

An Analysis of the Relationships between Corruption and Political Trust in Present China—Base on Asian Barometer Survey Data of 2008

Ruan Mengying

Master degree, Public administration and political science and law institute, Southwest Jiaotong university, Chengdu, Sichuan province, China, 610031

*Corresponding Author

Ruan Mengying

Email: kakaka5054@163.com

Abstract: Political trust, as a key element of political capital, has an important influence on the survival and development of the country. In recent years, China's political trust has been declining. In a variety of factors influencing political trust, corruption is considered to be the most important factor. Since the implementation of the reform and opening up policy, China has investigated and dealt with all kinds of economic cases and corruption cases have been more than 1 million, an average of more than 30,000 per year, while the corruption has been disclosed is only part of the actual corruption activities. The frequent corruption cases have a serious impact on political trust (Ma,2007), the occurrence of corruption reduced the public's political trust on government. In the whole field of corruption research, the subjective corruption has not been paid enough attention by the scholars. In addition, compared to subjective corruption, the "objective corruption" as an objective indicator of the public's actual understanding of the corrupt behavior of government agencies or officials, also has a significant impact on the public's political trust in the government agencies. According to analysis the data of Asian Barometer Survey data of 2008 in main land China, the "objective corruption" has more serious negative impact on political trust than "subjective corruption". Moreover, political trust also has impacts on corruption, which means that if the public doesn't believe in government agencies, they may regard government actions as corrupt. Hence, the relationship between them is endogenous. This paper analyses the relationship between corruption and political trust. It finds that corruption and political trust present an endogenous relationship. Namely, it means that when the public's political trust increases, the government's corrupt actions will decrease, and vice versa. Not only that, this paper give some suggestions were put forward for local government to promote public's political trust ascending.

Keywords: political trust; subjective corruption; objective corruption; local government; central government

INTRODUCTION

Research Background

The current research on political trust in China

Political trust can be defined as: the public having confidence in the institutions of representative democracy. In recent years, political trust as a key factor of substantiating political capital (Xiao, Wang, 2010) has drawn the extensive concerns of numerous scholars. The studies have shown that the level of China's political trust has been declining in recent years (Li, 2011).

In a critical period of the socialist transformation of China, the declining political trust may cause stakeholders to show their political apathy, political resistance and even political struggle to the public power system and the actors who are in control of political power, which will lead to the stagnation of state power, unrest and impeded social development (Chen,2012). This has extremely serious consequences. At the same time, China suffers from rampant corruption and frequent corruption cases. Understanding corruption from the point of view of the

side effects of people's political trust therefore becomes highly significant (Ma, 2007). According to the corruption perception index published by Transparency International, in China since the late 1990s, it is probably in the middle of the ranking score level ranks of all participating countries [1]. Existing studies show that corruption has penetrated into all areas of the public sector [2]. In the field of research throughout corruption, in comparison with the reality of corruption research, corruption as a "subjective feeling" that is "corruption perception" has not been afforded enough attention. There is a very close relationship (Li, Hu, Tang, 2015) between the public perception of corruption to political trust and legitimacy of the government's regime. In addition, compared with the subjectivity of "corruption perception", "corruption touch" as an objective indicator, not only lets the public actually know the corrupt actions of a government agency or official, but also has important implications for public political trust in government. In this context, research on the relationship between political trust and corruption, which is the theoretical and practical

exploration of current China who in the face of the grim situation.

Based on the existing literature findings, the researchers focused around two core methods: political trust's assessment and determination, and its origin. European countries mostly have much more research results regarding political trust than other countries, but Asian countries' research results are relatively limited, especially empirical studies on aspects of political trust. These are extremely few in number in China. Moreover, in the existing literature, there are few scholars who conduct empirical analysis based on the perception of corruption and corruption experiences to analysis the influence of them on political trust. Therefore, in facing the current situation where frequent corruption cases occur in China and to rectify this situation, this research addresses the influence of corruption perception and corruption experiences on political trust which has the most important theoretical and empirical significance for the current cases. For the current academic discourse it can fill both gaps in political theory of trust influence, and also provides a theoretical basis and practical power to the government and the judiciary, punishing corruption, which will improve public political trust, and enhance the legitimacy and stability of the ruling administration.

The relationships between political trust and corruption

Corruption has a very closed relationship with political trust. There is a comparative analysis of perceived corruption in four Latin American countries by Pharr & Putnam [3], they found that an increase in perceived corruption degrades the political legitimacy of the regime. For the countries who have not yet reached a period of consolidation in their democratic transformation, higher perceptions of corruption is very dangerous and may even ruin the future of democracy [4]. Corruption undermines the ability of societies to create social solidarity in civil society by fostering social suspicion and erosion of social trust and reciprocity [5]. Scholars Andrew Wore, Nicholas, and Sarah Birch [6] point out that corruption leads to distrust of government officials, in particular, the impact of popular perceptions of corruption on political trust. They argue that mistrust pre-suppositions of politicians will affect the uncertainty of public who judge politicians' behavior, corruption motives will be imposed on government officials, leading to lower political trust on government. Davis *et al.* also found that perceived corruption can culturally create a climate of political skepticism that would drive citizens to go out of public activities and reduce recognition of their political legitimacy [7].

Furthermore, citizens' experiences of corruption will reduce their political legitimacy [8], thus leading to a crisis of the legitimacy of the political system. In corrupt countries, citizens show their lower trust and evaluation of the political system [9]. Studies have shown that corruption has a corrosive effect on trust in political institutions [10]. The impact of corruption on political trust is indirect, and Bo Rothstein and Eric M. Uslaner [11] argue that trust, inequality, and corruption are linked: corruption leads to greater inequality and inequality will lead to lower political trust. Corruption also undermines the fundamental principles of democracy: responsibility, equality and openness, corruption creates a distrust of citizens' political beliefs and leads to a crisis of the legitimacy of the political system [8, 9]. Political scholars [12] argue that corruption leads politicians to abuse of the power conferred (trust), thereby reducing citizens' trust in political institutions. In addition, corruption has also led to a decline in the efficiency of government agencies, since dishonest governments use a large amount of resources to serve specific groups and a small amount of resources for public service projects, thereby reducing responsiveness to citizens' preferences, Resulting in a decline in the efficiency of government agencies, in turn, corruption as a means of citizens to bribe policy makers also reduces the trust of institutions. In corrupt countries, citizens show lower trust and evaluation of the political system. Increasing corruption and dishonesty in political life are, therefore, the cause of the decline in political trust [9].

Statement of aims

According to the existing literature, we can find that: there is a relationship between corruption and political trust. Therefore, the first aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between political trust and corruption. According to the data form the 2008 Asian Barometer Survey of main land China, we found that the relationship between political trust and corruption is endogenous, it means that: when the public's political trust decreases, government corruption will increase; when government corruption decreases, public's political trust in government will increase.

Moreover, a country's corruption condition is the key factor what often influences the speed of economic growth and the level of foreign direct investment, and always concerns government, enterprises and business consultancy. Therefore, the second aim of this paper is to reduce government's corrupt actions to increase the public trust in political institutions through demonstrating the relationship between political trust and corruption.

Besides that, the public's "corruption touch" directly and significantly influences the public

evaluation of the government's anti-corruption work. The government institutions those have frequent interactions with the public would determine the level of public's "corruption touch". Hence, the third aim of this paper is to advise local government to improve their public service level to meet the public's needs and increase their political trust on government.

