

Democratic Institutions and Political Trust: a study of case of Cuiabá (M.T.)

Thales Torres Quintão

Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT)
Vetor Assessoria e Pesquisas – Cuiabá (MT)

Iara Lima Vianna

Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT)
Vetor Assessoria e Pesquisas – Cuiabá (MT)

Abstract: This paper briefly reviews and make reflections about the concept of political trust; demonstrating and comparing the different approaches which have the objective to study this phenomenon: culturalist approaches – based on factors related to socialization – and cognitive institutionalism, based on factors related to experience with the political system. On the second moment, it is developed a critical review of the operationalization of this concept and how to make it objective and measurable. So, with data from the survey denominated “Nossa Casa” (“Our House”), collected on 2011, this paper uses quantitative techniques (such as correlation analysis and regression analysis) to investigate the variables that can be correlated with political trust in democratic institutions of Cuiabá and the possible causes for this phenomenon. Among the variables tested, showed no statistical significance, in correlation with the variables of trust in political institutions, the following variables: “satisfaction of living in Cuiabá”; “family’s financial situation” and “degree of political sophistication and information”. The variables that presents correlation with the variables of political trust were: “optimistic about the future of Cuiabá”, “assessment of the former mayor”, “assessment of the mayor” and “evaluation of municipal policies”. Then, these latter were included as independent variables in a regression model, and the output of this regression analysis was that the variable with the highest coefficient of explanation (with greater explanatory power of the variance of response variables) was the variable “optimism about the future”.

Keywords: political trust; democratic institutions; statistical analysis; Cuiabá; Brazil

1. Introduction

The study of the trust of the society in democratic political institutions has been a phenomenon of great interest from the Political Sociology from the second half of the twentieth century. This issue sparked more interest from researchers from 80 years, according to the present process of democratic transition in countries of Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe. Since then, seeks to research and assess the attitudes of citizens in relation of the democratic regime that has consolidated over time - what Norris (1999) calls the third wave of democratization.

In the middle of 70's "allegations that the people [were] losing trust in politicians and in many respects the political system" (LISTHAUG, 1995, p. 262) began to preoccupy scholars of democracies in the later levels. According to Power & Jamison (2005), this distrust was first detected in the United States, in the midst of the Vietnam War and the famous Watergate case. However, recent surveys show that the distrust of the democratic political institutions and on the politicians seems to be a global problem, reaching from countries with more established democracies like the United States and England, and in countries still in democratic development, such as Latin Americans.

The main analytical challenge has been to analyze and assess if the erosion and political distrust is a phenomenon of a "global trend" due to general and common structural factors, or whether these trends would be cyclical and even country-specific, being affected by aspects such as the historical conditions of each country, government performance and operation of certain political systems (Norris, 1999).

Regardless of political distrust is a global aspect or specific, research Latinobarômetro and the World Values Survey show, over the years, a sharp fall in confidence in political institutions in Latin America¹.

These low levels of confidence can cause the problem to the legitimacy of the democratic regime has in countries that are in the process of democratic transition. Thus, one of the points discussed by contemporary literature is the possible consequences of the continued decline of trust in institutions for the functioning of democracy in these countries, in the other words, if the distrust in democratic institutions poses risks to the political regime.

However, there are still gaps in the researches that aim at studying the causes and consequences of mistrust in the democratic political institutions. In this context, is necessary try to answer, among others, the following questions: what are the independent variables and

¹ It is essential to note that there is no data available on political trust in Latin American countries, when they lived under an authoritarian regime. Thus, we should not join the growing distrust on the political actors and on institutions is linked to democratic rule.

explanatory of this phenomenon? What consequences can be derived from low levels of trust in democratic institutions?

This work will seek to answer these two questions above, by taking as a case study the city of Cuiabá, located in Mato Grosso². Cuiabá is the capital of Mato Grosso, whose HDI is 0.821 (IBGE, 2000), a rate considered high by the UNDP. It is essential also to note the evolution of GDP per capita of this city. According to the IBGE, in 2003 GDP per capita of Cuiabá was R\$9.780,00 and in 2008 became R\$16.549,00 - an increase of just over 84.0% in five years. Thus, Cuiabá became the 10th Brazilian capital with the best GDP per capita. Through these data we see the economic development that prevails in this city. So, a search then becomes relevant in this context: to measure the confidence in the role of political institutions in a context of prosperity (about 57% of household heads of Cuiabá stated that the current family's financial situation is better than two years ago) and optimism the future (more than 73% of household heads surveyed believe Cuiabá will improve in the next two years).

First of all, we will do a literature review and reflection on the concept of political trust, demonstrating their different approaches in the Sociology and in the Political Science; on the second time, we will try to seek a critical review of the operationalization of this concept as a way to make it objective, measurable; and finally we will make analysis of data using quantitative techniques (such as correlation analysis and multivariate regression) to investigate the variables that can be correlated with political trust in democratic institutions of Cuiabá municipality³ and the possible causes for this phenomenon.

2. The Study of Political Trust

In ordinary language, trust means security procedure or belief on others who interact and live. In the Social Sciences, the interest in the concept is associated to a concern with the informal processes through which people face uncertainty and unpredictability resulting from the increasing complexity of social life. This situation implies limited knowledge and incomplete information about the processes of collective decision making and actions of governments that affect people's lives. Therefore, the notion of trust has been used as a way of describing and analyzing a variety of social and political phenomena, which puts the actors involved in

² Database from the "Nossa Casa 2011" Project (project conducted by Vetor Research Institute), which consisted of a survey of opinion among the heads of household of Cuiabá, MT - sized sample of 505 cases and calculated on the basis of the following quotas: gender, age, education and socioeconomic class (classes were defined according to criteria ABEP / 2009).

