.07	Labor union	13
	2.1	0.14	0.65	0.14	0.06	Political parties	14

Table 3 presents the frequency and percentage of public trust in the institutions. Important point the most answers provided in this table (not very high) is 46%, which indicates the degree of trust in institutions and organizations in Iran is not appropriate.

Table (3): Frequency and percentage of public trust in the institutions

percent	frequency	Institutional trust
7.8	208	Very high
25.9	692	High
46	1226	Not very high
3.6	97	Never

The following table (Table 4) shows the level of institutional trust into separate generation at a scale of 1 to 4. As it can be seen there are weak changes between generations in terms of institutional trust but it is something public

and it should be descending between generations. Comparison of institutional trust in each generation determines that first generation is 2/26 second generation is 2/54 and third generation is 2850.

Table (4): level of institutional trust into separate generation at a scale of 1 to 4

15 to 29 years	30 to 54 years	55 years and above	Name of organization or institute	Row
3.14	3.17	3.17	mosques	1
2.68	2.81	2.86	Army forces	2
2.29	2.31	2.46	press	3
2.52	2.53	2.56	television	4
2.23	2.29	2.36	Labor union	5
2.70	2.71	2.76	police	6
2.51	2.51	2.58	court	7
2.56	2.59	2.78	government	8
2.11	2.11	2.22	Political parties	9
2.42	2.49	2.62	parliament	10
2.65	2.75	2.81	charitable organizations	11
2.28	2.31	2.44	Public offices	12
2.51	2.53	2.55	Environmental Protection Agency	13
2.36	2.41	2.44	Women agency	14
2.50	2.54	2.62	Average trust on a scale of 1 to 4	-

Analytical Results

Test results of F test (ANOVA) in ANOVA table shows that the significance level is equal to $\text{sig}=0.002$ that represents a significant difference in the average institutional trust between studied generations. This difference is significant at the 5% of error level. These findings confirm the main hypothesis of the study indicate that there are significant institutional trust differences between the generations.

Table (5): ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.403	2	1.702		
Within Groups	592.183	2213	0.268	6.359	0.002
total	595.587	2215			

The table below shows the results of Scheffe test. With this test, which compares average one to one, we find that the institutional trust of first generation average of 95% has significant difference with the third generation.

Table (6): Scheffe test

Generation	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Second generation	0.08652	0.03975	0.94
First generation	0.13187*	0.03887	0.003
Third generation			

First generation	-0.08652	0.03975	0.094
Second generation	0.04535	0.02329	0.151
Third generation			
First generation	-0.13187*	0.03887	0.003
Third generation		0.02329	0.151
Second generation	- 0.04535		

Overall, the results of Scheffe test shows:


- ✓ There is no significant difference between the average institutional trust of first-generation and second-generation. Significance level equals to sig =0.094 and is higher than the desired level, i.e. 0.05.
- ✓ There is significant difference between institutional trust average of first-generation and third generation because the significant level equals to sig = 0.003 and is less than the desired level, i.e. 0.05.
- ✓ There is no significant difference between average institutional trust of second-generation and third generation, because the level of significance equals to sig = 0.151 and is higher than the desired level, i.e. 0.05.

Thus, as previously noted, the only significant difference is between the mean institutional trust of the third generation and the first generation, and this difference is significant at the error level of 5%. The following table shows another part of the results of Scheffe's about "homogeneous subsets". It is noted that generations have been grouped into two categories based on the amount of trust. The first row shows the third generation descendant as the lowest levels of trust. The motion of the front row down shows the increment of trust. Interpretation of this table based on the two columns is: 1 – Average 2 - more than average.