Significance

In corrupt countries, the public presents lower trust and evaluation to political institutions and systems [9]. Studies have shown that corruption has corrosive influence on political trust [10]. The impact of corruption on political trust is indirect, Bo Rothstein and Eric M. Uslaner [10] consider that the trust, inequality and corruption are linked, so that corruption will lead to greater inequality, and inequality will cause political trust to be reduced. Corruption also undermines the fundamental principles of democracy, responsibility, equality, openness, and corruption will cause citizens to distrust politics, leading to a crisis of legitimacy of the political [9]. Political scientist [12, 13] thought that the corruption caused politicians abuse of power, thus reducing the citizens' trust in political institutions. In addition, corruption has caused the government to reduce the efficiency of the organization, which is due to the dishonesty of government that will use a lot of resources for specific service groups, and a small amount of resources for public services, which reduces the response to citizen preferences, resulting in a decline in government agency efficiency. In turn, corruption as a tool, can be used by citizens to bribe corrupt policy makers, and also reduces the institution trust. Thus, the political life of the growing corruption and dishonest political authorities are the reasons for the declining political trust [9].

Hypothesis

This paper's core word is "endogenous". The whole paper seeks to demonstrate that the relationship between political trust and corruption is endogenous, it means that: when public's political trust increases, the government's corrupt actions will decrease, and vice versa.

Moreover, the corruption part of this paper is divided into "corruption perception" and "corruption touch", it means that we want to respectively explore the influence of each of them on political trust. Therefore, the core hypothesis of this paper attempts to demonstrate that the "corruption perception" and "corruption touch" respectively have a negative impact upon political trust, it means: the higher the public's "corruption perception" is of political institutions, the lower the public's political trust is of government agencies; the more public "corruption touch", the lower public political trust is of political institutions.

Besides that, there is a difference between "corruption objection" and "corruption subjection." It means that corruption measurement differences exist in subjective and objective results. This is to say that, it is not necessarily the case that the more serious corruption objective measurements are, the stronger local public subjective perception of corruption is, and vice versa.

Definitions

The key terms used throughout this paper are three words, they are: political trust, corruption and endogenous. In the empirical studies of political trust, the most important thing is the operationalization of the concept of political trust, that is, how to better measure the concept to accurately reflect the connotation of political trust (Xiong Meijuan, 2014). In the New Democracies Barometer Survey data, foreign political organizations, such as: political parties, courts, civil servant, government, trade unions, national presidents, patriotic societies, private enterprises, peasant organizations, government consultants, as the variable to measure the public's political trust on government. In general, the measurement of political trust is mainly directed to the several of these organizations in government (Xiong Meijuan, 2014). For example, Ma Dongyong (2007) selected seven political organizations, they are: courts, central government, local government, public security department (police), parliament (mainland China for the NPC), army, political party (Communist Party of China) as an indicator Political trust; Letki [14] based on the main factor analysis and selected four organizations (parliamentary, executive department, military, and police) to summed the four indices into an additive index as a trust variable for political institutions; Newton [15] did a comparative analysis of countries, so only the parliament is drawn as a measure of political trust. Therefore, the one of paper's aims is to better measure the public's political trust, political trust can be defined as: public have confidence in the representative democracy institutions, such as: party, parliament, procuratorate, military, police, army and so on [3].

Corruption has a very closed relationship with political trust. Political science thinks that the nature of corruption is abuse of power for personal gains. Power is the carrier of corruption. If there is no power, there will be no corruption. White (1996) considered corruption to fall into three categories: The first category is the "black corruption" which is mainly used for economic crimes; the second category is "gray corruption", which includes the leaders of public institutions through a variety of legal, semi-legal or illegal forms, using the power of their institutions, increasing agencies' revenue, improving employee benefits, and so on; the third category is "white

corruption", including staff recruitment and promotion nepotism and favoritism when law enforcement does not act within the law or distorted laws to favor relatives and friends to offer them concessions, and so on. Transparency International simply defines corruption as: from the terms of the operation, corruption is commissioned behavior that amounts to the abuse of power for personal gain. Therefore, for better measure the influence of corruption on public's political trust, the definition of corruption in this paper is: abuse of power for personal gains.

The whole paper attempts to demonstrate that the relationship between political trust and corruption is endogenous, so what does "endogenous" mean? It means that "born from inside": two things what interact with each other have an influence on each other.

These three words constitute the core of this paper. Therefore, their definition for the theoretical framework of the whole article is very important.

Limitations

In this paper, political trust is only examined primarily from one perspective, that of public trust in government agencies, to explore the relationship between political trust and corruption. The public's judgments of government behavior are based on incomplete information and subjective perceptions. Moreover, this paper only solves the issue from the perspective of government agencies' aspects to interpret the hypothesis. All of these are weaknesses of this paper, which I attempt to compensate for by conducting the research in a form that will allow me to complete these parts in the future – for example by developing the present study in to a longer more extensive project, such in the form of a PhD.

Outline

The opening section of this paper will focus on the body of critical political trust and corruption's literature review that has sought to explore the relationship between them. Following this, analysis of the relationship between them, based on the Asian Barometer Survey data of main land China is conducted. Besides this, this paper will divide corruption into two parts, namely: corruption perception and corruption experiences, and analysis the relationship between political trust and corruption. And then, using these findings to support my core argument: the relationship between political trust and corruption is shown to be endogenous. The hope is that the above will further discussion and exploration of why the relationship between them is endogenous and how best to decrease the government's corrupt actions and increase the public's political trust.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Political trust

The definition and origin of political trust

Political trust has narrow and broad definitions, in a narrow definition: academia have reached a consensus that political trust is the public trust in government; in a generalized definition: political trust is linked with legitimacy, the regime, government performance, trust in government and other political propositions together (Xie, 2011), which generally refers to public trust in political organizations (such as political parties), trust in government institutions (government, parliament), the army, etc. (Ma, 2007), is a political phenomenon based on direct or indirect interaction to people trust and expect the political system (Shangguan, Cheng, 2011). Based on current literature, we can find that: although our trend which public trust on government is downward, but overall the level of political trust of government (especially the central government) is still at a high level (Lv, 2015), but the angle and its influence factors of the conclusions are not consistent, the differences are follows.

In the existing literature on factors affecting the political trust, the scholars divided these factors into three aspects: performance-based theory [8, 16, 17], social theory (in Wenxuan, 2013) and literary theory [18-20].

From the performance-based theory, people's political trust in the political system comes to judge the performance of rational choice (Yanxia, 2011). La Porte and Metlay [17] found that government officials lack of capacity in public administration, reduce public trust in the government. Berman [16] found that the low-quality public services can significantly reduce public confidence in the US local governments. Seligson [8] considered that the good performance of the Government will improve the political trust of citizens, citizens believed that a higher fair, satisfactory and good economic prospects will show a higher trust in government, but if public received higher education showed a pair lower government trust.

However, Van de Walle and Bouckaert [21] pointed out that there is no direct relationship between government performance in the provision of public services and impact on political trust, Christensen and Laegreid [22] research indicates that elements of the political culture has more power than government performance in impact on political trust, which emphasizes the important role of culture for the formation of political trust. From cultural theory that people of different cultures has a very different view for personal trust in the government. Yang and Holzer [19] took an example of the United States, pointed out that political distrust is deep-rooted in cultural traditions,

regardless of the government performance, people tend not to trust the government. Shi [20] do the comparative research between Taiwan and China, found that different cultural leading to the different political trust. Ma (2007) set an example of eight Asian countries and regions for the study, found that in eight countries and regions, different areas of culture shaping different levels of political trust.