³ The local political institutions taken as a study references are: the Prefecture of Cuiabá and the City Council.

situations of risk in their relationship with others, which leads to the logic of uncertainty in these situations.

The term political trust was originally defined as an interpersonal natural phenomenon, based on a culturalist approach, initiated by the work of Almond & Verba (1963) and David Easton (1965). According to these authors, the factors related to socialization appear to be central in explaining the attitudes of individuals in relation to politics. The political confidence would rise in the processes of social relations, and can be considered as an extension of interpersonal trust. Thus, the variation of trust in politicians and democratic institutions is the result of complex cultural values of each society or each individual: the concepts underlying each society would be resulted from the political culture⁴.

Cultural analysis has a biased more moralistic, in order to be seized with the social life, with an emphasis on explaining the phenomenon of mistrust between individuals⁵ through the historical causes. Thus, the adherence or non in democracy and its institutions are conditioned to trust in other individuals, beyond their associational involvement.

Lagos (2000), for example, argues that “the cultural characteristics of pre-rational and non rational” shaped the foundations of Latin American population. The socio-cultural traits based on the practice to “remain in silent about their feelings and emphasize [...] appearances” would have been a part of the survival strategy of individuals under the Iberian colonialism (Lagos, 2000, p.2). This feature of the culture would be rooted in the way of living of Latin Americans, structuring an interaction marked by mistrust between people and, consequently, the distrust of state institutions. The author analyzes the data Latinobarômetro 1996 and concludes that democracy in Latin America faces a problematic scenario of low levels of interpersonal trust and low public confidence in their ability to influence political decisions.

On the other side, the Cognitive and Institutional Theory analyzes the confidence in the political system through experience, evaluation and expectation that social actors and political makes in relation to activities and performances of the institutions. The members of the political community are seen as identifying with institutions because they have learned to do so through successive processes of transmission of meaning from generation to generation, but, mainly, because their concrete experience, throughout his adult life, qualifies them to rationally

⁴ The concept of political culture is designated as “the orientations and political attitudes of people towards the political system and its various components and attitudes toward their role in the system” (Almond & Verba, 1989, p.12). Thus this concept is linked to the norms, values, beliefs that are internalized by the citizens through the process of political socialization, and are distinguished in three areas: 1) cognitive - knowledge of policy, 2) affective - feelings of support or rejection of politics, 3) evaluative - opinions and judgments about objects and political facts. According to Moisés (2008), “political culture refers to a variety of attitudes, beliefs and political values - like national pride, respect for law, participation and interest in politics, tolerance, interpersonal and institutional trust - that affects the involvement of people in public life” (p.16)

⁵And consequently a political distrust.

evaluate their performance. So, there is an adaptation of political institutions by the routine experiences.

According to Moisés (2005) the trust in institutions would be based on fact that citizens share a common perspective, the prospect that the institutions are normative and act within the law (legitimacy). Thus, confidence in political institutions refers to the performance of them; in addition, is taken as a base the assessment and consistency of its internal rules and regulations, rather than individual action of its managers and administrators. The public would recognize and critically evaluate the institutions from which it learned that its fundamental mission (Easton, 1975). This evaluation will include aspects related to the country's economic situation, social advances, public policy, among other factors.

It is felt that the concept of trust in political institutions presents a multidimensional character. For both involve aspects of social relationships, civic engagement, and the bonds of solidarity and cooperation (social capital), and includes factors related to rational choice too, in which trust in institutions and governments would be associated with the assessment, judgment and expectations of citizens who lives in the same political community.

3. The Brazilian Paradox

However, this author demonstrates that certain political distrust is required for the development of democracy, because would generate on the society more interest in oversight and accountability, which could result in more accountability process (horizontal and vertical) in relation to powers administrative state. Norris (1999) notes that the decreased levels of specific support (confidence in the authorities, institutions and satisfaction with the scheme) offered no threat to democracy. Two expressions have been coined to describe individuals who are able to distinguish the functioning of the institutions of the attributes of the political regime, “critical citizens” and “dissatisfied democrats”. Rather than posing a threat to democracy, these citizens should be considered as an “instrument” for improvement of the democratically system.

Inglehart (1997) develops Norris studies when suggest that the citizens from the 80's are not moving away from politics, but they are more involved in politics by non-traditional ways. For

6 The question of the questionnaire was written as this follow way: I would like you to note that a 01 to 10 for how you feel satisfied with democracy in Brazil today? There was a group of notes as a form of analysis. Thus, grades 7 to 10 were grouped as positive evaluation, grades 5 and 6 were considered as regular assessments, and grades 1 to 4 were assembled as a negative evaluation.

7 Refers to democratic political institutions: the Judiciary Power, the National Congress, the Legislative Assembly of Mato Grosso, the Cuiabá City Council, the Prefecture Municipality of Cuiabá, the Mato Grosso State Government, the Federal Government, and the political parties.

8 The question was prepared as this follow way: I will mention some social institutions and I would like to know about your trust in them: you trust completely, partially or not trust on the....?

this author, the significant decline of political trust is leading the debate on public policy closer to commons citizens, through councils and forums, with a more capacity of participation and / or deliberative from civil society⁹. More recently, some authors also point out, returning the concepts and studies made by Habermas, which we are in the process of consolidation of a virtual public sphere¹⁰ due to the advent and expansion of new forms of communication and information coming from the Internet (Maia 2002; Marques, 2006; Gomes, 2005).

By analyzing the expressions of public support for political systems, Easton (1965) distinguishes specific support of diffuse support, conceptualizing them as different dimensions. Specific support to the author refers to citizens' satisfaction with the performance of governments and political leaders and authorities. While diffuse support concerns the attitude of individuals in the political system as a whole, regardless of the performance who are the responsible.

