



SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER OF THE BRAZILIAN FEDERAL DISTRICT: PUBLIC IMAGE, POLITICAL TRUST AND LOCAL POWER

Antonio Teixeira de Barros¹

Fernando Moutinho Ramalho Bittencourt²

Abstract: This article presents an exploratory study based on the social perceptions about the Brazilian Federal District Legislative Chamber (CLDF), regarding the following aspects: political trust, public image and citizen interest in politics and local power. The study is based on data collected through a websurvey applied in 2018 with 572 citizens residing in the Federal District. The main conclusions reveal that the perception of the informants is very negative in relation to the three aspects analyzed. The public image is considered bad and bad (89.16%). The level of political trust is low and very low (94.06%). Interest in district policy is also low and very low (83.22%).

Palavras-chave: Legislative Chamber of the Federal District; Public image; Political trust; Subnational legislatures; Local power.

Introduction

The Federal District Legislative Chamber (CLDF) was created in 1990, after the political autonomy established by the 1988 Constitution. The FD is a differentiated federative entity, since it simultaneously exercises the state and municipality roles. Therefore, the CLDF acts as both State Legislative Assembly and City Council. In total, CLDF has 24 district deputies, elected every four years. The number was established by the 1988 Federal Constitution and is equivalent to three times the number of federal deputies in the Federal District, that is, eight. Despite being headquartered in Brasilia, the CLDF is in the shadow of the great Republic branches, especially the National Congress. In addition, there are many studies on the image and political confidence in the federal legislature, but few on the district one (DIAS; REYES JUNIOR; REIS, 2017).

In light of this observation, an exploratory study is justified to capture the social perceptions about the CLDF, in charge of the local political representation, the inspection of the Executive branch acts in the FD and the formulation of laws at the district level. The study focuses on three interrelated and of great interest aspects to political science: the CLDF public image before the local public opinion; the citizens' political confidence at the CLDF; and interest in the activities carried out by the CLDF. To this end, a websurvey was carried out in May 2018 with 572 citizens residing in the FD, aiming at detecting perceptions about the three topics mentioned.

In addition to the closed questions, the questionnaire intentionally presented open ones to

¹ Doctor in Sociology. Professor and Advisor of the Graduate Program (Cefor) of the Chamber of Deputies.

² Economist (UFRJ), Audit Specialist (PUC/MG) and in Political Science (UFMS). Legislative consultant to the Federal Senate and university lecturer. Master in Legislative Branch by Cefor.

enable the opinions qualitative deepening. The qualitative study of social perceptions is a methodological resource widely used in the social sciences, based on the premise that such studies enable the empirical analysis of issues, themes and phenomena from the perspective of the citizens themselves, the representative democracy actors per excellence. By giving an opinion on the questions posed to them, we were able to detect the social representations, that is, the knowledge resulting from the experience, the collective reflection mediated by the practical conscience of the respondents. As such, the product of analyzes of this nature is the result of a “double process of translation and interpretation involved in research operations and relations, and in elucidating the cognitive capacity of social actors”, with the purpose of understanding their opinions and discursive justifications. (BARROS, 2013, p.341).

Although social perceptions are subjective and work as intangible reputational measures, the literature highlights that it is socially produced and of great relevance in specific contexts. After all, these perceptions are shared and, even though they constitute indirect and changeable measures, they can reveal relevant cultural traits of groups and population contingents, such as citizens residing in the Federal District. Therefore, social perceptions are significant ways of detecting subjective assessments of citizens, agents and observers of social practices, and political scenarios and processes. Moreover, we are dealing with empirical material relevant to the analytical study and the understanding of social and political problems, such as the public reputation of the CLDF, the citizens' trust and interest in its activities.

Before analyzing the data, we present a brief contextualization on the theoretical topics related to the websurvey, that is, public image, political confidence and the citizen's interest in politics and local power.

Public image

The public image concept, despite being widely used, is considered to be quite broad, as it brings together “a multifaceted, dynamic and somewhat volatile set of information flows, opinions and mental and/or articulated representations (made public)” - (NOLETO FILHO, 2014, p.12). Thus, public image is “a concept that can be understood broadly and is applicable to organizations of the State, the market and society, social groups and individual citizens” (p.12).

The public image of government officials, institutions and their representatives plays a fundamental role in the political life, as it is directly associated with the symbolic capital of credibility and trust, directly reflected in the institutional reputation (GOMES, 2006). After all, as Baldissera (2008, p. 197) adds, “the concept image contemplates the notion of reputation, because forming a concept implies appreciating, considering, judging, sentencing and sanctioning”. Thus, it is a symbolic form, in the words of Thompson (1995), that is, a significant expression produced, transmitted and received in historically specific and socially structured contexts and processes. As a result, the public image, understood as a symbolic form, is liable to

“complex processes of appreciation, evaluation and conflicts” (THOMPSON, 1995, p. 203). Appreciation occurs on a symbolic level, through the approval or rejection of the public image projected to public opinion. This symbolic appreciation implies constant assessment and conflict, depending on the visibility dynamics.