At the same time, scholars of socialization theory [23] considered that the personal political values and beliefs (including political trust) is shaped by personal growth process of socialization process, so the person's age, gender, education, religion, income level and social status of political and economic determines personal political trust. Therefore, based on the theory of socialization, gender, age, education, income level and political and economic status and other personal demographic factors has become a research focus on the independent and control variables of political trust, which is the reason why these be selected to be control variables on this paper for researching political trust.

In my own opinion, I believe that these three aspects can not perfectly explain the cultivation and development of political trust, and with the process of public confidence in the government declining, cultural theory and social theory can not reasonable explain the declining reason, because in a longer period of time, the process of socialization and individual country's culture is stable and continuity. Form the performance-based theory, political trust what based on the performance is fragile and unstable (Yu, 2013), efficiency and trust in government has no direct link [8], therefore it can't explain the reasons for the decline of political trust.

The influences of political trust on corruption

Political trust refers to the level of public's confidence in government institutions, which also has an important impact on corruption. Some scholars [24] pointed out that if a country's people's political trust level is high, they are more likely to trust the government's behavior, be more tolerant to government officials, they perceive the government's corruption level is low; If the level of political trust of a country's citizens is low and their confidence in the government is low, it is more likely that the government and its officials' behave as corruption. Therefore, the level of public's political trust has influenced the political corruption. Tirole (1996) has developed an iterative model to explain the impact of organizational reputation on individual behavior: outsiders believe that all officials in a government organization with a reputation of corruption are corrupt and bribery, and in this case, a newly official will choose corruption because even if they can not change the organization's reputation. From this we can find that: there is a negative relationship

between political trust and corruption, if public has low political trust on the government institutions or officials, they may be more likely to regard their actions as corrupt. Uslanner (2002) considered that if public has higher political trust on government, it is very difficult for politicians to do corrupt or bribery actions. According to what Rothstein said, because there is trust between people, they are more likely to act in accordance with the rules of the government agency contracts, that is to say there is a negative correlation between corruption and trust. Bjornshow (2011) considered that a country with high political trust, the official system is more efficient to fight the corruption.

Corruption

The definition of corruption

The key to measure corruption refers to how to define corruption, there are four corruption definition forms which established by China officially: the first one is government officials' crime (particularly economic crime); the second one is the collusion between government officials, abuse of power for the personal interests; the third one is the squandering public funds; and fourth is the unethical behavior of party and government officials, such as gambling, affair, etc. (zhu, 2008). Transparency International's definition of corruption is the behavior what abuse of entrusted power for personal gain. Transparency International organization do the further research to distinguish "according to rule corruption" and "gainst the rule corruption", the former refers to officials abuse their power to give some kind of preferential treatment to bribe, bribery must do the action within the legal framework; the latter refers to bribery against the law to give the benefit to briber (transparency international). Apparently this definition seems straightforward and even irrefutable, but carefully you will find that there are many problems and difficulties in this definition. It is very difficult to define the "private benefits" of the "commission power", more seriously, criticism believed that this definition only limited corruption to bribery, but many more forms of corruption does not included, such as the not involved exchange of money.

Above of all, the definition of corruption is generally recognized by the academia is that: political science thinks that the nature of corruption is abuse of power for personal gains. Power is the carrier of corruption. If there is no power, there will be no corruption.

The current corrupt condition of China

In the transition period, China is facing serious corruption problems. In the Transparency International Bribery Index, which ranks mainly among the world's largest economies, China ranks in the bottom-most position. According to study of Ni Xing (2012),

corruption caused China lost the average 2.5 billion yuan of direct economic loss per year from 1983 to 2002, and after the introduction of corrupt black, China estimated economic loss of 25 billion yuan per year on average. Accordingly, in the past three decades, China set-off a long-term anti-corruption from 1994 to 2004, an average of 5000 officials per province each year had been disciplined by the party and procuratorate. The data from the procuratorate showed that, due to the corruption, from 1990 to 2009, an average of about 4,400 officials per year put on the record by the procuratorate, the data has been increase rate of 5.54% per year. Thus it can be seen that China faced with a very serious corruption problem.

The influences of corruption on political trust

There is very closed relationship between political trust and corruption. A comparative analysis of perceived corruption in four Latin American countries by Pharr & Putnam [3, 8] found that an increase in perceived corruption degrades the political legitimacy of the regime. For those who have not yet reached a period of consolidation in their democratic transformation, higher perceptions of corruption are very dangerous and may even ruin the future of democracy [4]. Corruption undermines the ability of societies to create the social solidarity by fostering social suspicion and erosion of social trust and reciprocity in civil society [5]. Scholars Andrew Wore, Nicholas, and Sarah Birch [6] point out that corruption leads to distrust of government officials and, in particular, the impact of popular perceptions of corruption on political trust. They argue that presuppositions of mistrust of politicians will affect the uncertainty of the behavior of citizens to judge politicians, corruption motives will be imposed on government officials, leading to reduced political trust. Davis et al also found that perceived corruption can culturally create a climate of political skepticism that would drive citizens out of public activity and participation and reduce recognition of their political legitimacy [7].

In corrupt countries, citizens show lower trust and evaluation of the political system [9]. Studies have shown that corruption has a corrosive effect on trust in political institutions [10]. The impact of corruption on political trust is indirect, and Bo Rothstein and Eric M. Uslaner [10] argue that trust, inequality, and corruption are linked: corruption leads to greater inequality and inequality what will lead to the lower political trust. Corruption also undermines the fundamental principles of democracy: responsibility, equality, openness. Corruption creates a distrust of citizens' politics and leads to a crisis of the legitimacy of the political system [9]. Political scholars [12, 13] argue that corruption lead politicians to abuse of the power conferred (trust),

thereby reducing citizens' trust in political institutions. In addition, corruption has also led to a decline in the efficiency of government agencies, since dishonest governments use a large amount of resources to serve the specific groups and a small amount of resources for public service projects, thereby reducing responsiveness to citizens' preferences, resulting in a decline in the efficiency of government agencies. In turn, corruption as a means of citizens to bribe policy makers also reduces the trust of institutions. In corrupt countries, citizens show the lower trust and evaluation of the political system. Increasing corruption and dishonesty in political life are, therefore, the cause of the decline in political trust [9]. In all, the corrosive effects of corruption on people's trust in the actors and institutions of government, the effects of public-sector corruption on attitudes related to political support, the consequences of corruption on growth in GDP per capita, and the links among welfare, sustainable development, and corruption (Luminita Ianeseu, 2013).

The measurement and classification of corruption

Currently, in order to analysis the relationship between the political trust and corruption, the measurement of corruption is very important and necessary. The academic has two main ways to measure corruption: the one is objective measurement method which using the number of official / unofficial release of the perpetrators of corruption to estimate the prevalence of corruption in a region; the other one is subjective measurement which by sampling questionnaires, interviews and other forms to understand the prevalence of corruption perception of residents in location area (Zhu, Gong, 2015). Zhu and Gong (2015) use a number of filing data corruption of provincial procuratorate and an democracy East Asia survey data, compared with the result of Chinese corruption subjective measurements and objective measurements, found that there is inconsistent between subjective and objective measurements of corruption in China, that is to say: the more serious corruption objective measurement results, the local public's subjective perception of corruption is not necessarily intense, and vice versa. Thus, the differences between public's awareness of subjective corruption and objective corruption lead to the differences of impact on political trust.

The differences of subjective corruption and objective corruption

Due to the concealment of corrupt behaviors, the existing literature can only be used to estimate the extent of corruption in an area from officially published data of corruption, or to use a large sample survey to obtain the data of public general perceptions of corruption in one region. The former is the objective

measure of corruption, the later is the subjective measurement of corruption.

