

Government, Institutions and Crises, Analysis of Confidence in the Largest Democracy

Arvind Choudhary

Alumini, Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata

Binay Shankar

Research Assistant, Department of Economic Sciences,
Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur

Bipasa Banerjee

Student,
Tata Institute of Social Sciences Hyderabad

Shashi Shankar Arya

CS & IT Assistant,
Indian Institute of Management, Bodh Gaya

ABSTRACT

Policy interventions, government decisions and policy implementation affect the citizen's confidence in the government. This confidence in turn tends to improve the public services provided by the government. In this study, we have tried to understand the dynamic nature of citizen's confidence over different kinds of civil services with the change in their perception of government responsibility. We have found from OLS estimation that on average as the perception of the government responsibility among the common citizens increases the confidence over major companies, civil services, labour unions, armed forces and democracy starts to decrease.

Keywords: *Crises, Perceptions, Confidence, Public establishments, World Value Survey*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Corona virus pandemic confronted the government and its institutions in their functioning. India, being the largest democracy with the second largest population has a massive set of daily workers who were hurled into irregularity. This crisis leads the way to a decrease in trust over the government and its persona. [See e.g., (Schraff, 2020; Aiyar, 2020; Suttie, 2020)]. Covid-19 had

surprised both the developed and the developing nations equally. Though nations who have had the health infrastructure to curtail previous pandemics like yellow fever, HIV/AIDS etc. were expected to be more successful in handling the new pandemic, studies showed that curtailing Covid-19 down was more than infrastructure. Here the most effective strategies were by the government were the ones that could implement a smart lockdown rather than a mere lockdown (Arshed, et.al, 2020). Thus, other than providing a health infrastructure the government had an even more significant role to play during the pandemic. In the context of Covid-19 people's confidence in the government was based on unexpected determinants, for example, a study by GirayGozgor showed that the education of an individual had negative relation to confidence in the government. It was also observed that older and healthy people had higher levels of confidence over public institutions (Gozgor, 2021).

Table 1: Major crises in context to Indian economy along with the period

MAJOR CRISIS	TIME/SNAPSHOT
1991 INDIAN ECONOMIC CRISIS	1990-1991
DEMOLITION OF THE BABRI MASJID	6-Dec-92
KARGIL WAR	3 May – 26 July 1999
GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS (GFC)	2008-2009
ANTI-BIHARI SENTIMENT	2008

Source: Compiled by author by using many sources

People's confidence in public services is majorly dependent on certain decisions and policy implications made by the government. In the timeline selected for our study certain major external factors such as opening up of the economy through globalization, liberalization and privatization occurred other than that other major event within the timeline are the demolition of Babri masjid in 1992, the Kargil war in 1999, the global financial crisis of 2008 and the rise in anti-Bihari sentiments in certain states in 2008 along with cases like Nirbhaya in 2012 also have implicitly affected citizen's perception and belief on the government as well as the public services.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

We have found large literature studying the causes for the variation in the confidence over Public establishments. Confidence of an individual over the government has a lot more to do than just trust as confidence is an indication of the competence of the government. A decline in confidence in the government will be affected by multiple factors such as corruption, economic inequality, etc. (Kumagai, et.al.2020). In terms of economic inequality, it has been observed that it adversely affects individuals and societies. In cases of business consequences of societal-level economic inequality, it is found that economic inequality indirectly affects organizational performance via human development in the society, and directly affects the individual employees based on their workplace interaction and with the institutions in which the organizations are embedded. (Bapuji, 2015).

Thus, income inequality not only reduces the citizens' confidence in the government but also in major companies. The empirical study focused on America exhibited the downturn of trust of Americans in the public services because of the changing perception, compassion and certain decisions taken in terms of policies by the then President (Kim & Norris, 2000). People tend to have a certain belief in the way they would prefer their government to function. It is observed that mostly the lowest rungs of the society have exhibited a high level of confidence in the government institutions as their requirements from the government are restricted to support.

Whereas the upper-class societies tend to show dissatisfaction with the change in government responsibility as they want to see a liberalized environment. Both these contrasting tendencies, in the end, impacts the state by making it more responsible for its citizens (Shastri, 2002).

Researches suggest that weak ideological attachment between individuals and the median policy-making positions in parliament lessens overall citizens' confidence in political institutions. Citizens' confidence for each political institution is most positively affected by the involvement of the median party in policy processes (Kim, 2007).

Individual's trust in the government does have a gendered point of view too as some theoretical bases have shown that women are more supportive of government programs than men. Some of the factors for this purpose is the differences in emotional responses to social problems, gendered differences in the

awareness of those problems among one's kin, differences in the perceived fairness of existing social institutions, differences in the perceived efficacy of government programs, and variations in the preferred form that those programs should take (Schlesinger et.al, 2001). This can be improved with the betterment in the procedural quality of bureaucracy which would tend to result in boosting the support for democracy by reducing the likelihood of the event of cognitive dissonance between the idea of ideal democracy and the experienced one. Moreover, the beneficial impact of a higher quality of government (QoG) is expected to be more visible in younger democracies (Boräng, et.al, 2017). Recent studies suggest that democracies tend to show a link between political dissatisfaction and a rise in democratic awareness which calls for the government to be held accountable (Jamal,2007).