Public image is a consequence of visibility, as what is shown produces cognitive and symbolic effects on the public (GOMES, 2004). As Maria Helena Weber (2004, p.265) defines it, “the public image is the result of the conceptual one, emitted by political subjects in power disputes and recovered in the synthesis of abstract images (the intangible, the imagination) with the concrete ones (the tangible, the senses)”.

Besides the media performance, operators per excellence in visibility, the public image also relies on political-institutional factors and the political culture features (NOLETO FILHO, 2014). This means that public perceptions about a particular institution and its representatives depend on how the institution itself relates to society and how that same society builds its political representations. For this reason, it is a “hybrid concept forged in the combination of visibilities and secrets” (WEBER, 2009, p.11), based on the articulation of the three factors mentioned and a strong impact on the institutional reputation.

The public image construction is associated with the production and dissemination of opinions and the consequent public adherence to certain ways of thinking. After all, politics is based on the capacity to build an opinion (ARENDRT, 1983). While the natural sciences operate with rational or empirical evidence expressed in definitions, postulates, theorems and the like (monological discourses), politics is located in the dialogical field of ideas plurality, as it is an activity established in the relationship between men, that is, plurality is at its own origin and visibility inherent to it (THOMPSON, 1995). Such reasoning leads to the assumption that politics is within the opinion scope, with all positive and negative implications.

A central concept, in this order of ideas, is that of public opinion³, in its direct relationship with political practices and the construction of the public image. In this regard, it should be noted that, in the Brazilian Political Science field, public opinion studies are more concerned with electoral behavior than with the opinion formation. The main explanations for electoral behavior result from two main aspects: the rational choice theory and the sociological perspective (CASTRO, 1992). We briefly understand the former as the one that explains political behavior considering citizens as rational and always intending to maximize their gains, with small theoretical variations among the authors who work with this base, obviously (DOWNS, 1957; FIORINA, 1981); and the latter, as the one that explains the vote direction also by social and communicational variables, linked to political participation, such as social groups, education,

³ This work does not aim at discussing the theoretical complexity involved in the concept of public opinion discussion, especially because there would be not enough space for it. An overview of this discussion, from the perspective of Political Science, is formulated by Cervi (2006).

exposure to advertising etc. (CASTRO, 1992; KEY, 2013; FIGUEIREDO; 1991; ALDÉ, ET AL., 2007).

Habermas (1971, 1984), in turn, associates the public opinion concept with the notion of advertising, that is, the dynamics of public debate of arguments that interest an audience. Generally, advertising refers to the status of what is public, to the quality or state of public things (making it public). In the Habermasian view, in democratic societies, the media exercise the function of “bundling” the different opinion currents through an instrumental action that selectively excludes certain subjects from public discussion, while politically accentuating the insertion of other themes.

In summary, despite the debate complexity and breadth, some authors point out that public opinion is, therefore, a kind of socially constructed or induced consensus, although this does not mean unanimity (CHAMPAGNE, 1988). It converges to the coincidence of public attention regarding certain issues or themes, but without necessarily implying widespread toxic adherence by the population. The collective debate helps to strengthen public opinion.

In specific regard to the Parliament, based on the Habermas (1994) concept, it is also interesting to consider what is called “an opinion regime”, established with the first liberal governments at the beginning of the 19th century. In an opinion regime, it would be lawful and prudent for parliamentarians to consult the public opinion, as the democratic power is popular (SÁ, 2004; HABERMAS, 1994). It shows rationality and discussions, conferring the authority principle, which can be reinforced or questioned by the population depending on the nature of the dominant public image and the level of society's trust in political institutions.

Political trust

Above all, political trust is a public good, an indispensable symbolic asset for the existence of societies and their political systems. Thus, from a normative perspective, trust is highly desired. However, it is a social construction, which relies on the political and cultural values of a society and how they are transmitted and redefined, through the political socialization processes (PUTNAM, 1993; INGLEHART, 1997). Political socialization can be directly affected by the way institutions relate to citizens, especially in the capacity of institutions to build competent speeches to foster trust. Citizens' expectations may be contemplated in everyday experience, in the way these institutions deal with public goods and, mainly, in how they behave in the face of collective demands. Based on what was transmitted to them “about the institutions meaning and, above all, their concrete experiences, citizens evaluate the institutions performance distinguishing, however, their specific performance and cyclical effectiveness and their permanent function” (FINURAS, 2013, p.120).

When studying the theoretical foundations of political trust, Leandro, Leandro and Nogueira (2011) highlight G. Simmel's contribution, mainly the correlation established between

trust and secrecy. Simmel (1999 [1908]) highlights the social impact of trust in terms of social cohesion.⁴ While trust creates a bridge to enable social relations, secrecy preserves individuality and also favors the formation of more restricted social circles. For Simmel, trust is essential for the construction and solidification of social cohesion, through commitments governed by the logic of reciprocity. Besides, trust implies a feeling of insecurity, which “increases or decreases with the capital of experience acquired in relation to it, depending on the behaviors of those in whom we place trust: if they prove to be faithful, trust has all the probabilities to increase and solidify behaviors, and, conversely, the opposite happens”(LEANDRO; LEANDRO; NOGUEIRA, 2011, p.219).