To Easton (1965), people learn to distinguish these dimensions (specific support and diffuse support) involved in the political process, and once that fact becomes a routine, they begin to differentiate between situational action from governments and permanent functioning of democratic institutions and its adherence to the political regime. By separating the adherence to democratic regime, of political institutions, since they are confused with the support of political leaders who exercise power in these institutions (circumstantial object); so that has become a phenomenon of simultaneous adherence to democracy and distrust institutions. Thus, this phenomenon of separation and even confusion between political regime, democratic institutions and political actors, could explain the denominated Brazilian paradox.

4. The Operationalization of Political Trust and the Independent Variables

The first challenge for the analysis of political trust lies concentrates in the operationalizing the concept. As a way to measure this concept, first you it is necessary to determine which institutions we wish to explore in a meaningful way. Most studies seeking an approximation of the index produced by Norris (1999), which uses the trust in State institutions. For this, she defines political institutions as: the Judiciary, the National Congress, the Presidency and the Political Parties.

⁹ Civil society is understood as a third arena located between Market and State. It is the part of society that is out of the state apparatus (citizens organized), or even located between society and state. It would be the political aspect of society: the way in which it is structured politically to influence the action of the state (Avritzer, 1994).

¹⁰ "The public sphere can be described as an adequate network for the communication of contents, positions, and opinions; in her communication flows are filtered and synthesized until they condense in public opinions bundled on specific subjects" (Habermas 1997, p.92). So, the public sphere is characterized as the "local" for the communication, the spaces in where people discuss issues of common interest, form opinions and discuss and define action plans.

Differently from studies of Norris (1999), and research as the World Values Survey and the Latinobarômetro, which were surveys that had population parameter as the national population, the sample of our study of case is restricted to household heads of Cuiabá. This difference from the sample makes our analysis on the political trust is limited to two institutions of local / municipal level: the City Council and City Hall.

In this article, the dependent variables are the trust in municipal democratic institutions mentioned above. The independent variables involve the two main theoretical approaches of political trust have cited in this work: cultural theory and cognitive institutional theory.

Variables related to culturalist theory are the optimism¹¹ about the future of Cuiabá, and the satisfaction of living in this municipality¹². The hypothesis is that individuals who are optimistic in the progress of the city and are satisfied to live in this city have more confidence in political institutions.

For definition the independent variables related to institutional theory and cognitive that included in this statistical model, some notes should be made. McAllister (1999) shows that economic satisfaction tends to have a more effect of trust in political institutions in new democracies, such as Brazil, if compared with consolidating and established democracies. Therefore, it is expected that citizens of Cuiaba which declare that the family economic situation has improved, have more confidence in local institutions¹³.

It is worth to note that Norris (1999) points out that the opinion of individuals in relation to the trust in institutions is influenced by political forces which are in the power. For her, those who voted for politicians who are in the power, the called “winners” tend to consider the institutions with the highest degree of responsiveness to their needs and desires: meanwhile, the “losers,” who voted for candidates who lost the elections, would be less confident. Bowler & Donovan (2003), for example, conducted a study with the American voters and concluded that, those who did not elect their candidates in the 2000 presidential election had less confidence in the Supreme Court and in the Federal Government of the United States.

However, in this article, based on studies of Colen (2010), we used the approval of former mayor and current mayor of Cuiabá¹⁴, as a way closer to examine the aspect of identifying and

11 The question was formulated as follow way: For you, in general, the situation in Cuiabá will improve, will stay the same or will get worse until 2012?

12 The question was developed as follow way: How do you feel living in Cuiabá? Is or is not satisfied? The answer options were: is satisfied, indifferent (when respondents talked spontaneously), and is not satisfied.

¹³ The question posed was this: The family’s financial situation today is better, equal, or worse than two years ago?

14 The assessment questions of the administration of the former and the current mayor of Cuiabá were the following, respectively: In your opinion, how was the administration of former mayor Wilson Santos: would you say was excellent, good, regular, bad or very bad. In your opinion, how was the administration of the actual mayor Francisco Galindo? Being excellent, good, regular, bad or very bad?

supporting the political leader who is in the power, in other words, to test the hypothesis that the so-called “winners” have more confidence in the institutions. It should justify why we decided to put the variable of the administration of ex- mayor of Cuiabá, Wilson Santos (PSDB), in this statistical model.

Wilson Santos (PSDB) has administered the city of Cuiaba until the middle of 2010, when he asked resignation to contest the elections for governor of Mato Grosso, assuming then the deputy mayor and currently mayor of Cuiabá, Francisco Galindo (PTB). Thus, as the “Nossa Casa” research was conducted between the months of February and March 2011, a few months after Wilson Santos (PSDB) had left the power, and Francisco Galindo took over the prefecture, we believe that there would be no disruption in the management and administration of the City Hall, in addition to the respondents still associate the city administration with the person of the former mayor.

Another hypothesis to be tested is if there is an independent effect of evaluation and the performance of institutions on increasing the political confidence. Therefore, variables that involve citizens and cognitive aspects of perception and expectation of the political, economic and social will be included in the analysis model. According to Colen (2010) the political sophistication¹⁵ and evaluation of public policies¹⁶ have the objective to capture elements of the political experience of citizens in post-socialization. The hypothesis is that the more sophisticated and the more satisfied citizens with the performance of municipal public policies have more trust in institutions.

Finally, it should explain why we prefer to adopt the cognitive institutional theory on majority way to systematize the concept of political trust. What we would like to say is that the operationalization of the concept of political trust through culturalist theory still has gaps to be filled, which makes the data with less measurable quality. For these factors we decided to concentrate and focus our empirical study on the cognitive institutional.