The media has always held a certain amount of power to influence public decisions. Despite trying to keep a third-party neutral approach to issues media has always played a passive role in accentuating it. The belief lies in the fact that though media is not the source of contention they merely amplify the contention (Plowman, Walton. 2020). Thus, the location of an individual in terms of economic inequality and their belief in government responsibility would change their confidence in the modes of information like television and media.

We have found that causes like the self-perception of government responsibility and income inequality are unavailable in the literature. We have found such study are based on WVS (World Value Survey), we got variables like income inequality, ownerships over the goods and services in the economy, and perception of government responsibility in WVS.

2.1 Research gap

Previous studies have been indicative of the fact that the impact of confidence of the individuals on the service delivery of the government tends to be overwhelmed by other effects too (Sims, 2001) thus here we have included other responsibilities of the government to understand the change in the confidence of the citizens. Instead of adhering to one or two public institutions, we have studied the causal effect relationship, how the perception of income inequality and government responsibility as a cause, affects the confidence over multiple government institutions like Armed Forces, Media, Labour Unions, Police, Democracy and Major Companies.

3. OBJECTIVE

Considering the situation of crises, there may be factors affecting confidence over the governments and their institutions and major organizations. Hence there are numbers of questions that can be raised:

- (1) what are the causes that are affecting confidence?
 - (2) What are methods can be addressed to track the variation in confidence?
 - (3) What are the possible trails that can be intervened to establish confidence?
- And
- (4) Out of trails, which trail will have more economic impact?

3.1 Data and Methodology

Using longitudinal secondary data from the WVS (World Value Survey), we have estimated the following equation using OLS (ordinary least square), which provides the micro-level foundations for the public interest.

$$y_{kji} = \alpha_k + \beta_{k1} * x_{k1i} + \beta_{k2} * x_{k2i} + \gamma\theta + \varepsilon_{kji} - (i)$$

As per the data available, we have tracked the dynamics of cause-effect variation for the year 1990, 1995, 2001, 2006 and 2012. Vector of controls has been used to emphasize the assertion for endogenous characteristics of an individual. Note here we have assumed that the distance between the categories of the responses, recorded against the confidence, having the equal distance, and are like as preference or marks. [See e.g., Islam et al., (2021), Agrwal et al., (2020), etc.]

3.2 Study design

To justify the causal effect relationship, we have used the longitudinal data from the WVS (World Value Survey) and performed OLS (ordinary least square) for error, ε , minimization, the hypothesis can be reported as:-

$$H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$$

H_1 : otherwise

Where β_i represents the coefficients of the estimated effect from the perception of government responsibility and income inequality in presence of control, here we have also considered the smallest county-level effect.

The perception of Income inequality and government responsibility had been considered as explanatory variables. Along with numbers of controls as the binary of sex, and categories of age groups, the highest education level attained, employment status and size of the town. The smallest county-level available with us was the state to which the respondent belongs.

Table 2: Summary statics of explanatory variables and controls

Variables of interest	Overall		1990		1995		2001		2006		2012	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Income equality	3.775	3.221	3.268	2.978	5.712	3.113	3.563	3.452	4.108	3.67	2.781	2.408
Govt. responsibility	6.863	3.322	6.898	3.478	4.671	2.871	7.276	3.356	7.142	3.458	7.848	2.763
Sex												
Male	0.556	0.497	0.549	0.498	0.535	0.499	0.568	0.495	0.568	0.495	0.562	0.496
Female	0.444	0.497	0.451	0.498	0.465	0.499	0.432	0.495	0.432	0.495	0.438	0.496
Age group												
18 to 39	0.566	0.496	0.628	0.483	0.676	0.468	0.547	0.498	0.503	0.5	0.508	0.5
40 to 59	0.318	0.466	0.32	0.466	0.22	0.415	0.324	0.468	0.359	0.48	0.355	0.479
60 to 99	0.115	0.32	0.052	0.223	0.104	0.305	0.129	0.336	0.138	0.345	0.136	0.343
Highest education level attained												
No formal education	0.309	0.462	0.322	0.467	0.1	0.3	0.402	0.49	0.39	0.488	0.344	0.475
Pre college education	0.337	0.473	0.374	0.484	0.306	0.461	0.251	0.434	0.249	0.432	0.423	0.494
Post college education	0.354	0.478	0.304	0.46	0.594	0.491	0.347	0.476	0.361	0.481	0.233	0.423
Employment status												
Employed	0.492	0.5	0.542	0.498	0.556	0.497	0.521	0.5	0.46	0.499	0.429	0.495
Housewife	0.247	0.431	0.296	0.457	0.248	0.432	0.026	0.159	0.29	0.454	0.309	0.462
Unemployed	0.08	0.272	0.075	0.263	0.078	0.268	0.108	0.311	0.077	0.267	0.072	0.259
Others	0.181	0.385	0.087	0.282	0.119	0.324	0.345	0.475	0.172	0.378	0.19	0.392
Size of town												
Less than 10000	0.567	0.496	0.382	0.486	0.151	0.358	0.611	0.488	0.837	0.37	0.761	0.427
Between 10000 ~50000	0.176	0.381	0.201	0.401	0.213	0.41	0.228	0.42	0.081	0.273	0.161	0.368
Greater than 50000	0.257	0.437	0.417	0.493	0.636	0.481	0.16	0.367	0.082	0.275	0.078	0.268
Observation	12621		2040		2500		2002		2001		4078	