Although trust is an issue in political studies, what usually calls attention is the discredit regarding politics, which leads some authors to affirm that we live in the mistrust era (INNERARITY, 2011). In the field of political science, one of the theoretical strands associated with political trust studies is dependent on the theory of rational choice (HARDIN, 1992; NOOTEBOOM, 1992). These authors differentiate trust in the actors' competence and in their intentions. The former has to do with appetite and the ability to act in line with ideological and political expectations, such as a labor party or an environmental institution, for instance. The latter is related to “the ability and interest to act in good faith according to the best of skills and the expected correctness of principles, whether by norm, habit, routine or role” (FINURAS, 2013, p.46).

In both cases, trust can be associated with rational behavior, that is, a rational choice of individuals, who choose to trust or not trust, depending on the rational calculations made individually. From the perspective of the rational choice theory, “decisions about trust are similar to other forms of risk choice”, that is, “it is assumed that individuals are motivated to make rational and effective choices” (FINURAS, 2013, p.46), in order to maximize gains and minimize losses. Thus, the choices are motivated by a system of conscious calculation, anchored in one of cultural and political values.

Pipa Norris (1999) points out five aspects to be highlighted in the political analysis of trust. The first one concerns the feeling of citizens belonging to the Nation, which implies a greater or lesser willingness to politically cooperate. The sense of patriotism and national identity are considered relevant in this process. The second one refers to the level of citizens' adherence to democratic values. The greater the adherence to the regime and its values, the greater is the tendency of citizens to trust democracy and its institutions. The third aspect concerns the assessment that citizens make about the democratic performance, comparing how political institutions work with the ideal meaning of democracy. The fourth one contemplates the

⁴ Theoretical approaches to trust are multifaceted, as Finuras (2013) recalls. While psychologists have trust from the perspective of individual characteristics and interpersonal relationships, social scientists prioritize institutional character and the relationship with cultural values and political culture.

assessment of the institutions themselves, which includes the institutional level per se and not its directors or representatives. It is about assessing trust in institutions and not in people. The fifth level, in turn, is related to the support of political actors for democracy, which includes citizens' evaluation of their representatives, government officials and leaders. In opposition to the previous level, this one is about the perceptions about the personal performance of these actors.

For Giddens (2001), the citizen's trust in political institutions is directly associated with the legitimacy of the State before society. It should be noted, according to the author, that the State has undergone relevant resettings, such as the globalization effects. "As a result of globalization combined with the new individualism, the mechanisms of political trust have undergone changes - as have the mechanisms of trust in the industry, in other types of organizations and even in emotional life" (GIDDENS, 2001, p.246). Therefore, the confidence expressed in the adherence level to the democratic regime and in the use of official institutions is a symbolic factor of paramount importance for political and institutional stability.

From the specific perspective of trust in political institutions, the author emphasizes the strength of active citizenship in shaping the forms of power legitimacy. After all, "an intelligent citizenship goes hand in hand with the centrality of active trust in the government legitimacy" (GIDDENS, 2001, p.246). In this point of view, the loss of confidence is a factor that contributes to the deflation of political power and to the very legitimacy of democratic regimes. It happens because the loss of confidence can favor the institutions' beliefs in force as a way to preserve political integration (GIDDENS, 2001).

The author also stresses that institutional trust is one of modernity central elements in the form of public credibility, which is directly reflected in the image and reputation of governments and public institutions. It is "a form of faith in which the security acquired in probable results expresses more a commitment to something than just a cognitive understanding" (GIDDENS, 2001, p.29). As a result, the confidence expressed in the level of adherence to the democratic regime and in the use of official institutions is a symbolic factor of paramount importance for political and institutional stability.

As Miguel points out, there is a "deterioration of popular adhesion to representative institutions" (2003, p.123), especially from the liberal perspective of democracy adopted by authors like Schumpeter. In another work, Miguel summarizes the studies that point to a crisis of representation or democracy in western countries in the '70s and '90s of the last century and that reveal "the generalized discrediting of representative institutions among ordinary citizens" (MIGUEL, 2005, p.27). Confidence, therefore, can become an antidote to the recurring democracies crises (MCCOY, 2000).

Several other authors (PORTO, 1996; STOKER, 2006; DALTON, 2007; MOISÉS, 2009) emphasize the discredit crisis that contemporary political institutions are going through. Recent research shows that the population's level of trust in political institutions has never been lower,

especially regarding the Legislative Houses (LESTON-BANDEIRA, 2012).

As presented by Moisés and Carneiro (2008, p. 7), this phenomenon has been documented since the 1980s. Although it greatly varies in each country and in comparative terms, there is a confidence drop in the institutions that maintain democracy, despite a lesser degree of oscillation in countries with a more consolidated regime, such as Holland, Norway, Finland and Denmark. The greatest variation observed occurred in the older democracies, such as in the United States, England, France, Sweden and Canada. Using this logic of empirical studies carried out through surveys in Brazil, Mexico and Chile, Moisés and Carneiro point out that there is an “association between feelings of dissatisfaction with democracy, apathy or political impotence and the distrust of citizens of democratic institutions” (2008, p. 8)⁵.