15 In this work, we use the concept of political sophistication developed by Castro (1994). Thus, the Degree of Political Sophistication and Information was drawn from six questions: how often do you usually watch political news on television, how often do you usually hear on the radio about politics, how often do you usually read about politics in the newspaper or magazines, how often do you usually read about politics on the Internet, how often do you usually talk about politics with friends or relatives, and how often do you usually participate of meetings to discuss political issues. The response options are: always (2), sometimes (1) and never (0). The points were summed into a degree which range from 0 to 12 points recoded into three levels: 0 to 3 points as low sophistication, from 4 to 7 as middle, 8 to 12 as high.

16 The evaluation of public policies (policies on health, education, security, sanitation, and housing) was prepared from five questions: how do you evaluate the public health service today in Cuiabá compared to two years ago; how do you evaluate the public security service today in Cuiabá compared to two years ago; how would you evaluate the public education service today in Cuiabá compared to two years ago; how do you evaluate the basic sanitation (water / sewage) service in Cuiabá today compared to two years ago; and how do you evaluate the housing service (construction of popular houses) in Cuiabá today compared to two years ago. The response options were: improved, same or worsened. Through these five questions was created an index using the technique of factor analysis; which consists in generating a new variable (score or factor) product of the correlation of groups of questions that assess the same cognitive ability.

Lundasen (2002) analyzes the questions raised in various surveys, such as the American General Social Survey (GSS) and World Values Survey (WVS), aimed to measure the generalized trust (trust in people in general way, in the human nature). In reviewing these surveys, the author realizes that the different results are due to the different formulations of the questions. In 1983 was made an experiment that tested two questions with different elaborations: "Do you think that you can trust most of people?" and "Generally speaking, would you say that you can trust most people or you should to be very careful when dealing with people?".

As was pointed out earlier, according to the cultural theory, it is expected that individuals who have more trust in people, also have more confidence in political institutions. However, the first formulation of the question generated 57% of positive responses, while the second formulation, 36,5% of respondents answered that "you can trust most of people" (Smith, 1997)¹⁷. According Lundasen (2002), the empirical results indicate that caution and confidence is not the best opposites and extremes. Thus, those who show high confidence also show high levels of caution and carefully.

5. Methodology of data analysis

In this article we will use the following methodologies for analyzing data from the survey¹⁸ which we take as a case study: correlation analysis, factor analysis and regression analysis.

In Correlation Analysis, the Pearson Coefficient¹⁹ measures the degree of correlation (the strength and direction of this correlation - whether positive or negative) between two variables. However, we should make clear that the existence of a correlation does not imply causality: the existence of a correlation says anything about the nature of the causal relationship that may exist between the variables. When we interpreting a correlation coefficient we must be careful not to consider that X is cause of Y and that Y is a cause of X. The Pearson Coefficient, usually represented by ρ , only takes values between -1 and 1. In witch, $\rho = 1$ means a perfect positive correlation between two variables, $\rho = -1$ means a perfect negative correlation between two variables (that is, if the values of one increases the other decreases) and when $\rho = 0$ it means that the two variables are not linearly depend on each other. It is

¹⁷ Moreover, the question about trust is influenced according to the context of the questions, in order words, the position where these questions was posed in the questionnaire. According Lundasen (2002), if the interviewer asks questions about crime and drug legalization, before the question about trust, the choice on the alternative that "you can trust most of people" has a considerably decrease.

¹⁸ It is worth remember that the database used in this article is from the Projeto Nosso Casa, 2011 (conducted by the Institute Vetor Assessoria e Pesquisas - Cuiabá, MT). This opinion survey was carried out among heads of households of Cuiabá and their sample had sized at 505 cases, and calculated based in quotas of gender, age, education and socioeconomic class (classes were defined according to the Criteria of Socioeconomic Classification - ABEP / 2009)

¹⁹ The Pearson coefficient is obtained by division of the covariance of two variables by the product of their standard deviations.

essential to note, however, that in these cases, there may be a nonlinear relationship between them. Thus, when we faced with the result $\rho = 0$ we have to investigate it by other ways, other statistical techniques.

The Factor Analysis is a statistical technique that, through a multivariate random process, adds certain variables, pre-selected according to some criteria, in a single index (or factor). Then, it generates a new variable (or factor score), product of the correlation of all other. The Factor Analysis can be analyzed in isolation, or the new score generated can be correlated with another variable or included in other statistical techniques, such as the t-test of averages or the regression analysis. According Collares (2011 *apud* PASQUALI, 2009; PRIMI, 2003; PRIMI, 2006; THOMPSON, 2004; YANAI & ICHIKAWA, 2007), the reduction of variables in a single "factor", "size" or "score", maximizes the explanatory power of the set of all possible variables and give the possibility to identify subgroups of questions that assess the same skill or cognitive ability.

Finally, the Regression Analysis is a technique that lets the researcher explore and infer the relationship between a dependent variable (response variable) and independent variables (explanatory variables). Run a regression means getting a mathematical equation that describes the causal relationship between two or more variables. The estimation method most widely used is the method of ordinary minimum squares – that consists is the search to find the best fit for a set of data trying to minimize the sum of the squares of the differences between estimated and observed values of data (this differences are called residues). In the data analysis developed in this paper we will use the linear regression analysis model, a technique that is based on the assumption that the relationship between the response variable and the independent variables is a linear function of parameters. The regression model that is not a linear function of the parameters can be called a model of nonlinear regression.

It is worth noting that the basic assumptions of linear regression model were verified in the regression analysis performed for this article. They assumptions are: 1) the residue must be distributed randomly around 0 (zero), in the global model and for each variable (assumption of randomness); 2) the response variable must have a normal or approximately normal distribution (assumption of normality); 3) the variation of the independent variables must be the same for each value of y (assumption of homoscedasticity); 4) the values of the dependent variable have to be obtained at random from the population and are independent of each other (assumption of independence of residues); and 5) the points on the scatter diagram should show a linear trend (assumption of linearity).