1-Subjective corruption

The result of subjective measurement of corruption is public's subjective corruption. Subjective measurement is mainly use the questionnaire survey to understand different groups of people's (such as: experts, businessman, the general public, etc.) the subjective evaluation of corruption in the living country. Subjective measures are always used by crossed-country surveys, including the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (CPI), the World Bank Corruption Control Index (CC), the World Economic Forum's Bribery and Corruption Index, and the Political Risk Information Corporation's Citizenship Risk Guidance (ICRG) and so on.

Media Contact is one of the important factors that affect the public perception of corruption. Zhu (2013) and others divided the information of the public perception of corruption into two categories: the one is the impaction of the mainstream media which be controlled by the government officials; the other one is the informal "grapevine" impaction. The results showed that: The government-controlled officials media reduced public's perception of corruption, but unofficial rumors on the contrary, which enhance the public's perception of corruption (Zhu, Lu, Shi, 2012).

In this paper, in order to better measure the public's subjective feeling about China's corruption condition, "corruption perception" will as the independent variables of whole paper, which use subjective measurements to fully reflect public's awareness of corruption.

2-Objective corruption

Compared to subjective corruption, the objective corruption is the result of objective measurement of corruption. Objective measurement of corruption is use the official crime data and the number of corruption cases to measure the condition of corruption in a country. The advantage of objective measurement is that because the political system and legal structure within a country are basically the same, there is little difference in the level of socio-economic and cultural development, and the unobservable factors are less, which can weaken the deviation of measurement analysis to a certain extent. (Zhou lian, Tao jing, 2009).

In this paper, in order to accurately better measure the corruption of China, according to objective measurement, the "corruption experiences" will be the independent variable of the whole paper to fully measure the corruption condition of public came into contact with.

Corruption perception and its' effects on political trust

First of all, it is worthy to study of public's subjective corruption perception, which is an important factor of determining the public's credibility to the government. In the throughout field of research of corruption, compared with the study of reality corruption, scholars seems to less concerned about the public's "subjective feeling" of government corruption. There is a very closed relationship between public perception corruption, the political trust in government and legitimacy.

The professor of political science in National Taiwan University, Chu Yunhan's study shows that the corruption perception will reduce the legitimacy of the regime, especially for those countries in which just completed the transition to democracy regime. Such as Costa Rica and Mexico, through data analyzing found that the corruption perception can form a political skepticism in the cultural, which will lead to public withdraw from public activities and civic participation. Some scholars (Pharr & Putnam, 2000; Seligson, 2002) comparative analysis of four Latin America countries, corruption perception will reduce the regime's political legitimacy, a high perception corruption is a very dangerous thing for those who just completed the transition to democracy but has not reached the consolidation of "democracy newborn child ", even it will ruin the future of democracy [4]. Through the growth of a sense of social suspicion and erosion of social trust and reciprocity, corruption collapsed the public's capacity of creating social solidarity in the civil society [5]. Scholar Andrew Wore, Nicholas and Sarah Birch [6] pointed out that corruption caused a citizen distrust of government officials, in particular the impact of public perception corruption on political trust, they believed that the pre-assumptions which public do not trust politicians that would affect the citizens' evaluation of behavior of politicians, which has more possibilities to consider the government actions to be corrupt and resulted in reducing political trust.

Corruption experiences and its' effects on political trust

Compared with the corruption perception, the public's own government corruption experiences with government officials in process of dealing with government affairs, called "corruption experiences."

The corruption information source which public contacts can be divided into two channels: indirect and direct sources. The indirect information including the mass media (newspapers, radio, television, Internet, etc.) and gossip, these are very significant for the public perception corruption and get a strong empirical evidence to support it. With respect to indirect

corruption information, direct information of corruption even has more far-reaching effects on political trust (Jiangnan, Z., Lu, J. and Tianian, S, 2013). Scholars (Sharafutdinova, G, 2010) believed that public who experienced corruption can has strong sense of government corruption than those who did not experience the corruption. Those public who experienced corruption, profound understanding of the ugly act of corrupt officials, hated corruption, therefore their political trust on government is lower than those who have not experienced corruption. Seligson [8] considered that the citizens' corruption experiences also lowered their recognition of political legitimacy, which led to a crisis of legitimacy of the political system. Thus, in daily life, public corruption experiences have a direct and significant impact on their political trust in government, we must vigorously regulate the behaviors of government officials, and effectively improve the level of grass-roots government's public service.

The differences between “corruption perception” and “corruption experience”

"Corruption experience" has more direct affection to the public trust in political, it will directly reduce public confidence in the government civil servants, damage the image of civil servants, reducing public trust in politics and political institutions. In addition to the differences in the sources of information, there are also differences between “perception corruption” and “contact corruption”: The first one is the difference between subjective perception and objective reality of corruption, probably due to corruption sources of information of government agencies, the public may have a strong perception of corruption on political organizations, however, in process with the government officials, public did not have own experience of government corruption and bribery or other forms of corruption, which led to the differences between subjective perception corruption and objective contact corruption; Secondly, the “perception corruption” reflects the respondents' subjective localization of corruption, which is not suitable for corruption quantitative research. In contrast, “contact corruption” use of public exposure of corruption what actually reflect the public's objectively corruption localization, is suitable for quantitative research. And finally, due to differences between subjective and objective, combined “corruption perception” and “corruption experiences” will more fully reflect the public's awareness of corruption, it's important to consummate the impact of corruption on political trust.

However, there is no enough literature about the influences of corruption perception and corruption experiences on the political trust, which directly lead to the relevant literature in the absence of state. Based on the above discussion, this article will explore the

influences of corruption on the political trust. In order to measure “corruption perception” and “corruption experiences”, this paper analyzes three dimensions, namely: the public corruption perception of the local government, the central government and the public's actually exposed to incidents of corruption. Thereby, there is a problem we should further to research: whether the public corruption perception is consistent with their experiences of corruption, namely: whether the public corruption perception comes form their corruption experiences with government institutions? For example, Olken [25] compared the level of corruption perception and corruption experiences in a town of Indonesia, found that they only have a weak correlation between themselves. Ni and Chen (2013) introduced the Chinese corruption ranks in all countries, found that the level of sub-provincial city of corruption and the corruption perception in China percentile ranking presents negatively correlated in time trends, however, these studies have not be paid enough attention.

Therefore, based on the above discussion, the assumptions of this paper are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: the higher the public's corruption perception in local government, the more corrupt the government agency is, the lower the political trust of the public to government institutions.

Hypothesis 2: the higher the public's corruption perception in the central government, the more corrupt the government is, the lower the political trust of the people in government institutions.

Hypothesis 3: the more people actually exposed to corruption, the more corruption that the government agencies, the people of the government institutions, the lower the political trust.

Hypothesis 4: there is inconsistency between public's corruption perception and exposure to corruption, namely that, public's corruption perception in political institutions is high and does not mean that public are exposed to corruption more frequently, and vice versa.