The distrust of politicians, the skepticism about democratic institutions and disillusionment with the democratic process are pointed out by Dalton (2007) and Stoker (2006) as the great challenge of contemporary democracies, as it is common to all advanced industrial democracies. Distrust is pointed out in various studies in the social sciences⁶ as an effect of the corruption perception and the media's emphasis on information about inappropriate conduct by parliamentarians and public life figures (POWER; JAMINSON, 2005). The development of an increasingly critical and vigilant citizenship is also pointed out as one of the factors that increase distrust (RIBEIRO, 2011).

Regarding Brazil and the other young Latin American democracies, scholars point out that they suffer from the “generalized distrust syndrome” (POWER; JAMINSON, 2005; COLEN, 2010; LOPES, 2004; RIBEIRO, 2011), but are the causes of political distrust in Latin America the same as those identified in advanced democracies? According to Ribeiro (2011), the reasons are different and the explanations are in the cultural and historical context. While in the consolidated democracies the mistrust is the result of the high level of education and critical citizens' information, the explanation would be in the citizens' disillusionment with the concrete functioning of the political institutions, mainly the parliaments, in the young Latin democracies. In a social environment marked by extreme inequalities, the perception of citizens that the political and economic systems “benefit individuals differently can lead to a feeling that institutions are not to be trusted” (COLEN, 2010, p.5). This “Latin American cultural syndrome” would have taken roots in the citizens of these young democracies' way of life; thus, structuring “a marked coexistence between people and, consequently, due to distrust in relation to State institutions” (COLEN, 2010, p.4).

Brazil follows interpretative paths that are different from advanced industrial democracies. In this scenario, low confidence shows itself close to feelings of apathy and

⁵ Authors who point to this conclusion in their studies: Moisés (1995), Durand Ponte (2005) and Hunneus (2004).

⁶ For an overview of these studies, see Power e Jaminson, 2005; Colen, 2010; Lopes, 2004; Ribeiro, 2011, among others.

detachment from political aspects, which are not reflected in critical attitudes towards the system. These notes lead us to confirm the need to base studies on political culture related to its contextual realities, far from the standards in advanced industrial democracies in force.

Another pertinent observation is that parliaments are not the exclusive focus of the population's mistrust, but a focal mistrust point. In a comparative study of 11 countries, Norris (2011, p. 103) draws attention to the fact that confidence in this specific institution has dropped significantly over time.

Interest in politics and local power

The citizen's level of interest in politics is usually associated with their knowledge about the political system. Therefore, interest generates more knowledge and this feeds interest. Coexistence and socialization are factors that interfere in the building of individuals' interests. Socialization is understood as a continuous learning process for life in society (DARMON, 2006), that is, a way of "learning to become a member of a society" (BERGER; BERGER, 1990). It is an experience "that lasts a lifetime and happens through interaction with others and participation in the daily routines of everyday cultural life" (COFFEY, 2010, p.192). This complex socialization process encompasses language, symbolic systems, ethical and moral norms, aesthetic taste, economics, ideas and political values. Political socialization is specifically associated with what individuals learn about the political system from socialization agencies, such as family, religion, work, political news, electoral propaganda etc.

Political socialization is one of the pillars of civic culture, understood as a process of political learning through diffuse political education that results in the acquisition of political values, confidence or mistrust in institutions and in the public image of institutions and elected representatives. It is a long-term process, connected to changes in society and politics, such as the renewal of mindsets by new generations (ALMOND; VERBA, 1989).

The literature considers the citizen's interest in political activities the basis for motivating political engagement and participation. Interest leads citizens to be attentive, to pay attention to politics, especially through political news, conversations with friends and family, and debates on social media. Leston-Bandeira (2012) stresses that it is a process with several complementary stages. The first one is the citizen's willingness to pay attention to what happens in the political sphere. This leads to the formation of a political interest field. The author believes information serves as a symbolic input for possible forms of citizen intervention, especially in the virtual sphere. This whole process still requires cognitive ability to understand the politics universe, relating to certain tendencies and proposals, and, finally, an effective participation, as the stage that completes the political engagement circle. In this perspective, "citizens must start from information to develop a gradual understanding and identification with parliament, which could lead them to participate and, finally, intervene in the decision-making process" (BARROS,

BERNARDES; RODRIGUES, 2016, p.547).

Another relevant aspect in the analyzed literature is individuals' willingness and interest to participate in politics, a democratic way of exercising social control over the actions of government officials and other political representatives. Social control refers to the citizen's power of inspection, which requires participation and monitoring of institutional activities and public policies, "sharing the decision-making power between the State and society, and guaranteeing rights (...) always aiming at power sharing between the State and society, defending the public interest and respecting the autonomy of civil society actors" (SERAFIM, 2008, p.1; 2).

The literature identifies local power as the privileged space for participation and social control, as it is the space in the city where the citizens reside, work, study and build family and social relationships (BAQUERO; CREMONESE, 2009). Local power concerns the actors directly responsible for the management of the neighborhood, the city, the municipality or the Federal District. It is a sphere of power that deals with the urban agenda and the definition, debate, planning, execution, evaluation and inspection of public policies. The daily democratic experience is directly related to the local level, a context in which citizens experience their most direct and concrete experiences with the authorities and political institutions (BAQUERO; CREMONESE, 2009; LOPEZ; ALMEIDA, 2017).