6. Data Analysis

Before we start analyzing the data, we present below the simple frequency of variables "Trust in the City Council" and "Trust in the City Hall", variables that measures the concept that this paper seeks to analyze – concept of the political trust in democratic institutions – and will be tested throughout all the article.

Table 1 - Trust in the City Council

Trust in the City Council

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Trust	277	54,9	54,9	54,9
	Trust in Part	186	36,8	36,8	91,7
	Fully Trust	32	6,3	6,3	98,0
	Don't Know	8	1,6	1,6	99,6
	Don't Answer	2	,4	,4	100,0
	Total	505	100,0	100,0	

It was observed that 54,9% of respondents said they did not trust in the City Council of Cuiabá (MT), other 36,8% trust partially and only 6,3% say that trust completely in this municipal institution.

Table 2 - Trust in the City Hall

Trust in the City Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Trust	289	57,2	57,2	57,2
	Trust in Part	181	35,8	35,8	93,1
	Fully Trust	27	5,3	5,3	98,4
	Don't Know	6	1,2	1,2	99,6
	Don't Answer	2	,4	,4	100,0
	Total	505	100,0	100,0	

In relation of the City Hall, it was noted that 57,2% of respondents say they did not trust, 35,8% trust in part and only 5,3% say they fully trust in this institution.

6.1 Correlation Analysis

Now, starting the analysis of correlation, first we will analyze the variables related to the Cultural Theory of Political Trust: "optimism about the future of Cuiabá" (optimism) and "satisfaction of living in Cuiabá" (satisfaction).

Table 3 - Optimism. vs. Trust in the City Council

Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Optimism About the future of Cuiabá
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,148**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,001
	N	505	505
Optimism About the future of Cuiabá	Pearson Correlation	,148**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 - Optimism. vs. Trust in the City Hall

Correlations

		Optimism About the future of Cuiabá	Trust in the City Hall
Optimism About the future of Cuiabá	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,123**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,005
	N	505	505
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	,123**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,005	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Observing the above tables, we find that the correlations between optimism and confidence in the City Council and City Hall are statistically significant at a confidence level of 99%. Both correlations are positive: more optimism, more confidence in local political institutions.

Below, we show tables that correlate the satisfaction of living in Cuiabá with the political trust in local institutions.

Table 5 - Satisfaction vs. Trust in the City Council

Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Satisfaction of living in Cuiabá
Confiança da Câmara dos Vereadores	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,097
	N	505	505
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	,074	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,097	.
	N	505	505

Table 6 - Satisfaction vs. Trust in the City Hall

Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Satisfaction of living in Cuiabá
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,222
	N	505	505
Satisfaction of living in Cuiabá	Pearson Correlation	,054	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,222	.
	N	505	505

We can note that the both correlations between satisfaction and trust in local institutions are not statistically significant (note the significant quadrant “sig.2-tailed” in the table). There is a correlation between the variables tested, after all the Pearson Coefficient is different from 0 (zero). However, the correlation test tells us that these correlations are not statistically significant: the values of “sig. 2 tailed” are higher than 0.05 (alpha set for this test).

In relation to the family's financial situation - compared with two years ago, we can see in the tables below (tables 7 and 8) that the correlation between this variables and political trust in local institutions are not statistically significant. As was said in the case of the correlation of satisfaction in live in Cuiabá, say that the correlation is not statistically significant is not to say that there is no correlation. There are correlation between this variables, the Pearson coefficient is different from 0 (zero). However, when we run the correlation test setting the significance level as 5% (or, setting alpha to 0.05) we see that the correlation between the variables tested is not statistically significant.

Table 7 - Family's Financial Situation -compared with two years ago vs. Trust in the City Council

Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Family's Financial Situation - compared with two years ago
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	1,000	-,009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,835
	N	505	504
Family's Financial Situation - compared with two years ago	Pearson Correlation	-,009	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,835	.
	N	504	504

Table 8 - Family's Financial Situation -compared with two years ago vs. Trust in the City Hall

Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Family's Financial Situation - compared with two years ago
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,538
	N	505	504
Family's Financial Situation - compared with two years ago	Pearson Correlation	,027	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,538	.
	N	504	504

About the connection between the assessment of the mayor (the 'winner' of elections and occupant of the majority position in the executive municipal) and political trust in municipal institutions, we can see in the tables below (tables 9 and 10) that the correlation between these variables are statistically significant and positive; that is, better assessment of the mayor more trust in local institutions (City Hall and City Council).

Table 9 - Assessment of the Mayor vs. Trust in the City Council

Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Assessment of the Mayor
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,106*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,018
	N	505	505
Assessment of the Mayor	Pearson Correlation	,106*	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,018	.
	N	505	505

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 10 - Assessment of the Mayor vs. Trust in the City Hall

Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Assessment of the Mayor
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,139**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,002
	N	505	505
Assessment of the Mayor	Pearson Correlation	,139**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As we can observe on the tables below, the correlation is also statistically significant for the analysis of the variable "assessment of the former mayor (ex-mayor)" and the variables of political trust in local institutions (tables 11 and 12).

It is worth mentioning that this variable was included in the survey and in the analysis due to political and circumstantial factors - the time of the survey, February 2011, was a moment of transition: the former mayor had just left the municipality administration, and the current assumed this occupation; moreover, the current mayor was the vice mayor of the former. So, the municipal administration was still associated with the person of the former mayor, and there was no political and administrative breakdown between these two governments.

Tabela 11 – Assessment of Former Mayor vs. Trust in the City Council
Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Assessment of Former Mayor
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,182**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000
	N	505	505
Assessment of Former Mayor	Pearson Correlation	,182**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 12 - Assessment of Former Mayor vs. Trust in the City Hall

Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Assessment of Former Mayor
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,129**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,004
	N	505	505
Assessment of Former Mayor	Pearson Correlation	,129**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,004	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

About the issue of sophistication and political information, as was said in the previous section of this article, we created an index that combines six variables in a single degree (see note number 15). As we can see in the tables below (tables 13 and 14), we have no statistical significance in the correlation of the Degree of Political Sophistication and Information created and the variables of political trust in local institutions. There is correlation, because the Pearson Coefficient is different from 0 (zero), but this correlation is not statistically significant on the defined confidence level (alpha = 0.05).