Table (7): homogeneous subsets

generation	Subset for alpha= 0.05	
	1	2
Third generation	2.5038	
Second generation	2.5492	
First generation		2.6357
sig.	0.094	1.000

Figure (1): Means Map: The chart below shows the level of institutional trust in terms of generations:



Conclusion

Trust is one of the major social issues that a lot of researches have been done about it. In this study, we investigated an important aspect of the social trust and institutional trust in a generational perspective on the sociological concept of "generation" and "generational experience". Here's a question that was the level of trust in institutions and organizations and the differences or lack of differences among the different generation. The results show that institutional trust is in average (or slightly lower). These findings are in accordance with the research outcomes of Mohseni and colleagues (Mohseni Tabrizi et al, 1390, p 64), Ojaghlo and colleagues (Ojaghlo and colleagues, 1384, p.115) and Nateghpour et al (Nateghpour and colleagues, 1384, page 83). On the other hand, the results of this study show a significant difference between the mean of institutional trust of the first generation and third generation in a descending form. Erosion of institutional trust status in this study are in accordance with most studies. Mahmoud Ketabi (and colleagues) in a summary of research results relating to the trust said that: the overall findings of the research carried out evaluated the trust at the individual level, interpersonal and team as high level, in the political and institutional levels to moderate or lower levels or eroding (Ketabi et al, 1390, p 99). Based on the difference between institutional trust in the two generations, it seems to explain that appealing to the ideas of thinkers such as Patnam, Inglehart, Zetomka, Paxton, social, political, economic space and society in the early period of thirty and forty (first generation socialization time) and the duration of the imposed war (WLAN socialization time) should be carefully studied.

References:

1. Abbas Zade, M. (1383) Factors affecting the formation of students' social trust, Quarterly Journal of Social Welfare, 1383, the fourth year, No. 15.
2. Agili, Seyed Mahmoud and Mohammed Abbas Zade (1383) Factors affecting the formation of social trust ", Quarterly Journal of Social Welfare, the fourth year, No. 15
3. Baker, Terzal (1377) how do social researches, translated by H. Naebi, Tehran, Roshan publication.
4. Coleman, James, (1377), Foundations of Social Theory, translated by M. Sabouri, Tehran, Ney Publication.
5. Depstvaten, (1999), Isabelle and Ester. Peter et al: Talking about me generation, ego and alter. Images of generations in the nether lands, Netherlanre s journal of social science.
6. Fukuyama, Francis (1384) Social capital and civil society efforts, with the help of K. Tajbakhsh, translated by Afshin Khakbaz and H. Purian, Tehran, Shiraze Press.
7. Golabi, F., 1383, Effect of trust at the development with a look over the Islamic Council, Master's Thesis Research, School of Social Sciences at Tehran University.
8. Jit Saz Qummi, MJ (1386) Recognition of the concept of generation and the generation gap ", Journal of Youth and generational relations, first issue, spring and summer.
9. Ketabi, Mahmoud and M. Adibi Sade, Vahid Ghasemi, Sattar Sadeghi Dahcheshme (1389) measurement of social trust and its influencing factors in Chahar Mahal and Bakhtiari province centers, sociology Application, Serial No. 40
10. Khosh Far, Sadegh and Gholamreza Salehi (1388) Social capital and responsible environmental practices in the north of Iran, Journal of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Volume XVI, Special Issue 1
11. Mansoor, Jehangir, 1384, Center for 4th economic, social, cultural, publishing Development Plan, Doran publication.
12. Mohsen Tabrizi, AR and Saeid Moidfar, F. Golabi (1390) Evaluation of community social trust with a look over generations, Journal of Applied Sociology, twenty-second year, No. 41, No.
13. Myztal, Barbara, 1380, Trust in Modern Societies, explore of the principles of social order, translated by Naserdin Garab, the profile of research, Number 18.
14. Nateghpour MJ and Syed A. Firoozabadi (1384) Social capital and factors affecting its formation in Tehran, Iran Journal of Sociology, Volume VI, Issue 2.,
15. Putnam, R.D. (1992) making Democracy work, Newjericy, Prinseton University press.
16. Sharee Poor, Mahmoud (1383) dimensions and functions of social capital and the consequences of the erosion of the social issues in Iran, the authors, the publisher PNU.
17. Sharee Poor, Mahmoud, Taqi Azad Armaki, Ali Asgari (1388) Social capital tolerant relationship among students of faculty of social science at Tehran University and Allameh Tabatabai, Iranian Journal of Sociology, Volume10, Number 1.
18. Vossoughi M. and H. Aram (1388) study of social trust and Influencing Factors in Khalkhal (Ardabil Province), Social Science Research, Third Year, No. 3.
19. Zetomka, Piotr (1384) Trust as a sociological theory, translated by F. Golabi, Sotude publishing.