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

Confidence over multiple government institutions like – Major Companies, The Civil Services, The Police, Labour Unions, Armed Forces, The Democracy, and The Media had been considered as outcome variables. Here confidence over the democracy had been assumed as a rounded average of confidence over the political parties, confidence over parliament and confidence over the government. In the same manner confidence over the media had been considered as a rounded average of confidence over newspaper and confidence over television.

Table 3: Summary statics of Outcome variables

Variable	Overall		1990		1995		2001		2006		2012	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mea n	Std. Dev.	Mea n	Std. Dev.	Mea n	Std. Dev.	Mea n	Std. Dev.
Confidence: Major Companies	2.665	0.88	2.759	0.729	2.682	0.887	2.562	0.872	2.714	0.841	2.633	0.958
Confidence: Civil Services	2.775	0.85	2.835	0.717	2.898	0.822	2.575	0.878	2.738	0.846	2.786	0.895
Confidence: The Police	2.414	0.991	2.249	0.934	2.253	0.963	2.223	0.92	2.689	0.973	2.553	1.026
Confidence: Labour Unions	2.535	0.921	2.442	0.914	2.474	0.864	2.348	0.905	2.532	0.915	2.713	0.939
Confidence: Armed force	3.441	0.746	3.283	0.738	3.528	0.662	3.555	0.694	3.402	0.816	3.429	0.772

Confidence: Democracy	2.807	0.778	2.808	0.749	2.872	0.74	2.73	0.762	2.899	0.746	2.758	0.829
Confidence: Media	3.025	0.74	2.84	0.656	2.842	0.678	3.028	0.775	3.168	0.673	3.159	0.785
Observation	12621		2040		2500		2002		2001		4078	

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

In equation (i), j varies from 1 to 7 for different confidence variable and i varies across respondent. Here k had been used to track the dynamics for year-wise variations. As per the data availability we have tracked the dynamics of causal – effect variation for the year 1990, 1995, 2001, 2006, 2012 and overall. The vectors of controls (θ) with their coefficient (γ) had also been used to emphasize the assertion for the endogenous characteristics of an individual. The obtained empirical results using the OLS (Ordinary Least Square) estimation had been listed in the Appendices table 4A to 4G. We have used three-level of significance as (***) 99%, (**) 95% and (*) 90%.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Confidence over Major companies:

People's belief in government responsibility hurts confidence in Major companies(overall). The coefficient for government responsibility is -0.016 and it's significant at a 99% level of significance. When we look for trend over the period from 1990 to 2012, the coefficient has been consistently negative but only once it was significant in 1995. People who believe more in income inequality has a lower level of confidence in Major companies, the coefficient for income equality is -0.005 but it's insignificant.

Table 4A: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over Major Companies

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: Major Companies (Overall)	Confidence: Major Companies (Year = 1990)	Confidence: Major Companies (Year = 1995)	Confidence: Major Companies (Year = 2001)	Confidence: Major Companies (Year = 2006)	Confidence: Major Companies (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.005	-0.005	0.001	0.008	-0.020*	0.001
Government responsibility	-0.016***	-0.006	-0.009*	-0.017	-0.004	-0.010
Controls						
Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	0.042*	-0.050	0.121	0.088	0.046	0.023
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	-0.023	-0.083*	-0.011	-0.026	0.037	0.025
60 to 99	0.013	0.019	-0.071	0.133**	0.032	0.019

Highest educational level attained(With ref:No formal education)						
Pre college education	-0.054*	-0.034	0.009	-0.014	-0.078	-0.038
Post college education	-0.005	0.046	0.020	-0.068	-0.045	-0.015
Employment status(With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	0.014	0.058	-0.064	-0.248**	0.063	-0.009
Unemployed	-0.086	-0.031	-0.063	-0.091	0.157	-0.171
Others	0.002	0.073	0.143	0.040	-0.046	0.044
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	-0.015	0.027	-0.118*	-0.034	-0.053	-0.258
Greater than 50000	0.008	-0.079	-0.068	0.091	0.060	0.111
Constant	2.726***	2.480***	2.746***	2.675***	2.698***	2.688***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.020	0.127	0.112	0.167	0.054	0.082
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. Major companies includes the set of Maharatna, Navratna and Miniratna, along with some location specific identified companies.