DATA ANALYSIS

Asian Barometer Survey 2008 of main land China

The data used in this study is the Asian Barometer Survey 2008 from the Asian Barometer Institute of Taiwan University, hosted by the Center for Contemporary China Studies, Peking University. The survey collected the public's political, economic, traditional and multi-module subjective evaluation in their area. I selected the second round of the survey data (2007-2009) in main land of China The sample survey was conducted in a random sample of 22 provinces, 4

autonomous regions and 4 municipalities directly under the jurisdiction of the Tibet Autonomous Region · the regions surveyed did not include the Chinese residents of the Tibet Autonomous Region. Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews of voting-age adults (18 years old and above). The method of sample selection was determined based on the statistics of annual population in China. According to the sampling procedure, the goal was to survey 5402 samples. The actual number of samples surveyed was 6971, which excluded 583 cases of vacant rooms, unqualified interviewees at the assigned addresses, entire family out for work and relocation. 4786 questionnaires were completed and returned in total and 2388 questionnaires were uncompleted for a completion rate of 72.6%.

Variables

The whole paper divided into two parts, the one is the influences of corruption on political trust, the other one is the effects of political trust on corruption. Therefore, in the first part, the dependent variables are that public's corruption perception and public's corruption experiences, and the public's political trust will be the independent variables. In the next part, the dependent variables are public's political trust on corruption, the public's corruption perception and public's corruption experience will be the independent variables.

In a word, in this paper, the dependent variable and independent variable will act as a variable to each other, the dependent variables will be independent variables, and vice versa.

Dependent Variables

According to the MA Deyong's (2007) definition of political trust, the author defines the concept of political trust from the following eight government agencies: universal government institutions (central government, civil servants, local governments), and specialized political institutions (courts, political parties, parliaments (the National People's Congress), violent government agencies (military, police) to measure public's trust in government institutions.

In the empirical studies of political trust, the most important thing is the concept's operation of the political trust, that is, how to better measure the concept to accurately reflect the connotation of political trust (Xiong Meijuan, 2014). In the world value survey, some specific organizations were selected to measure the public's political trust. These organizations include the churches, the military, press and publishing, television, trade unions, police, courts, governments, political parties, parliaments, civil servants, major corporations, environmental organizations, women's organizations, charitable or humanitarian organizations,

the European Union and the United Nations. In the New Democracies Barometer, selected the foreign organizations and experts, including political parties, courts, civil servants, governments, trade unions, national presidents, patriotic societies, private enterprises, farmer organizations, government consultants, to measure the public's political trust. In general, the measurement of public's political trust is mainly pointed to several of these organizations (Xiong Meijuan, 2014). For example, Ma Deyong (2007) selected seven political organizations: courts, central government, local government, public security department (police), parliament (mainland China for the NPC), army, political party (Communist Party of China) as an indicator of Political trust; Letki [14] selected four organizations (parliamentary, executive, military, and police) based on the main factor analysis and summed the four indices into an additive index as trust in political institutions. Because Newton [15] did a comparative analysis of countries, only parliament was drawn as a measure of political trust.

Based on the research hypothesis of this paper and the consideration of China's political system and government structure, this paper chooses the "institutional trust" of the second round of the East Asian democratic dynamic survey as the indicator of public's political trust. The eight government agencies trust variables as instruments of measurement of political trust: universal government institutions (central government, civil servants and local governments), and specialized political institutions (courts, political parties, parliaments (the National People's Congress) As well as violent government agencies (military, police). And measure them separately by the public's corrupt perception and corruption experience, which can reflect the differences of political trust on the government level and the differences of political trust on the different government departments. It should be noted that: the corresponding questions in the questionnaire are: "I'm going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much trust do you have in them? Is it a great deal of trust, quiet a lot of trust, not very much trust, or none at all?" The options for this issue are: 1. a great deal of trust; 2. quite a lot of trust; 3. not very much trust ; 4. none at all; 7. can not understand the problem; 8. can not choose; 9. refused to answer this question. Since the continuity of values from 1 to 4 is not very obvious, this study makes a virtual encoding of 0-1, even if the process will give up some information, but this assignment is easier to understand and explain, in order to make logic regression analysis, in which the data will be assigned to the 1 and 2 to 0,3 and 4 to 1 and missing values, of which 0 on behalf of distrust, 1 on behalf of the trust.

Independent Variables

The independent variables of this study are mainly selected from the following three aspects: corrupt perception of local government, corrupt perception of central government, corruption experiences to local and central government.

Studies have shown that there is a mutually reinforcing function between corrupt perception and political mistrust, because it reduces public's confidence in the government [17] and there is a significant difference in the public's assessment of the central and local governments, (Lvshu Peng, Xiao Tangbiao, 2015). Therefore, this paper chooses "local government corrupt perception" and "central government corrupt perception" as the independent variable to analyze the relationship between political trust and corruption. In addition, in the political life, because of the public's own interests and demands, they will deal with government agencies and their officials, in the process, corruption can make public actually come into contact with the government image will be greatly reduced and reduce their trust. Therefore, this study will use "corruption experience" into the choice of independent variables, to explore its impacts on political trust.

According to the above discussion, this paper selects three independent variables from the perspective of corruption perception in the data of the 2008 Asian Barometer Survey. The corresponding questions in the questionnaire are: "In your local government, you think corruption and bribery "How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in your local/municipal government?"; " How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in your national government (in capital city)?" The questionnaire's options for perceiving local and central government corruption are: 1. Hardly anyone is involved; 2. Not a lot of officials are corrupt; 3. Most officials are corrupt; 4. Almost everyone is corrupt; 8. Can't choose; 9. Decline to answer. Values of 0 and 1, respectively, and missing values were assigned in the data literature. Among them, 0 is on the behalf of not corrupt, 1 is on the behalf of corruption. The corresponding questions of corrupt experiences in the questionnaire is: "Have you or anyone you know personally witnessed an act of corruption or bribe-taking by a politician or government official in the past year? If witnessed: did you personally witness it or were you told about it by family member or friend who personally witnessed it?" The answers on the issue of corrupt experiences' are: 1. witnessed; 2. never seen; 7. Do not understand this problem; 8. Can't choose; 9. Refuse to answer this

question. In the literature, 1 is assigned a value of 0, and a value of 2 is assigned to 1 and a missing value. Among them, 0 on behalf of witnessed, 1 on behalf of never seen. The reassigned data is to better perform binomial logistic regression analysis.

Control Variables

In the choices of control variables, based on the relevant literature research, we put some of the common variables as control variables that affect the political trust into the regression model in order to control the impacts of these factors on the dependent variables and analyze the marginal impacts of independent variables.

For a long time, scholars [24, 26-29] generally agree that public's trust in the government mainly depends on their own factors, such as: gender, age, education and so on. Therefore, the demographic variables of gender, age, education level will as the control variables in this paper, these variables will be lead in regression model to control the impacts of these factors. The definitions and assignments of gender variables are: 1. men; 2. women. The age variable is the actual age of the respondents in the survey, ranging from 18 to no limited. The education level variables are converted from the highest education level, assigned in the data file from low to high, 1 on behalf of without basic education, 10 on behalf of with postgraduate education, and from 1 to 10, respectively, in the data file with the missing values.

In addition, the prevailing views among western scholars is that political trust is easier to form in a democratic system, and political trust is more difficult to form under authoritarian or authoritarian regimes [30]. Thus, The variable of the degree of democracy is also introduced into the regression model for analysis as a control variable. The question about the degree of democracy in the questionnaire corresponds is: in your opinion how much of a democracy is [Country Name]? The options are: 1. A full democracy; 2. A democracy, but with minor problems; 3. A democracy, with major problems; 4. Not a democracy; 7. Don't understand question; 8. Can't choose; 9. Decline to answer. In the data file, respectively assigned these for 1 to 4 with missing values.