Table 13 - Degree of Political Sophistication and Information vs. Trust in the City Council

Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Degree of Political Sophistication and Information
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,620
	N	505	497
Degree of Political Sophistication and Information	Pearson Correlation	,022	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,620	.
	N	497	497

Table 14 - Degree of Political Sophistication and Information vs. Trust in the City Hall

Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Degree of Political Sophistication and Information
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,544
	N	505	497
Degree of Political Sophistication and Information	Pearson Correlation	,027	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,544	.
	N	497	497

To evaluate the correlation between the assessment of public policies and political trust in local institutions, we use the technique of factor analysis. In the table below we see that all variables are correlated with each other; even though the forces of the correlations are low, the observation here is about the existence of correlation – the Pearson Coefficient is different from 0 (zero).

Table 15 - Correlation Matrix - Factor Analysis

Correlation Matrix

		Public Health - compared with two years ago	Public Safety - in comparison with two years ago	Public Education - compared with two years ago	Construction of "popular" houses - compared with two years ago	Sanitation (water and sewer) - compared with two years ago
Correlation	Public Health - compared with two years ago	1,000	,306	,224	,094	,354
	Public Safety - in comparison with two years ago	,306	1,000	,251	,159	,182
	Public Education - compared with two years ago	,224	,251	1,000	,197	,222
	Construction of "popular" houses - compared with two years ago	,094	,159	,197	1,000	,205
	Sanitation (water and sewer) - compared with two years ago	,354	,182	,222	,205	1,000

When we use factor analysis, there are several ways and methods to extract, run and interpret variables. It is essential to mention that in principal components analysis the variance to be considered for the extraction of factors is the total variance. About the extraction of factors, we should note that not all variables can always make part of the factor analysis. In addition, there is

controversy about the criteria that determine when a factor is statistically important and have to be included in the final score. According to the Kaiser criterion, we should keep two factors (the two with the largest eigenvalue). Jolliffe designs another criterion: keep only factors with 'eigenvalue' higher than 0.7. There are authors, such as exhibits Coralles (2011), who preach that the Kaiser criterion often underestimates the number of factors and Jolliffe criterion is even worse, in this case the factor explain less variance than an original variable. Faced with so much controversy, the agreement is that the analysis of the scree plot, to verify the inflection point of the graph, and the percentage of explained variance are fundamental. It should be noted also that the rotation of the factors chosen for extraction depends mainly on the degree of interrelation that is assumed for its variables (factors).

However, this article has not the intention of turning to the interpretation of a factor analysis. The objective our use of this technique was to create a new variable, product of others, measured in the same interval scale²⁰, and then include them as a dependent variable in regression analysis. So, we will not enter into more specific analysis on extraction of factors, explained variance, analysis of the inflection point of the scree plot, etc.. We will focus on the next step on a *continuum* of statistical analysis of data: the regression analysis.

Before we look at the results of regression analysis, we present below the correlations between the factor generated by the factor analysis (described above) and the variables of political trust in local institutions. We can see that these correlations are statistically significant. The factor (variable) generated as a product of the variables included in the factor analysis is called of "Evaluation of Municipal Policies".

Table 16 - Evaluation of Municipal Policies vs. Trust in the City Council
Correlations

		Trust in the City Council	Evaluation of Municipal Policies
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,134**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,005
	N	505	446
Evaluation of Municipal Policies	Pearson Correlation	,134**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,005	.
	N	446	446

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

²⁰ All variables included in the factor analysis were measured in the same scale of response options: "improved", "equal" or "worsened".

Table 16 - Evaluation of Municipal Policies vs. Trust in the City Hall
Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Evaluation of Municipal Policies
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,109*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,021
	N	505	446
Evaluation of Municipal Policies	Pearson Correlation	,109*	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,021	.
	N	446	446

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

6.2 Regression Analysis

A linear regression is said multiple when there are two or more independent (or explanatory) variables included on the model.

This article will examine a multiple regression, in which the dependent variable is a factor generated, by a factor analysis, from the two variables of political trust in municipal institutions used throughout the paper: “Trust in the City Council” and “Trust in City Hall”. As we can see in the table 17 below, the correlation between these two variables can be considered as “substantial” (it presents a value for the Pearson Coefficient between 0.5 and 0.69). Furthermore, throughout this paper we saw that there was a pattern between the correlation of these variables of political trust and other variables: when there was a statistically significant correlation between “Trust in City Hall” and certain variable (for example, “Optimism about the future of Cuiabá”) there was statistically significant also in the correlation between this variable and “Trust in the City Council”; similarly, when it was not observed statistical significance between “Trust in the City Hall” and another variable (for example, “Family's Financial Situation) was not also observed a significant correlation between this variable and “Trust in the City Council”. So, the intention here is to justify why the decision to join these two variables of trust in local institutions on a single factor.

Table 17 - Trust in the City Hall vs. Trust in the City Council
Correlations

		Trust in the City Hall	Trust in the City Council
Trust in the City Hall	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,504**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000
	N	505	505
Trust in the City Council	Pearson Correlation	,504**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As was said above, we created a factor, by factor analysis, which adds the two variables of political trust in local institutions. This factor will be the dependent variable on the regression analysis; it will be called “Trust in the Municipal Institutions”. The independent variables included in our multiple linear regression model were the variables that showed statistically significant correlation with the variables of political trust in local institutions in section 6.1 of this article. They are: “Optimism about the future of Cuiabá”, “Assessment of the Mayor”, “Assessment of the Former Mayor (Ex-Mayor)” and “Evaluation of Municipal Policies”. In the regression model we also included the following control variables: “Education of household head”, “Gender” and “Age”.