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

For gender, we find that females tend to have more confidence in Major companies compare to males. Results are mixed for different age groups. Education level seems to harm confidence in Major companies. But the coefficients are not significant to expect pre-college education (overall) coefficient. Other control variables, Employment status and Size of town seems to have mixed and most are showing insignificant relations.

Confidence over the Civil Services:

People who believe more in income inequality tend to have less confidence in civil services (overall), but the result is insignificant. Where people who think that government should take more responsibility tend to have less confidence in civil services (overall), this result also holds over the period 1990 to 2012 but it is not significant for all the periods, coefficient of government responsibility is only significant in the year 1995 and 2006.

Table 4B: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over The Civil Services

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: The Civil Services (Overall)	Confidence: The Civil Services (Year = 1990)	Confidence: The Civil Services (Year = 1995)	Confidence: The Civil Services (Year = 2001)	Confidence: The Civil Services (Year = 2006)	Confidence: The Civil Services (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.008	-0.013	-0.003	0.001	-0.018	0.006
Government responsibility	-0.019***	-0.001	-0.018*	-0.011	-0.026**	-0.002
Controls						
Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	0.016	-0.023	0.093	0.036	-0.065	0.065
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	-0.014	-0.042	-0.018	0.022	-0.009	0.013
60 to 99	0.022	-0.014	0.008	0.103**	-0.019	0.033
Highest educational level attained(With ref: No formal education)						
Pre college education	0.063**	0.175*	0.000	-0.007	-0.026	0.082*
Post college education	0.097**	0.250**	0.057	-0.010	0.024	0.068
Employment status(With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	0.065*	0.120**	-0.030	-0.183*	0.155**	-0.027
Unemployed	-0.068	0.037	-0.031	-0.126	0.076	-0.110
Others	0.017	0.131**	0.088	-0.018	0.002	0.024
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	-0.003	0.010	-0.064	-0.104	0.034	-0.236
Greater than 50000	0.027	-0.088	0.002	-0.061	0.164	-0.087
Constant	2.844***	2.792***	2.964***	2.604***	2.966***	2.755***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.046	0.127	0.116	0.213	0.079	0.071
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. The positions like Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service, Indian Foreign Service, Indian Audit and Accounts Service, Indian Civil Accounts Service, Indian Postal Service, Indian Ordnance Factories Service, etc., are considered as Civil Services

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

There is a positive impact of education level(overall) on confidence over The Civil services, the coefficient is highest for post-college education. Education level also positive and significant at different periods expect few. In 2001 the coefficient is negative for both pre-college education and post-college education but it's also insignificant. The coefficient has the highest value 0.175 and 0.250 in the year 1991 respectively for pre-college education and post collage education level of education attained. Employment control has mixed results, like on overall level housewife tends to have a positive and significant impact while unemployed status has a negative relation with confidence over the civil services but its insignificant. When we look at the impact of employment status over the different periods, we find out that results are not consistent. Housewife has a positive significant coefficient in the year 1990 and 2006,concerning employed. But the same variable has a negative coefficient in remaining time points, 1995, 2001 and 2012 but it is only significant in the year 2001. The size of town tends to have a mixed effect when we look at different periods and each category has negative coefficients in the year 2001. All coefficients for the size of the town are insignificant.

Confidence over the police:

People who believe that government should take more responsibility tend to have less confidence in the police but the coefficient is no significant. While people who believe in income inequality (income proportional to effort) tends to have more confidence in the police than who believe in income equality. The combined impact of different is negative and insignificant but when we look at different period, we find out that the coefficient is only negative in 1991 while it is positive for the remaining years.

Table 4C: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over The Police

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: The Police (Overall)	Confidence: The Police (Year = 1990)	Confidence: The Police (Year = 1995)	Confidence: The Police (Year = 2001)	Confidence: The Police (Year = 2006)	Confidence: The Police (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.003	-0.024***	0.022	0.003	0.000	0.029***
Government responsibility	-0.004	0.015	-0.026	-0.010	-0.016	-0.007
Controls						

Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	-0.064**	0.057	0.028	-0.016	-0.217***	-0.055
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	-0.002	-0.063	-0.063	0.033	-0.096*	0.025
60 to 99	0.080***	0.019	-0.133	0.213***	0.033	-0.038
Highest educational level attained(With ref:No formal education)						
Pre college education	0.063*	0.047	-0.122	0.154	-0.011	0.096
Post college education	0.116**	0.066	-0.016	0.070	0.076	0.187**
Employment status(With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	0.137***	0.080	-0.008	-0.134	0.188**	0.156**
Unemployed	0.018	-0.028	0.197	-0.047	0.058	-0.026
Others	0.026	0.037	0.056	0.023	-0.145	0.121
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	-0.173*	-0.041	-0.055	-0.033	0.133	-0.303*
Greater than 50000	-0.213**	-0.111	0.067	0.030	0.320	-0.165
Constant	2.562***	2.380***	2.797***	2.180***	2.660***	2.549***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.065	0.150	0.200	0.098	0.164	0.171
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. Portrayal of the local police with the local population had been considered as the police.