Research results

In this paper, we performed a descriptive statistical analysis for the variables of the model in order to have a general understanding of the basic statistics, such as mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum. The specific statistical results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of variables and description

	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Explain	
Central government	0.9472	0.22358	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Local government	0.5809	0.49347	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Officials	0.5497	0.45798	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Court	0.768	0.42214	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Party	0.927	0.26019	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Parliament	0.9306	0.25424	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Army	0.9088	0.28799	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Police	0.7246	0.44679	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Local government Corrupt perception	0.4965	0.50007	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Central government Corruption perception	0.1624	0.36887	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Corruption experiences	1	0	0	1	0=distrust	1=trust
Gender	1.49	0.5	1	2	1=male	2=female
Age	46.83	15.176	18	95		
Education level	4.22	1.923	2	10	1 to 10, 1=illiteracy, 10=graduate student	
Degree of Democracy	1.98	0.739	1	4	1 to 4, 1=autarchy, 4=democracy	

Data from: Asian Barometer Survey (2008)

REGRESSION RESULTS

In order to clearly understand the relationship between political trust and corruption perception and corrupt experiences, this study used binomial logistic regression analysis to deal with the data. Besides that, this paper's aim is to analysis the endogenous relationship between political trust and corruption, therefore, this part will be divided into two parts, the

one is that the regression result of the impacts of corruption on political trust, the other one is that the regression result of the influences of political trust on corruption.

The regression results of the impacts of corruption on political trust

Table 2: Public's corrupt perception and experiences on central and local government

Variables	Central government			Local government		
	Model 1	Model2	Model3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Control Variables						
Gender	-0.045 (0.218)	-0.189 (0.303)	-0.005 (0.201)	0.091 (0.103)	0.085 (0.125)	0.094 (0.085)
Age	0.012 (0.009)	-0.003 (0.012)	0.013 (0.008)	0.006 (0.004)	0.006 (0.005)	0.006 (0.003)
Education level	-0.00906	-0.254*** (0.079)	-0.009295	-0.006 (0.030)	0.015 (0.036)	-0.022 (0.025)
Social status	0.136* (0.156)	0.262*** (0.075)	0.213*** (0.052)	0.116*** (0.028)	0.128*** (0.033)	0.130*** (0.023)
Democracy	-0.264 (0.155)	-0.115 (0.203)	-0.481*** (0.140)	-0.720*** (0.704)	-0.809*** (0.091)	-0.854*** (0.063)
Government performance						
National economic evaluation	0.713*** (0.128)	0.573*** (0.171)	0.656*** (0.116)	0.072 (0.076)	0.243** (0.094)	0.202*** (0.063)
Media influence						
The frequency of browse the political news	0.159 (0.096)	0.126 (0.136)	0.160 (0.091)	0.049 (0.047)	-0.019 (0.058)	0.030 (0.039)

Social culture						
Obey the government's decision	0.135 (0.190)	0.035 (0.241)	0.170 (0.183)	0.185 (0.103)	0.217 (0.126)	0.202* (0.090)
Independent variables						
Corrupt perception of local government	-1.068*** (0.271)			-1.218*** (0.102)		
Corrupt perception of central government		-1.898*** (0.305)			-1.113 (0.094)	
Corrupt experiences			-0.213 (0.281)			-0.877*** (0.150)
Nagelkerke R ²	0.187	0.281	0.16	0.268	0.216	0.186
Chi-square test	131.806***	120.135***	135.406***	467.396***	238.472***	415.950***
N	2092	1372	2804	2097	1363	2799

Table 2 shows the results of regression analysis of the public's corrupt perception and experiences of the central government and local governments. Model 1 and Model 4 only contain the independent variables of public corrupt perception in local government. In model 1 and model 4, the public's corrupt perception of local government has a strong negative relationship with the central and local government's political trust (P<0.001), that is, if the much serious public thinks that local government corrupt, the lower of their political trust on central and local government.

Model 2 and Model 5 are the regression results of public's corrupt perception on central government. Both in Model 2 and 5, the public 's corrupt perception has a strong negative relationship with central and local governments. That is, the much serious public thinks that the central government is corrupt, the lower of

political trust they have toward the central and local governments.

Model 3 and Model 6 are the regression results of public's corrupt experiences on the central and local governments. In the model 3 and 6, the public's corrupt experiences has a significant negative impact on the public's political trust of the local government and has a weak negative impact on the public's political trust of the central government. This result is due to that: there is more restrictions in public's life, on the conditions of the public come into contact with the most of the cases in person involving low-level administrative units, with little or no access to high-level corrupt cases of the central government, therefore, it is more likely to access and understand the local government corruption, so the negative impacts on local government political trust is higher than the central government.

Table 3: Public's corrupt perception and experiences on court and parliament

Variables	Court			Parliament		
	Model1	Model 2	Model 3	Model4	Model 5	Model 6
Control variables						
Gender	0.084 (0.114)	0.195 (0.153)	0.121 (0.099)	-0.099 (0.183)	-0.308 (0.247)	-0.121 (0.170)
Age	-0.001 (0.004)	0.000 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.004)	0.000 (0.007)	-0.008 (0.010)	0.001 (0.007)
Education	-0.048 (0.032)	-0.066 (0.041)	-0.074 (0.028)	-0.211*** (0.049)	-0.244*** (0.064)	-0.215*** (0.046)
Social status	0.165*** (0.030)	0.205*** (0.039)	0.183*** (0.027)	0.143** (0.047)	0.117 (0.063)	0.152*** (0.044)
Democracy	-0.579*** (0.080)	-0.703*** (0.016)	-0.712*** (0.070)	-0.672*** (0.132)	-0.603*** (0.175)	-0.806*** (0.121)
Government performance						
National economic evaluation	0.070 (0.079)	0.305** (0.103)	0.095 (0.068)	0.288* (0.113)	0.352* (0.151)	0.300** (0.103)

Media influence						
The frequency of browse political news	-0.030 (0.052)	-0.073 (0.070)	0.008 (0.045)	0.156 (0.082)	0.262* (0.110)	0.193 (0.076)
Social culture						
Obey the government's decision	0.241* (0.109)	0.205 (0.142)	0.248* (0.100)	0.026 (0.164)	-0.047 (0.208)	0.125 (0.157)
Independent Variables						
Corrupt perception of local government	-0.991*** (0.018)			-0.788*** (0.210)		
Corrupt perception of central government		-0.915*** (0.187)			-0.976*** (0.265)	
Corrupt experiences			-0.601*** (0.150)			0.108 (0.245)
Nagelkerke R ²	0.2	0.209	0.147	0.17	0.181	0.142
Chi-square	299.298***	195.800***	278.821***	149.012***	94.144***	148.779***
N	2076	1365	2762	2073	1365	2771

Table 3 shows the results of regression analysis of public's corrupt perception and corrupt experiences on courts and parliaments. Model 1 and Model 4 only contain the independent variables of public's corrupt perception on local government. In model 1 and model 4, the public's corrupt perception of local government has a strong negative relationship with the courts and parliament (P<0.001), that is, if the much serious public thinks that local government corrupt, the lower of their political trust on the court and parliament.

Models 2 and 5 are the results of regression analysis of public's corrupt perception of central government. In Model 2 and 5, the public's corrupt perception of central has a significant negative impact on public confidence in the courts and parliament (P <0.001). That is, if the much serious public thinks that central government corrupt, the lower of their political trust on the court and parliament.

Models 3 and 6 are the result of regression analysis of the public's corrupt experiences with the courts and parliament's. In models 3 and 6, the public's corrupt experiences has a significant negative impact on the public's political trust of the court (P <0.001) and has a weak negative impact on the public's political trust of the parliament (P <0.01). The reason why is that in real life, public often deal with the courts because of some civil or criminal disputes, therefore it's more likely to come into contact with courts and understand the corruption of the courts. On the contrary, public rarely have the right or the opportunity to enter the government's decision-making process, and thus rarely understand the case of corruption in Parliament, therefore, the negative impact on the court's is higher than parliament.