Table 17 – Variables entered/removed from the Model (independent variables and control variables)

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education of household head, Evaluation of Municipal Policies, Assessment of the Former Mayor, Optimism about the future of Cuiabá, Gender, Assessment of the Mayor, Age		Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: Trust in the Municipal Institutions (Factor Analysis of "Trust in the City Council" and "Trust in the City Hall")

The Coefficient of Determination (R Square) is a measure of quality of the econometric model in relation to its ability to correctly estimate the values of the dependent variable. The R Square indicates what percentage of the variance of the dependent variable is explained by the variance of the independent variables. Its value is in the range from 0 to 1: higher values, higher are the power of explanatory of model the model.

Table 18 – Model Summary (R Square and Adjusted R Square)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,334 ^a	,111	,097	,8870624

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education of household head, Evaluation of Municipal Policies, Assessment of the Former Mayor, Optimism about the future of Cuiabá, Gender, Assessment of the Mayor, Age

As we can observe on the table above (table 18), the R Square of our model is 0,111, which means that 11,1% (11,1 percent) of the variance of the “Trust in the Municipal Institutions” are explained by the variance of the explanatory variables.

The inclusion of many variables, even if they have very little explanatory power on the dependent variable, will increase the value of R Square, which is bad because it encourages the indiscriminate inclusion of variables, going against the principle of parsimony. To solve this "problem" we can use an adjusted measure of the Coefficient of Determination, which is adjusted (penalized) when we include some explanatory variables. In the most of cases the Adjusted R Square is used to compare different models with different number of independent variables. Our article will analyze just one model of linear regression; so, we will not focus and make interpretations about the Adjusted R Square.

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a statistical test that measures the variance between groups and says if the means of these groups are all different; ANOVA is useful in comparing two, three or more means. Using ANOVA on a regression analysis we have to pay attention on the F-Test (Test of Fisher) and observe if its significance is lower than the confidence level of 95% (alpha = 0,05). In our model, as we can see on the table 19, the significance value is 0,000. In this case we can say that the regression model is significant in a confidence level of 95%.

Table 19 – Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	43,163	7	6,166	7,836	,000 ^a
	Residual	344,653	438	,787		
	Total	387,817	445			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education of household head, Evaluation of Municipal Policies, Assessment of the Former Mayor, Optimism about the future of Cuiabá, Gender, Assessment of the Mayor, Age

b. Dependent Variable: Trust in the Municipal Institutions (Factor Analysis of "Trust in the City Council" and "Trust in the City Hall")

Table 20 – Regression Model (Coefficients)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,061	,294		-3,615	,000
	Optimism about the future of Cuiabá	,190	,048	,182	3,993	,000
	Assessment of the Former Mayor	,111	,033	,160	3,392	,001
	Evaluation of Municipal Policies	9,107E-02	,043	-,098	2,115	,035
	Assessment of the Mayor	3,685E-02	,020	,084	1,801	,072
	Gender	2,417E-02	,085	,013	,284	,776
	Age	7,637E-02	,033	,114	2,323	,021
	Education of household head	-3,726E-02	,039	-,046	-,947	,344

a. Dependent Variable: Trust in the Municipal Institutions (Factor Analysis of "Trust in the City Council" and "Trust in the City Hall")

The table above shows that our model of regression analysis is:

$$Y = 1.061 B_0 + 0,190 X^1 + 0,111 X^2 + 0,091 X^3$$

- In witch: **Y** = Trust in the Municipal Institutions
- B₀** = Constant
- X¹** = Optimism about the future of Cuiabá
- X²** = Assessment of the Former Mayor
- X³** = Evaluation of Municipal Policies

Interpreting the regression model set we can say that, monitoring the results by “gender”, “age” and “education”: 1) one more level on the scale of optimism²¹, increases by 0.190 the political trust in municipal institutions; 2) one more level on the scale of assessment of the former mayor²², raised on 0.111 the political trust; and 3) one more level on the scale of evaluation of municipal policies²³, increases by 0.091 the political trust in municipal institutions.

The independent variable “Assessment of the Mayor”, also included in the model, it is not significant on the confidence level of 95%, the value of the significance (observe on the column “Sig.”) is higher than the alpha (0,05) fixed for this model. Similarly, all the control variables (“Education of household head”, “Gender” and “Age”) are not significant on the fixed value to the

²¹ The question and response options were: “For you, in general, the situation in Cuiabá will improve, will stay the same or will get worse until 2012?” → 1) get worse; 2) stay the same, 3) improve.

²² The question and response options were: “In your opinion, the administration of the former Mayor Wilson Santos is: excellent, good, regular, bad or very bad?” → 1) very bad; 2) bad; 3) regular; 4) good; 5) excellent.

²³ The question and response options were: “How do you evaluate the (policy in question) today in Cuiabá compared to two years ago?” → 1) get worse; 2) stay the same; 3) improved.

alpha. But, is necessary to emphasize that we decided to include these control variables only to monitor the effect of others independent variables on the dependent variable. So, since the moment that we include these control variables in the analysis the intention was not to interpret the causality between socioeconomic variables and the political trust in municipal institutions.

About the lack of statistical significance for the variable “Assessment of the Mayor”, and the observation that the variable “Assessment of the Former Mayor” is statistically significant, first, it is necessary to emphasize that when two variables have moderate correlation (or more) between them is natural that one of them presents significance on the regression model and the other not. In the table below (table 21) we see that the correlation between the evaluation of the manager and the former manager of the municipal executive power has a Pearson Coefficient equal to 0.318 (moderate correlation).