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

When we looking into through the lens of gender, we find out that females tend to have less confidence in the police in comparison to males. The coefficient for combined all periods is -0.064 and its significant al 95 % level of significance. And by looking at different time points we find out that the effect of sex control for female was positive before 2001 and then it becomes negative but it was only once significant in 2006. The coefficient of the age group has mixed types of results, the age group above 60 has ha positive and significant coefficients while the age group 40 to 59 has a negative coefficient but it is insignificant. When we look at this control variable at different time points, we find out that the age group above age 60 has its highest coefficient in 2001 and it is positive and significant while the age group has its significant coefficient only once in 2006

with a value of -0.096. The highest educational level attained has a positive impact on confidence over the police. As the education level increases people tend to have more confidence in the police. The value of the coefficient for the pre-college education group is 0.063 and for the post-college education level coefficient increase to 0.116, both coefficients are significant. Housewife tends to have more confidence at an overall level as well as in the recent period. On the other hand, the size of town hurts confidence over the police, as town size increase confidence over the police decreases. The coefficient for Size of town (with ref: less than 10000) between 10000 & 50000 is -0.173 and for Size of town (with ref: less than 10000) greater than 50000 is -0.213, both coefficients are significant.

Confidence over Labour union:

People who have more belief in income inequality and government responsibility tend to have less confidence over the labour union while the coefficient is only significant for government responsibility. When we look at the coefficient at different periods, we find out that the coefficient of Income equality is only significant in 1990 while the coefficient for government responsibility is only significant in 2001. Females tend to have less confidence in the labour union. The coefficient is only having a positive sign in 1990 but it is also insignificant. For the remaining, all-time points we find out that the coefficient is negative and significant.

Table 4D: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over Labour Union

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: Labour Unions (Overall)	Confidence: Labour Unions (Year = 1990)	Confidence: Labour Unions (Year = 1995)	Confidence: Labour Unions (Year = 2001)	Confidence: Labour Unions (Year = 2006)	Confidence: Labour Unions (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.006	-0.021*	0.005	-0.015	0.010	-0.013
Government responsibility	-0.012*	0.002	-0.020	-0.011*	-0.009	0.002
Controls						
Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	-0.130***	0.030	-0.139*	-0.165**	-0.144***	-0.156***
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	-0.026	-0.093**	-0.046	-0.044	-0.028	0.022
60 to 99	-0.024	-0.116**	-0.072	-0.043	0.020	-0.069

Highest educational level attained(With ref:No formal education)						
Pre college education	0.078**	0.029	0.042	0.092	-0.112	0.086
Post college education	0.034	0.060	-0.140	0.038	-0.052	0.043
Employment status(With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	0.026	-0.138**	-0.045	-0.147	0.131**	-0.009
Unemployed	-0.051	-0.140	0.157	-0.009	-0.025	-0.117
Others	-0.084*	-0.019	-0.085	-0.084	-0.050	-0.005
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	-0.021	-0.004	0.206	0.115	0.076	-0.176
Greater than 50000	-0.217***	-0.102	0.044	-0.007	-0.064	-0.395*
Constant	2.772***	2.620***	2.742***	2.560***	2.442***	2.928***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.041	0.107	0.094	0.099	0.176	0.099
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. An association of the workers/traders/professionals/etc., may be formal or informal, if they are organized had been considered as the labour unions.

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

For different age groups impact on confidence over the labour union is negative but insignificant as well. It has significant value only once in 1991. Education level overall tends to have a positive effect on confidence in the labour union. The coefficient is only once significant for pre-college education at the overall level. Unemployed group tends to have less confidence in the labour union but it has an insignificant coefficient. The size of town also hurts confidence in the labour union and it significant for a town size of greater than 50000.

Confidence over Armed Forces:

People who have more belief in income inequality and government responsibility tend to have less confidence over Armed forces while the coefficient is only significant for government responsibility. In 2001 people who believe in more government responsibility has a positive effect but it is insignificant. Females tend to have less confidence in armed forces, coefficients at all-time points are negative except in the year 2001. Age category tends to have a positive effect on confidence over armed forces. And coefficients are significant for both groups at an overall level.

Table 4E: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over Armed Forces

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: Armed Forces (Overall)	Confidence: Armed Forces (Year = 1990)	Confidence: Armed Forces (Year = 1995)	Confidence: Armed Forces (Year = 2001)	Confidence: Armed Forces (Year = 2006)	Confidence: Armed Forces (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.002	0.009**	-0.007	0.000	-0.014	-0.005
Government responsibility	-0.005*	-0.003	-0.003	0.001	-0.021***	0.012
Controls						
Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	-0.008	-0.129***	-0.049	0.073	-0.013	-0.042
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	0.030*	0.034	0.012	-0.050	0.109***	0.026
60 to 99	0.072**	0.025	0.054	0.003	0.119**	0.029
Highest educational level attained(With ref:No formal education)						
Pre college education	0.052	0.155***	-0.043	0.069	0.058	0.064
Post college education	0.103**	0.172***	-0.031	0.074*	0.125	0.078
Employment status(With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	-0.035	0.123**	0.021	-0.051	0.039	-0.035
Unemployed	0.014	0.028	-0.089	-0.016	0.219*	-0.017
Others	0.015	0.025	-0.017	-0.051	-0.090	0.033
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	0.025	-0.201***	0.074**	-0.003	0.055	0.042
Greater than 50000	-0.016	-0.130***	0.064	0.009	0.018	-0.142
Constant	3.313***	3.453***	3.024***	3.153***	3.577***	3.347***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.044	0.224	0.211	0.165	0.165	0.096
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. Countries army including land, naval and air forces had been considered as the Armed Forces.