In Dowbord's perspective (2017, p.21), local power, "as an organized system of civil society consensus in a limited space", implies "changes in the information organization system, the administrative capacity reinforcement, and an extensive training work both in the community and the administrative machine itself". For the author, the issue of local power is evolving, tending to become a central issue today, involving the debate on decentralization, de-bureaucratization and local participation.

Local power is also understood as a planning region (VAINER, 2002, p.19), in the sense that "the place acquires the connotation of the socio-territorial target of the actions". Such actions are situated, contextualized in a given space: the city. For the author, a city or equivalent territory is not a mere social reflection, as there are its own political dynamics linked to local culture. The city "is itself a social, economic and political universe. It produces wealth, produces and reproduces economic, political, cultural relations etc.". The city "is not just a localized and reduced replication of the social structure; it is also a complex of social relations – economic ones, but also power relations" (VAINER, 2002, p.26).

In the case of the Federal District, local power is exercised by the Governor, 20 State Secretaries and 31 Regional Administrations, representing the Executive Power. The Legislative branch is exercised by the Federal Legislative Chamber of the Federal District (CLDF) and the Federal Audit Court of the Federal District (TCDF). The Judiciary one is exercised by the Court of Justice of the Federal District and Territories (TJDF).

The local government headquarters is Brasília, which is also the capital of the Republic.

Built in 1960, based on a project by Lúcio Costa and Oscar Niemeyer, it resulted from the political developmental program of then President Juscelino Kubistchek, driven by the need to occupy and urbanize the geographic countryside of Brazil. In addition to Brasília, there are 18 cities in the FD, known as satellite cities, and 15 others surrounding the FD, the so-called “Entorno”, bordering Goiás and Minas Gerais.

The Metropolitan Region of the FD is the fourth largest one in the country, behind São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Salvador. Brasília also has the highest monthly income per capita (equivalent to R\$ 5,752.41) and the highest schooling rate of the population, with 18.57% of the inhabitants with a college degree. The national average is 8.09%. Chart 1 presents a summary of the basic information about the FD.

Chart 1 – Basic information about the FD

DATA	
Territory	5,779,997 km ²
Total population	2,977,216
Female population	52.19%
Male population	47.81%
Elderly population (over 60 years old)	12.80%
Population with a university degree	18.57%
Population density	444 inhabitants/km ²
Voters	1,985,872 (68% of the population)
Human Development Index	0.824
Average monthly income per capita	R\$ 5,752.41

Source: Elaborated with data from IBGE, 2014

Data analysis

Before presenting the websurvey data, we will briefly contextualize the CLDF regarding its party composition, commissions and other basic information. Like other Brazilian legislative assemblies, ALCE has its representatives elected by proportional election, with a four-year term. There are four women among the 24 parliamentarians, who represent 17 parties and are distributed in 10 permanent thematic commissions, as shown in Charts 2 and 3.

Chart 2 – CLDF general profile

	Election	Proportional
1	Mandate	4 years
2	Total deputies	24
3	Male deputies	20
4	Female deputies	4
5	Parties with elected representatives	17
6	Standing committee	10
7	Temporary commissions (including CPI)	0

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Chart 3 – CLDF Standing Committees

	Committee	Acronym
1	Constitution and Justice Committee	CCJ
2	Budget, Economy and Finance Committee	CEOF
3	Social Affairs Committee	CAS
4	Consumer Protection Committee	CDC
5	Defense, Human Rights, Citizenship, Ethics and Parliamentary Decorum Committee	CDDHCEDP
6	Land Affairs Committee	CAF
7	Education, Health and Culture Committee	CESC
8	Security Committee	CS
9	Sustainable Economic Development, Science, Technology, Environment and Tourism	CDESCTMAT
10	Audit, Governance, Transparency and Control Committee	CFGTC

Source: Elaborated with data from the CLDF portal

Chart 4 shows the parties with the largest and smallest number of parliamentarians, revealing a framework of high plurality and fragmentation of acronyms. Of the 35 parties currently registered with the Electoral Court, 17 are represented in the CLDF. PT has the largest number of parliamentarians. Most of the acronyms are represented only by a parliamentarian, which reinforces the diagnoses of party fragmentation and pulverization (RODRIGUES, 1995).

Chart 4 - Parties with elected representatives

	Party	Deputies
1	PT	3
2	PDT	2
3	PMDB	2
4	PR	2
5	Rede	2
6	SD	2
7	PPS	1
8	PSB	1
9	PHS	1
10	PRB	1
11	PROS	1
12	PSDB	1
13	PTB	1
14	PTN	1
15	PV	1
16	PTN	1
17	PV	1
	TOTAL	

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Methodological strategies

In this work, the responses to a websurvey in May 2018 were analyzed, with 572 citizens residing in the FD. The option for this type of data collection instrument is justified by its increasing use and also by the fact that the FD is characterized as the Federation unit in which the population has the highest Internet use in Brazil today, with 85.3% (CARDOSO, 2018). Because of this, the informants profile (Table 1) shows an expressive diversity in sociodemographic terms.