Table 21 – Assessment of the Mayor vs. Assessment of the Former Mayor

Correlations

		Assessment of Former Mayor	Assessment of the Mayor
Assessment of Former Mayor	Pearson Correlation	1,000	,318**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000
	N	505	505
Assessment of the Mayor	Pearson Correlation	,318**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.
	N	505	505

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

However, it is worthy to note that the output of no statistical significance for the variable “Assessment of the Mayor” only corroborates the decision to include in the survey, and in the analysis of data made by this article, the variable “Assessment of the Former Mayor”, which is statistically significant in the regression model set. The assumption underlying the inclusion of the variable “Assessment of the Former Mayor”, and the output showing that this variable is statistically significant, is that at the time of data collection, due to political and circumstantial factors, respondents associated the public administration more to the person's of the former mayor.

7. Final Considerations

As it was revealed in the statistical analysis of data, not all hypotheses presented in Section 4 (fourth) of this paper were supported. In this study of case, some variables did not show statistical correlation with the variables of political trust in democratic institutions. They are: “satisfaction of

living in Cuiabá”; “family's financial situation”, and “degree of political sophistication”. It is important to mention that the theories which served as basis for the choice of these three variables did not show empirical evidence in this case, but we can not draw conclusions allotments. We believe that further research would be needed with this content to strengthen and enhance data analysis.

Regarding the variables that showed statistical correlation with the variables of political trust (“optimism”, “assessment of the former mayor”, “assessment of the mayor” and “evaluation of municipal policies”), we found that they were included as independent variables in a model of regression analysis. The output of the model was that the variable "optimism" had the highest coefficient. In other words, we can say that optimism is the thing that more explains the variance of the political trust in local institutions (the dependent variable regression model).

As pointed out earlier in this article, the idea that people more optimistic about the future have higher trust in political institutions is inserted into the culturalist theory of political trust. It is interesting to note that the empirical evidence found by this paper goes against studies of Colen (2010), which shows that variables from the cognitive institutional approach would have more explanatory power than those coming from the culturalist theory. On the other hand, this study refers to the work of Lopes (2004), which researches political trust in Latin America and demonstrates the importance of optimism about the future to the political trust in democratic institutions.

The most of researches that investigates the political trust use data of surveys that involving all the Latin America. We would like to stress that more researches about the Brazilian case still needs to be developed. As we saw earlier, there is what we can call Brazilian paradox, which involves the political culture of Brazilian citizens, the construction of Brazilian democracy, and the functioning and performance of democratic institutions at this country.

References

- ALMOND, G.; VERBA, S. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- AVRITZER, L. *Modelos de Sociedade Civil: uma análise da especificidade do caso brasileiro*. In: AVRITZER, Leonardo (org.), **Sociedade Civil e Democratização**. Belo Horizonte. Editora Del Rey, 1994, p.269-308
- BABBIE, E. *Métodos de Pesquisa de Survey*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2005.
- BARBETTA, P.A. *Estatística Aplicada às Ciências Sociais*. Florianópolis: Editora UFSC, 2006.
- BOWLER, S.; DONOVAN, T. *The Effects of Winning and Losing on Attitudes about Political Institutions and Democracy in the United States*. Chicago IL, 3-6, Midwest Political Science Association Meeting, Apr. 2003.
- CASTRO, M. M. M. *Determinantes do Comportamento Eleitoral: A centralidade da Sofisticação Política*. Tese de Doutorado em Ciência Política, IUPERJ. 1994.
- COLARES, C F. O que é análise fatorial? In: <http://carloscolares.blogspot.com> - acesso em 24/08/2011.
- COLEN, C. M. L. *As covariantes da confiança política na América Latina*. **Revista Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 16, n. 1, junho, 2010.
- EASTON, D. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc, 1965.
- HABERMAS, J. *Direito e Democracia: Faticidade, Validade e Racionalidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1997.
- INGLEHART, R. *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1997.
- LAGOS, M. *A Máscara Sorridente da América Latina*. **Revista Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v.6, n.1, p.1-16, abril, 2000.
- LISTHAUG, O. *The dynamics of political trust*. In: KLINGEMANN, H.-D.; FUCHS, D. (Eds.). **Citizens and the state**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- LOPES, D. M. N N. *Para pensar a confiança e a cultura política na América Latina*. **Revista Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 10, n. 1, maio, 2004.
- LUNDASEN, S. *Podemos confiar nas medidas de confiança?*. *Revista Opinião Pública*, Campinas, v.8, n.2, p. 304 -327, 2002.
- MCALLISTER, I. *The Economic Performance of Governments*. In: NORRIS, P. (org). **Critical Citizens: Global support for democratic government**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.88-203, 1999.

- MOISÉS, J. A. *Os brasileiros e a democracia: bases sociopolíticas da legitimidade democrática*. São Paulo: Ática. 1995.
- MOISÉS, J. A. *A desconfiança nas instituições democráticas*. **Revista Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 11, n. 1, março, 2005.
- MOISÉS, J. A. *Cidadania, confiança e instituições democráticas*. **Revista Lua Nova**, São Paulo, nº. 65, agosto, 2006.
- MOISÉS, J. A. *Cultura política, instituições e democracia: lições da experiência brasileira*. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais**, São Paulo, v. 23, n. 66, fev. 2008.
- MOISÉS, J. A.; CARNEIRO, G. P. *Democracia, desconfiança política e insatisfação com o regime: o caso do Brasil*. **Revista Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 14, n. 1, junho, 2008.
- NORRIS, P. *Critical citizens: global support for democratic government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1999.
- POWER, T. J.; JAMISON, G. D. *Desconfiança política na América Latina*. **Revista Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 11, n. 1, março, 2005.
- SMITH, T. *Factors Relating to Misanthropy in Contemporary American Society*. *Social Science Research*, v 26: p.170-196, 1997.