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

The highest education level attained also has a positive effect on confidence in the armed forces. The Coefficient of Post-college education level is significant. The coefficients for both pre-college and post-college education level in 1990

was positive and significant but in 1995 both coefficients become negative and insignificant and in 2001, that becomes positive again and remained positive thereafter they are insignificant expect post-college education level in 2001. Employment status and town size tend to have mixed types of result and insignificant at an overall level.

Confidence over democracy:

People who believe that government should take more responsibility has significantly less confidence in democracy. Over the different periods coefficient for government responsibility has been negative except in 1990, the coefficients are insignificant except in 2012. People who don't believe in income equality have less confidence in government but at the overall level coefficient is insignificant. When we look at different period's coefficient was only significant in 1990.

Table 4F: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over Democracy

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: Democracy (Overall)	Confidence: Democracy (Year = 1990)	Confidence: Democracy (Year = 1995)	Confidence: Democracy (Year = 2001)	Confidence: Democracy (Year = 2006)	Confidence: Democracy (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.008	-0.013**	-0.017	-0.006	-0.004	0.000
Government responsibility	-0.015**	0.005	-0.011	-0.009	-0.008	-0.020**
Controls						
Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	-0.026	-0.065	0.035	-0.075	-0.154***	0.017
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	-0.029	-0.019	-0.077*	-0.019	-0.017	0.003
60 to 99	-0.005	0.003	-0.184*	0.090*	-0.060	-0.006
Highest educational level attained (With ref: No formal education)						
Pre college education	0.011	0.201***	-0.050	0.008	-0.076	0.080*
Post college education	0.059	0.226***	-0.008	0.007	0.055	0.043
Employment status (With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	0.039*	0.041	0.028	-0.187	0.217***	0.015
Unemployed	-0.022	0.003	-0.044	0.067	0.135	-0.050

Others	-0.020	-0.033	0.076	0.018	-0.015	0.053
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	-0.052	0.021	0.047	-0.148	0.145	-0.226*
Greater than 50000	-0.050	-0.145**	-0.050	0.079	0.135	0.005
Constant	2.975***	2.588***	2.934***	2.873***	3.079***	3.031***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.053	0.215	0.202	0.155	0.112	0.105
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. Confidence over democracy had been considered as average sum of confidence over the parliament, political parties and government.

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

Dummies for the sex results that females tend to have less confidence in democracy but it is insignificant although. When we look for different time points, we find out that the coefficient was only significant in 2006. In age group control we find out that both age group (with ref: 18 to 39) 40 to 59 and 60 to 99 has a negative coefficient and that means older age groups tend to have less confidence in democracy but results are insignificant at glance. When we look at these results at different time points, we find out that both coefficients (for age group 40 to 59 and 60 to 90) negative and significant in 1995 while in 2001 the coefficient become positive and significant for age group 60 to 99.

The highest education level attained tends to have a positive impact on confidence over democracy but results are insignificant. But when we look into different periods, we find out that both levels of education are significant in 1990, post-college education has a high impact on confidence than pre-college education and no formal education. But in the year 1995 both becomes negative and insignificant and again they become positive in next time point and they are still insignificant. In lasted available period both have a positive effect on confidence over democracy but, only for the pre-college education level group, the relation holds significant. By looking at employment status we find out that housewives tend to have more confidence in democracy than employed people. The coefficient is significant at the overall level and also significant and positive in the year 2006. For other time points, it is insignificant and also in the year 2001, it becomes negative. Unemployed group tend to have less confidence in democracy at the overall level but results are insignificant.

On the other hand, the size of town hurts confidence over democracy, as town size increase confidence over the police decreases. The coefficient for Size of town (with ref: less than 10000) between 10000 & 50000 is -0.052 and for Size of town (with ref: less than 10000) greater than 50000 is -0.050, both coefficients are insignificant at an overall level. When we look for different time points, we find out that for medium-size town coefficient was positive in early years but later it becomes negative (significant only once in 2012) and for big size town coefficient was negative in early years and later it becomes positive (significant only once in 1990).