The comparison of data obtained through traditional methods and websurvey shows there are generally few differences between the results, according to the diagnosis by Manfreda and Vehovar (2002). After examining a series of conventional surveys with a similar series of websurveys, the authors concluded that there are no substantive differences in the two research modalities responses, except in the case of the non-responses percentage, which is higher in the websurveys. However, the authors emphasize the difficulties registered in the literature, which tends to consider that websurveys can result in unreliable samples of the population that make up the studies universe. This happens because the literature still resists the websurveys innovations and also because the methodological and scientific criteria for conducting surveys were established and agreed before the consolidation of the Internet as a research alternative (MANFREDA; VEHOVAR, 2002).

The strategy to increase the number of informants and diversify the sociodemographic profile was to use different contact networks to promote the access link to the questionnaire by e-mail and social networks, especially Facebook, the most used digital network in Brazil.

Table 1 – Respondents profile

GENDER	Q	%
Feminine	302	52.80
Masculine	270	47.20
Subtotal	572	100.00
AGE GROUP	Q	%
Up to 20 years old	95	16.61
21 to 30 years old	102	17.83
31 to 40 years old	105	18.36
41 to 50 years old	99	17.31
51 to 60 years old	92	16.08
Older than 60 years old	79	13.81
Subtotal	572	100.00
EDUCATION	Q	%
Elementary School	29	5.07
High School	213	37.24
Undergraduate Study	223	38.99
Postgraduation	107	18.71
Subtotal	572	100.00
MONTHLY FAMILY INCOME	Q	%
Up to 3 minimum wages	20	3.50
From 3 to 6 minimum wages	54	9.44
From 6 to 10 minimum wages	112	19.58
From 10 to 15 minimum wages	106	18.53
From 15 to 20 minimum wages	141	24.65
Above 20 minimum wages	139	24.30
Subtotal	572	100.00
DWELLING PLACE	Q	%
Plano Piloto	149	26.05
Neighborhoods around Plano Piloto	144	25.17
Satellite cities	142	24.83
Cities around the FD	137	23.95
Subtotal	572	100,00
DWELLING TIME IN THE FD	Q	%
Up to 5 years	102	17.83
From 5 to 10 years	136	23.78
From 10 to 15 years	133	23.25
From 15 to 20 years	101	17.66
More than 20 years	100	17.48
Subtotal	572	100.00

Source: Elaborated by the authors

It must be recognized that, with the websurvey procedures that are a matrix for the analyzed data, this is not a random population sample (in fact, the data in Table 1 show a profile of schooling and income quite different from the total FD population one). Therefore, it is not possible to infer the results of this exploratory study to the general population, and the conclusions should be understood as applicable only to the selected sample. Moreover, the comparison with a statistical distribution should be understood as a contrast with a hypothetical population with the same sociodemographic characteristics as the one obtained here. We believe, however, that the exercise of studying the empirical results obtained is valid, as a way of adding the knowledge of

an individual experience to the small number of empirical studies on the specific subject object of the research.

As this is categorical data in the response to the survey, it is appropriate to use the chi-square independence test for this first empirical approach to the subject. This test compares – from a contingency table made up by the combinations of each of the possible values of two categorical variables – the frequency for each combination with the one expected if the associations between each value were random⁷, stressing if the difference between both is statistically significant in the specific case - a situation in which the independence of the two variables cannot be asserted⁸ (FIELD; FIELD; FIELD, 2012; RIBEIRO JR., 2013; EVERITT, 2006 REIS; REIS, 2011). The assertion of independence between variables implies the negation of any association between them or of any particular pattern in their joint occurrence (that is, of any tendency for a particular value of one variable to occur more frequently when the other variable also assumes a certain value) (GAO, 1992).

The test consisted of comparing the associations between the responses grouped by the different blocks above using the chi-square tests⁹. As a result, the responses independence associated with confidence in relation to those of the general assessment of the Chamber, the ones about trusting the Chamber regarding information about knowledge and interest, and personal characteristics, and the responses of the global evaluation of the Chamber facing the ones relating to knowledge and interest, and personal characteristics were verified. The tests generated five sets of associations, contemplated in the tables in Appendix 3¹⁰.

The quantitative exploration developed here will analytically suggest pairs of variables that, due to their association, have good potential for approaches of a causal nature in later studies.

Results description¹¹

Initially, we show the descriptive data on the three axes of the study: political trust, public image and citizen's interest in local politics (Tables 2, 3 and 4). The three questions have similar results. The CLDF public image is considered predominantly bad and terrible, with 89.16% (adding the two alternatives). There are only 10.14% of informants who rate it as regular. It also draws attention to 0.70% of evaluations related to the “good” option and zero for the “excellent”

⁷ The theoretical distribution of these expected frequencies – under the hypothesis of independence of the variables making up the contingency table – is the chi-square distribution (EVERITT, 2006, p. 76).

⁸ Therefore, the null hypothesis is that the two compared variables are independent.

⁹ The standard chi-square tests received a test with the “simulate.p.value = TRUE” parameter, which applies a Monte-Carlo simulation to obtain the p value in view of the fact that it is a 2 x 2 contingency table and there is a pattern of responses with a high concentration of coincident responses and few or even zero responses in others, generating an alert message from R (“Warning message: Chi-squared approximation may be incorrect”) - cf. the “Pearson's Chi-squared Test for Count Data” entry in manual R (available at <http://stat.ethz.ch/R-manual/R-devel/library/stats/html/chisq.test.html>, accessed on 15/08/2018).