Table 4: Public's corrupt perception and experiences on Military and police

Variables	Military		Police			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model4	Model5	Model 6
Control Variables						
Gender	-0.041 (0.160)	-0.186 (0.218)	-0.081 (0.142)	-0.016 (0.109)	-0.077 (0.138)	-0.011 (0.093)
Age	0.016** (0.006)	0.009 (0.009)	0.011* (0.006)	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.005 (0.005)	0.000 (0.004)
Education	-0.202*** (0.043)	-0.028756	-0.194*** (0.038)	-0.109*** (0.031)	-0.003382	-0.085*** (0.026)
Social Status	0.137*** (0.042)	0.246*** (0.056)	0.169 (0.037)	0.094*** (0.029)	0.064 (0.036)	0.098*** (0.025)
Democracy	-0.730***	-0.568***	-0.755***	-0.861***	-0.885***	-0.960***

	(0.116)	(0.156)	(0.101)	(0.079)	(0.100)	(0.069)
Government performance						
National economy evaluation	0.198 (0.103)	0.255 (0.136)	0.229* (0.090)	0.068 (0.077)	0.328*** (0.099)	0.138* (0.065)
Media impact						
The frequency of browse the political news	0.102 (0.073)	0.103 (0.098)	0.127* (0.065)	0.003 (0.050)	-0.074 (0.064)	-0.004 (0.043)
Social culture						
Obey the government's decision	0.200 (0.149)	0.023 (0.188)	-0.069 (0.136)	0.057 (0.106)	0.174 (0.134)	0.139 (0.095)
Independent Variables						
Corrupt perception of local government	-0.739*** (0.098)			-1.136*** (0.110)		
Corrupt perception of central government		-0.803*** (0.245)			-1.038*** (0.183)	
Corrupt experiences			-0.090404			-0.945*** (0.147)
Nagelkerke R ²	0.186	0.182	0.069	0.272	0.232	0.193
Chi-square	195.236***	111.018***	202.747***	453.456***	240.266***	405.389***
N	2109	1377	2832	2105	1375	2819

Table 4 shows the results of regression analysis of public's corrupt perception and experiences on the military and police. Model 1 and Model 4 only contain the independent variables of public corrupt perception in local government. The regression results show that public's corrupt perception on local has a strong negative relationship with the public's political trust of the military and police (P <0.001). That is, if the much serious public thinks that local government corrupt, the lower of their political trust on the military and police.

Models 2 and 5 are the results of regression analysis of public's corrupt perception on central government. Regression results show that in both Model 2 and 5, the public's corrupt perception on central has a significant negative impact on public's confidence in the military and police (P <0.001). That is, if the public perceives that the central government is more corrupt, their political trust in the army and the police is lower.

Models 3 and 6 are the result of regression analysis of the public's corrupt experiences with the military and the police. In model 3, the public's corrupt experiences have a weak negative impact on the public's political trust of the military (P <0.05); in model 6, the public's corrupt experiences has a strong negative impact on police political trust (P <0.001). The reason for causing this difference is that the public in the real life is difficult to access to the political institutions of the army, so its' corrupt actions are difficult for public to contact and understand, so the public's corrupt experiences have a weak negative impact on the public's political trust of the military, compared with military, the public's contact with the police in real life is much more frequent, and thus it is more likely to come into contact with the corrupt behavior of the police, so the public's corrupt experiences showed a significant negative impact on the policy rather than the military .

Table 5: Public's corrupt perception and experiences on officials and party

	Officials			Party		
Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Control Variables						
Gender	-0.804 (0.099)	-0.117 (0.119)	-0.084 (0.083)	-0.285 (0.177)	-0.145 (0.255)	-0.310 (0.759)

Age	0.008* (0.004)	0.005 (0.005)	0.010*** (0.003)	0.022** (0.007)	0.006 (0.010)	0.020** (0.006)
Education	-0.028 (0.028)	0.014 (0.034)	-0.016 (0.024)	-0.165*** (0.049)	-0.165** (0.067)	-0.174*** (0.044)
Social status	0.067* (0.027)	0.031 (0.032)	0.074*** (0.023)	0.231*** (0.047)	0.322*** (0.064)	0.247*** (0.042)
Democracy	-0.537*** (0.071)	-0.462*** (0.085)	-0.653*** (0.061)	-0.760*** (0.129)	-0.07439	-0.923*** (0.114)
Government performance						
National economic evaluation	0.109 (0.073)	0.326*** (0.090)	0.182** (0.061)	0.203 (0.111)	0.292 (0.151)	0.303** (0.097)
Media impact						
The frequency of browse the political news	-0.045 (0.045)	-0.089 (0.055)	-0.034 (0.038)	0.071 (0.080)	0.004 (0.117)	0.106 (0.072)
Social culture						
Obey to the government decisions	0.213* (0.099)	0.329** (0.119)	0.215* (0.089)	0.272 (0.157)	0.223 (0.204)	0.256 (0.146)
Independent variables						
Corrupt perception on local government	-0.914*** (0.100)			-0.845*** (0.210)		
Corrupt perception on central government		-0.771*** (0.185)			-1.777*** (0.295)	
Corrupt experiences			-1.024*** (0.155)			-0.387 (0.218)
Nagelkerke R ²	0.181	0.124	0.14	0.23	0.279	0.212
Chi-square	302.118***	132.399***	305.084***	218.649***	151.159***	255.228***
N	2089	1372	2779	2121	1380	2845

Table 5 shows the results of regression analysis of public's corrupt perception and experiences on civil servants and political parties. Model 1 and Model 4 only contain the independent variables of public's corrupt perception in local government. The regression results show that public's corrupt perception on local government has a strong negative relationship with civil servants and political parties ($P < 0.001$), that is, if the much serious public thinks that local government corrupt, the lower of their political trust on the officials and party.

Models 2 and 5 are the results of regression analysis of public's corrupt perception on central government. The regression results show that, in Model 2 and 5, the public's corrupt perception on central government has a significant negative impact on public trust in civil servants and political parties ($P < 0.001$). That is to say, if the much serious public thinks that central government corrupt, the lower of their political trust on the officials and party.

Models 3 and 6 are the result of regression analysis of the public's corrupt experiences on the civil servants and political parties. In model 3, the public's corrupt experiences has a weak negative impact on the public's political trust of the civil servants ($P < 0.05$); in model 6, the public's corrupt experiences have a strong negative impact on the public's political trust of political parties ($P < 0.001$). The reason for causing this difference is that, in real life, public often deal with civil servants more frequently than parties, thus the public's corrupt experience has a strong negative influences on public's political trust of officials; by contrast, the public in the real life is difficult to have contact with political parties, and thus the occurrence of it's corrupt action may not contact, so the public's corrupt experiences have a weak influences of public's political trust on political parties.