Confidence over Media:

People who believe less in income equality has less confidence in media, the value of the coefficient is -0.008, but the result is insignificant. When we look at different time points, we found out that in early years the coefficient was negative and now it becoming positive but results are not significant, except for the year 1990. People who believe that government should take more responsibility tend to have more confidence in the media but results are not significant. Analysis at different time points has mixed results and the coefficient is only once significant in the year 2006 and it is also negative at that point. It may be speculated that people who believe that government should take more responsibility tend to have less confidence in media.

Table4G: Empirical results estimated using OLS for Confidence over Media

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables of Interest	Confidence: Media (Overall)	Confidence: Media (Year = 1990)	Confidence: Media (Year = 1995)	Confidence: Media (Year = 2001)	Confidence: Media (Year = 2006)	Confidence: Media (Year = 2012)
Income equality	-0.008	-0.018***	-0.002	0.004	-0.003	0.014
Government responsibility	0.002	0.001	-0.005	0.001	-0.015*	0.006
Controls						
Sex (With ref: Male)						
Female	-0.040**	-0.025	0.046	-0.082	-0.122***	-0.021
Age Group (With ref: 18 to 39)						
40 to 59	-0.015	-0.024	-0.004	-0.084**	-0.020	-0.027
60 to 99	0.002	-0.009	-0.090	0.009	-0.041	-0.076

Highest educational level attained(With ref:No formal education)						
Pre college education	0.089***	-0.171***	0.024	0.042	0.016	0.165***
Post college education	0.123**	-0.217***	0.068	0.139**	0.084	0.184***
Employment status(With ref: Employed)						
Housewife	0.009	0.033	-0.068	-0.066	0.047	0.002
Unemployed	-0.045	0.004	0.008	0.030	0.080	-0.118*
Others	0.002	0.023	0.138**	0.097*	-0.061	-0.035
Size of town(With ref: less than 10000)						
Between 10000 & 50000	-0.091	-0.022	0.093	0.002	0.017	-0.249
Greater than 50000	-0.209**	-0.050	0.115*	0.027	0.153*	-0.168
Constant	3.096***	3.089***	2.900***	2.795***	3.333***	3.158***
Observations	12,621	2,500	2,040	2,002	2,001	4,078
R-squared	0.048	0.170	0.136	0.099	0.139	0.122
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1						

Note: Respondent were asked to report their confidants, in between 1 to 4, as 1 “None at all” 2 “Not very much” 3 “Quite a lot” 4 “A great deal”. Average of two variables like confidence over press and confidence over the television had been considered as confidence over the media at a glance.

Source: Compiled by author using WVS data

In control variables when we look for sex dummy, we find out that females have less confidence in media than males. Results are significant at the overall level and as well as in the year 2006. For different age group, results are mixed types and are insignificant as well expect once in the year 2001 when the coefficient for age group 40 to 59 is negative and significant. The highest education level attained has a positive impact on confidence over media. Higher educated people tend to have more confidence in the media. Results are significant at the overall level. Coefficients are as follow 0.089 and 0.123 respectively for pre-college education and post-college education reference to no formal education. When we do our analysis for different periods, we find out that both groups have negative and significant coefficients in 1990. Expect this on all coefficients were positive which means education level has a positive impact on confidence over media. Results were only significant in 2012 for the pre-college education variable and post-college education results were significant in 2001 and 2012.

Employment status tends to have a mixed type of results. Moving further to the size of town we find out that at the overall level size of town has a negative relation with confidence over media. At an overall level size of town only one variable, greater than 50000 is significant. Analysis for different period's results that, coefficients were negative in 1990 and 2012 and positive for remain time points, 1995, 2001 and 2006. All results are not significant to except at two points when variable, size of town greater than 50000 is significant in 1995 and 2006.

When we see our constant or unexplained confidence overall different dependent variables, we find out that there is a decrease in confidence from 1995 to 2001 for each dependent variable except confidence over armed forces.

5. CONCLUSION

With an increase in people's perception of government responsibility, we observe a decrease in the confidence of the citizens in major companies, civil service, labour union, armed forces, democracy and media. Whereas in terms of people's perception of income equality as equality increases the confidence in major companies, labour union, democracy and media decreases. In the case of income equality and confidence over the police it shows a decrease in 1990 but later shows an increase in 2012. Positive relation is also observed in the case of confidence in the armed forces.

In terms of Females, we see a positive relation with confidence in major companies whereas a negative relation with the confidence in the police, labour union, armed forces, democracy and media. People ranging over the age of 60 has shown negative confidence over major companies and labour union but positive over civil services, the police, armed forces and democracy. Both people with pre-college and post-college education levels have a positive relation with confidence over media, democracy, armed forces, labour union, the police, civil services and negative relation with only major companies. Housewives have shown a negative relation with confidence over the major companies and labour union but positive in the case of civil services, the police, armed forces and democracy. People from towns with greater population exhibits a positive relationship in terms of their confidence over the media but negative in terms of democracy, armed forces, labour unions and the police. People from towns with smaller population have a negative relation with major companies and armed force.