¹⁰ The original data files and the R scripts used for the tests are available upon request to the authors.

¹¹ The descriptive part explores only the central questions of the websurvey, as there is no space to analyze all the items used for the correlations that will appear in the text sequence.

item.

Table 2 – How do you rate the Federal District Legislative Chamber?

Answers	Quantity	%
Bad	323	56.47
Terrible	187	32.69
Regular	58	10.14
Good	4	0.70
Excellent	0	0.00
Total	572	100.00

Source: Elaborated by the authors

As for trust, the sum of the “low” and “very low” alternatives reaches 91.26%. There is only 5.94% corresponding to the “average” level of trust and zero for the “high” and “very high” ones (Table 3).

Table 3 – Your level of trust in the FD Legislative Chamber is:

Answers	Quantity	%
Low	335	58.57
Very low	203	35.49
Average	34	5.94
High	0	0.00
Very high	0	0.00
Total	572	100.00

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Regarding the interest in local politics, adding the “low” and “very low” interest alternatives, we have 83.22%. The average level of interest is only 12.24%. The “high” and “very high” alternatives add up to 4.54% (Table 4).

Table 4 – Please indicate your level of interest in the FD politics

Answers	Quantity	%
Low	259	45.28
Very low	217	37.94
Average	70	12.24
High	21	3.67
Very high	5	0.87
Total	572	100.00

Source: Elaborated by the authors

Consequently, it is possible to notice a possible association between the three aspects analyzed. As demonstrated in the first part of the text, the public image is related to the concept

built by the population about the institution (BALDISSERA, 2008). This concept directly interferes with institutional reputation, which contributes to increasing or decreasing political confidence. Both the image and the trust can suffer interferences from the citizen's interest or lack thereof in politics, as they can motivate attention or indifference (LESTON-BANDEIRA, 2012). In this case, high disinterest can be a factor that feeds both the low confidence and the negative image of the CLDF.

The crossing of questions that reveal attitudinal aspects of the interested parties before the Legislative Chamber (those related to trust and the general assessment of the institution), shown in Table 5, points only to an association between the answer to question 9 and questions 1 and 2, that is, the reactions to the “evaluation of the district deputies work” are approached and linked, on the one hand, and to the public image and confidence attributed to the CLDF, which is compatible with a certain global view (positive or negative) of the respondent about the institution. On the other hand, the independence between the Chamber evaluations and the opinion on the impact of the decisions taken on it stands out.

Table 5 - ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN ISSUES IN THE CONFIDENCE AND GENERAL ASSESSMENT DIMENSIONS

Questions	χ^2 – initial test	p-value – initial test	χ^2 – second test	p-value – second test	Sign 95%	Sign 95%: initial	Sign 95%: second
1 8	5.564476351	0.134832676	5.564476351	0.135432284	NO	NO	NO
1 9	687.5039631	3.36E-142	687.5039631	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2 8	7.431033758	0.059357222	7.431033758	0.089955022	NO	NO	NO
2 9	854.3919621	4.13E-178	854.3919621	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3 8	5.84938299	0.119172485	5.84938299	0.108445777	NO	NO	NO
3 9	1138.467471	2.32E-239	1138.467471	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES

Source: Elaborated by the authors from the research results.

NOTE: Answers = Questions: Pair of questions whose answers were correlated

χ^2 – initial test = value of the chi-square statistic of the conventional test

p-value – initial test = p-value resulting from the conventional test

χ^2 – second test = value of the chi-square statistic of the test with the Montecarlo simulation

p-value – second initial test = p-value resulting from the test with the Montecarlo simulation

Sign 95% = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for both tests (that is, both tests were significant)

Sign 95%: initial = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the conventional test

Sign 95%: second = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the second test, with the Montecarlo simulation

For clarity in the visualization, Tables 6 and 7 show the crossing of data from the questions for which the association was significant, with the clear concentration of responses in negative tones both regarding trust and the institution evaluation, and the work of its members.

Table 6 – CROSS TABULATION – Questions 1 and 9

ASSESSMENT	Good	Regular	Bad	Terrible
Good	1	2	0	0
Regular	1	50	12	2
Bad	0	18	288	14
Terrible	0	3	43	138

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

Question 1 – Lines: “*In your opinion, the public image of the Federal Legislative Chamber is...*”

Question 9 – Columns: “*How do you assess the district deputies’ work?*”

Table 7 – CROSS TABULATION – Questions 2 and 9

ASSESSMENT	Good	Regular	Bad	Terrible
High	1	0	0	0
Average	1	48	11	2
Low	0	22	285	12
Very low	0	3	47	140

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

Question 2 – Lines: “*Your level of trust in the FD Legislative Chamber is...*”

Question 9 – Columns: “*How do you assess the district deputies’ work?*”

Moving on to the associations between trust in the Chamber and the respondent's knowledge and interest in politics (Table 8), it is observed that all questions are related to each other. This indicates the plausibility that people with specific interest and political activity knowledge (both in general and in the details of the district powers work) will, together, have similar opinions regarding the Legislative Chamber, which will differ significantly from those who demonstrate less involvement.