The regression results of the impacts of political trust on corruption

Table 6: The impacts of public’s political trust on public’s corrupt perception

Variables	Public's corrupt perception on local government Model 1	Public's corrupt perception on central government Model 2
Control Variables		
Gender	-0.107(0.080)	-0.271(0.135)
Age	0.001(0.003)	-0.005(0.004)
Education	-0.002(0.002)	0.008(0.005)
Social status	0.001(0.001)	-0.007(0.002)***
Democracy	-0.035(0.019)***	-0.115(0.029)***
Government performance		
The national economic evaluation	0.545(0.027)***	0.660(0.089)***
Media impacrer		
The frequency of browse political news	0.076(0.029)	-0.010(0.049)
Social culture		
Obet the government decision	-0.075(0.027)	-0.181(0.038)***
Independent variables		
Court	-0.043(0.036)	-0.122(0.074)
National government	-0.039(0.048)	-0.056(0.084)
Political parties	-0.053(0.059)	-0.423(0.113)***
Parliament	-0.046(0.041)	-0.003(0.084)
Civil service	-0.007(0.035)***	-0.010(0.061)***
The military	-0.056(0.044)	-0.341(0.095)
The police	-0.171(0.044)***	-0.309(0.079)***
Local government	-0.141(0.039)***	-0.126(0.061)
Nagelkerke R ²	0.120	0.167
Chi-square	276.158***	197.694***
N	2920	1912

As the Table 6 shows, this is the result of regression analysis of public’s political trust of eight government institutions on public’s corrupt perception. Model 1 only contain the dependent variable of public’s corrupt perception on local government, Model 2 only contain the dependent variable of public’s corrupt perception on central government.

In Model 1, the regression results show that, the public’s political trust on civil servant, police and local government has a strong negative influences of the public’s corrupt perception on local government (P <0.001), but public’s political trust on court, national government, political parties, parliament, military has a weak negative in public’s corrupt perception on local government (P <0.05). The reason for causing this difference is that, in real life, public often deal with government institutions of civil servant, police and local government more frequently than court, national government, political parties, parliament, military, thus

the public’s political trust on these institutions is stronger than others.

In Model 2, the regression results show that, the public’s political trust on political parties, civil servant, police has a strong negative influences of the public’s corrupt perception on local government (P <0.001), but public’s political trust on court, national government, parliament, military, local government has a weak negative in public’s corrupt perception on central government (P <0.05). The reason for causing this difference is that, in real life, public often deal with government institutions of political parties, civil servant, police more frequently than others, thus the public’s political trust on these institutions is stronger than others.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper explores how the relationships between political trust and corruption. The research hypothesis is

that the relationships between them are endogenous and there is a negative relationship between political trust and corruption. This paper use data form Asian Barometer Survey, according to the regression result, the hypothesis is confirmed.

Public's identification of corruption reduces their political trust in government institutions. The results of the study confirm the view of the past scholars that the corrupt perception has a negative impact on public's political trust, that is, the more serious the corruption situation, the lower the public's political trust [9]. However, unlike the previous research, this paper explores the impact of corruption on political trust from the two perspectives of public's corrupt perception and experiences and eight institutions of political trust. The findings are as follows: the public's corrupt perception and experiences to political trust is inversely proportional to the public that the more corrupt government agencies, the more contacts with government institutions, the lower of public's political trust; the more frequently contacts between public and government institutions, the lower the public's confidence on the political institutions. Thus, in order to improve the people's political confidence in government agencies, to save the decline of political trust, consolidate the legitimacy of the ruling and the stability of political power, we must vigorously punish corruption, severely punish corrupt officials and put an end to government officials. This reduces public perception of corruption in government institutions and enhances political trust.

Finally, there are some limitations in this study. The definition of political trust is only explained from government agencies, which may bias the measurement of political trust of government institutions. If we can improve the measurement of political trust in the future, it may make us better analyze the impact of perceived corruption on political trust.

REFERENCES

1. Zhu Q. Reorientation and prospect of China's combat against corruption. *Crime, law and social change*. 2008;49(2): 81–95.
2. Gong, Ting. Forms and characteristics of China's corruption in the 1980s: change with continuity. *Communist and post –communist studies*. 1997;(4): 277-78.
3. Pharr SJ, Putnam RD. *Disaffected democracies: what's troubling the trilateral countries?*. Princeton University Press. 2000;122.
4. Clientelism KP. credibility, and the policy choices of young democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2007;51(4):804–21.
5. Warren ME. What does corruption mean in a democracy? *American Journal of Political Science*. 2004;48(2):328–43.
6. Wroe A, Allen N, Birch S. The role of political trust in conditioning perceptions of corruption. *European Political Science Review*. 2013 Jul 1;5(02):175-95.
7. Davis CL, Camp RA, Coleman KM. The influence of party systems on citizens' perceptions of corruption and electoral response in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies*. 2004 Aug;37(6):677-703.
8. Seligson MA. The impact of corruption on regime legitimacy: A comparative study of four Latin American countries. *The journal of Politics*. 2002 May 1;64(2):408-33.
9. Anderson, Christopher, Tverdova Y. Corruption, political all agencies, and attitudes toward government in contemporary democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2003;47(1):91–109.
10. Eric CC, Chang, Yun-han Chu. Corruption and trust exceptionalism in Asian democracies?. *The Journal of Politics*. 2006;(5):259–271.
11. Rothstein B, Uslaner EM. All for all: equality, corruption, and social trust. *World Politics*. 2006;(5):259-271.
12. Doig, Alan, Robin Theobald, eds. *Corruption and democratization*. 2000, London: Frank cass.
13. Theobald, Robin. *Corruption, development, and underdevelopment*.1990, Durham: Duck University Press.
14. Letki N. Investigating the roots of civic morality: trust, social capital, and institutional performance. *Political behavior*. 2006;28(4):305–325.
15. Newton K. Trust、social capital, civil society, and democracy. *International political science review*. 2001;22(2):201–214.
16. Berman EM. Dealing with cynical citizens. *Public administrative review*. 1997;(2):105–112.
17. La Porta TR, Metlay DS. Hazards and institutional trustworthiness: facing a deficit of trust public. *Administration Review*. 1996;(4):341-347.
18. Christen T, Lagreid P. Trust in government: the relative importance of service satisfaction, political factors, and democracy. *Performance & Management Review*. 2005;(4):487–511.
19. Yang K, Holzer M. The performance trust link: implications for performance measurement. *Public Administration Review*. 2006;(1):114–142.
20. Shi, Tianjian. Cultural values and political trust: A comparasion of the people's republic of China and Taiwan. *Comparative Politics*. 2001;(4):401–419.
21. Van de Walle S, Bouckaert G. Public service performance and trust in government: the problem

- of causality. *International Journal Of Public Administration Review*. 2003;(8&9):891 – 913.
22. Caristensen T, Lagreid P. Trust in the public sector: individual and organization determinants. *Administration and Society*, 2005;(5):611 – 635.
 23. Thomas CW. Maintaining and restoring public trust in government agencies and their employees. *Administration and Society*. 1998;(2):166 – 193.
 24. Hetherington MJ. The political relevance of political trust. *American political Science Review*. 1998;92(4):791 – 808.
 25. Olken BA. Corruption perception vs corruption reality. *Journal of public economics*. 2009;93(7-8):950 – 64.
 26. Feldman S. The measure and meaning of trust in government. *Political Methodology*. 1983;9(3):341 – 354.
 27. Kinder DR. Presidents, prosperity, and public opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 1981;45(1):1 – 21.
 28. Lawrence RZ. Is it really the economy, stupid? In Nye, J.S., Zeikow, P.D.& King, D.C. eds. *Why people don't trust government*. 1997, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 29. Johnson I. Political trust in societies under transformation: a comparative analysis of Poland and Ukraine [J]. *International Journal Of Sociology*. 2005;35(2):63 – 84.
 30. Levi-M, Laura Stocker. Political trust and trustworthiness . *Annual Review Political Science*. 1998;(3):475 – 507.