6. WAY FORWARD

Policies can be implemented to ensure a feedback mechanism for the different civil services which are to be reviewed by an external body. This can help government officials to do their job better. In terms of Covid-19, it has been observed that in the case of developing nations straight forward lockdown has not been an optimal solution. Rather countries like these should have policies that would ensure contact tracing, movement restrictions and strategies to not aggravate poverty. (Arshed. Et.al, 2020) Women's confidence in the police has been consistently decreasing. Thus, policies that ensure training regarding dealing with crime against women can help in increasing confidence. Moreover, the presence of women police officers along with male at the police stations will also be helpful in this regard.

This piece of study contributes to the literature in answering, given crisis how the confidence over public affairs changes? Policymaker will find this study as a scientific way to build trials to retain the same. Based on the results of the trials for the awareness campaigns, targeting to change the perception that government responsibility can be performed. This study also puts way further to use of Rank Ordered Logistic Model (ROLM) [see e.g., Bekhor and Freund-Feinstein (2006); Fok, Paap, and Van Dijk (2012)] This research also suits to practice 'Rating Scale Model' and 'Category Characteristic Curves' to understand the probabilistic differences in the opted preferences. Shannon Entropy can also be used further to rank the different modes of transportation as per self-reported preferences by the respondents (Sen & Das, 2016).

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A., Lalji, C., & Pakrashi, D. (2020). He Has Gone to a Better Place, but She Has Not: Health Status of Hindu Widows in India. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 0(0), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2020.1802008>
- Aiyar, Y. (2020, July 22). Covid: The State-citizen trust deficit. *Hindustan Times*. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/columns/covid-the-state-citizen-trust-deficit/story-uAmoX3ZXtnJPsbChEjNclN.html>
- Arshed, N., Meo, M. S., & Farooq, F. (2020). Empirical assessment of government policies and flattening of the COVID19 curve. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(4), e2333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2333>

- Bapuji, H. (2015). Individuals, interactions and institutions: How economic inequality affects organizations. *Human Relations*, 68(7), 1059–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715584804>
- Bekhor, S., & Freund-Feinstein, U. (2006). Modeling Passengers' Preferences on a Short-Haul Domestic Airline with Rank-Ordered Data. *Transportation Research Record*, 1951(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198106195100101>
- Citizen Confidence in Political Institutions and Processes in India: Some Findings from the World Values Survey on JSTOR. (n.d.). Retrieved 28 March 2021, from https://www.jstor.org/stable/42743576?casa_token=2jXgFs6EphgAAAAA%3AG_EyzJvcXNmKtLZu-yEPMOhsCfooz_p2QAG2jldHEYTQZZOaoHOU9LDJVLyhtiO63jZThk2ccbjmEC4ZXPtZ38dNNEtrsd3gBxAK9bgtOcmQmFwIpGpQ&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Fok, D., Paap, R., & Dijk, B. V. (2012). A Rank-Ordered Logit Model with Unobserved Heterogeneity in Ranking Capabilities. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27(5), 831–846. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.1223>
- Gozgor, G. (2020). Global Evidence on the Determinants of Public Trust in Governments During the COVID-19 (SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3618837). Social Science Research Network. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3618837>
- Islam, A., Pakrashi, D., Vlassopoulos, M., & Wang, L. C. (2021). Stigma and Misconceptions in the Time of the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Field Experiment in India (SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3758696). Social Science Research Network. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3758696>
- Jamal, A. (2007). When Is Social Trust a Desirable Outcome?: Examining Levels of Trust in the Arab World. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(11), 1328–1349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414006291833>
- Kim, K., & Norris, P. (2000). Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture or Performance? Pharr, S y Putnam, R. *Disaffected Democracies. What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries*, 169–187.
- Kim, M. (2007). Citizens' Confidence in Government, Parliament and Political Parties. *Politics & Policy*, 35(3), 496–521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2007.00070.x>

- Kumagai, S., & Ilorio, F. (2020). Building Trust in Government through Citizen Engagement. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/33346>
- Plowman, K. D., & Walton, S. B. (2020). Negotiating public policy: Are there roles for the media and public relations? *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(4), e2148. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2148>
- Schlesinger, M., & Heldman, C. (2001). Gender Gap or Gender Gaps? New Perspectives on Support for Government Action and Policies. *Journal of Politics*, 63(1), 59–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-3816.00059>
- Schraff, D. (2002). Political trust during the Covid-19 pandemic: Rally around the flag or lockdown effects? *European Journal of Political Research*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12425>
- Sen, S. K., & Das, J. (2016). A Study On Performance Evaluation Of Public Sector Enterprise Steel Companies Using Shannon Dea Approach. *Vidyasagar University Journal of Commerce*, 21, 17. <http://inet.vidyasagar.ac.in:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/1048>
- Shastri, S. (2002). Citizen Confidence in Political Institutions and Processes in India: Some Findings from the World Values Survey. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 89-104. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42743576>
- Sims, H. (2001). Public confidence in government, and government service delivery (p. 41). Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development.
- Suttie, J. (2020, July 21). How Does COVID-19 Affect Trust in Government? Greater Good. https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/how_does_covid_19_affect_trust_in_government