Table 8 - ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ISSUES IN THE CONFIDENCE AND KNOWLEDGE/POLITICS INTEREST DIMENSIONS

Questions	χ^2 – initial test	p-value – initial test	χ^2 – second test	p-value – second test	Sign 95%	Sign 95%: initial	Sign 95%: second
1 4	753.7115689	1.38E-153	753.7115689	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1 5	18.89377809	0.000288	18.89377809	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
1 6	13.06391427	0.0045	13.06391427	0.004997501	YES	YES	YES
1 7	36.77590259	5.13E-08	36.77590259	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1 10	14.33009045	0.002489	14.33009045	0.003998001	YES	YES	YES
1 11	26.87955159	6.24E-06	26.87955159	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1 12	26.40619535	7.84E-06	26.40619535	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
1 13	17.57059634	0.000539	17.57059634	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1 14	48.85003877	1.40E-10	48.85003877	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES

1	15	36.56543072	5.69E-08	36.56543072	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1	16	90.29482807	8.74E-13	90.29482807	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
1	17	46.17035559	5.00E-05	46.17035559	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1	18	59.69570268	2.84E-07	59.69570268	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1	19	42.40598151	0.000195	42.40598151	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	4	814.7760662	1.12E-166	814.7760662	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	5	17.96622388	0.000447	17.96622388	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
2	6	13.12141907	0.004381	13.12141907	0.003498251	YES	YES	YES
2	7	35.42012706	9.93E-08	35.42012706	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	10	13.8618533	0.003099	13.8618533	0.003498251	YES	YES	YES
2	11	23.55445134	3.09E-05	23.55445134	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	12	18.91322922	0.000285	18.91322922	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	13	13.24085423	0.004144	13.24085423	0.006996502	YES	YES	YES
2	14	43.64878338	1.79E-09	43.64878338	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	15	27.85908136	3.89E-06	27.85908136	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	16	86.581424	4.29E-12	86.581424	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
2	17	50.91699725	8.52E-06	50.91699725	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	18	56.6931673	9.25E-07	56.6931673	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	19	42.55531546	0.000185	42.55531546	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	4	873.4313993	2.91E-179	873.4313993	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	5	21.87531164	6.92E-05	21.87531164	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	6	14.90947913	0.001896	14.90947913	0.00149925	YES	YES	YES
3	7	32.17606205	4.80E-07	32.17606205	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	10	25.18318149	1.41E-05	25.18318149	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	11	22.38678493	5.42E-05	22.38678493	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	12	15.22471207	0.001634	15.22471207	0.007996002	YES	YES	YES
3	13	20.67148657	0.000123	20.67148657	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
3	14	53.0491327	1.79E-11	53.0491327	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	15	27.97138273	3.68E-06	27.97138273	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
3	16	86.83111719	3.85E-12	86.83111719	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
3	17	50.21243345	1.11E-05	50.21243345	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
3	18	48.48700672	2.12E-05	48.48700672	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
1	4	753.7115689	1.38E-153	753.7115689	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

NOTE: Answers = Questions: Pair of questions whose answers were correlated

χ^2 – initial test = value of the chi-square statistic of the conventional test

p-value – initial test = p-value resulting from the conventional test

χ^2 – second test = value of the chi-square statistic of the test with the Montecarlo simulation

p-value – second initial test = p-value resulting from the test with the Montecarlo simulation

Sign 95% = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for both tests (that is, both tests were significant)

Sign 95%: initial = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the conventional test

Sign 95%: second = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the second test, with the Montecarlo simulation

To exemplify the situation described in the previous table of associations between knowledge and trust levels, Table 9 shows the cross tabulation between the answers about trust in the Legislative Chamber and the degree of knowledge reported by the interviewee about the institution. The “low” or “very low” knowledge about the organization (basically concentrating all the answers) and the low level of trust, which are strongly linked, stand out.

Table 9 – CROSS TABULATION – Questions 2 and 4

ASSESSMENT	Very High	High	Average	Low	Very Low
High	0	1	0	0	0
Average	0	1	56	4	1
Low	0	2	6	308	3
Very low	1	9	18	17	145

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

Question 2 – Lines: “*Your level of trust in the FD Legislative Chamber is...*”

Question 4 – Columns: “*How do you classify your level of personal knowledge on the FD Legislative Chamber?*”

The same degree of closeness cannot be inferred from the relationship between trust and some objective aspects of the respondents’ situation addressed in Table 10: only the situations described in question 23 (family income) are related to the answers to the three questions about trust, and the conditions of question 22 (education), to answers 1 and 2. In other words, education and monthly income seem to be important factors in conditioning trust attitudes regarding the local legislature.

This finding reinforces the suggestion in Table 9 of the close link between trust and the knowledge and involvement in politics level, given the likely links between schooling and income level, on the one hand, and knowledge level and political participation on the other. As a result, Tables 9 and 10 may be showing two faces of the same phenomenon.

On another perspective, the independence of the respondent’s confidence in the CLDF stands out regarding aspects such as gender, age, dwelling place and residence time, in a somewhat counterintuitive way (in the face of possible expectations of greater attachment due to residing in certain spaces, belonging to a younger population strata, or having more links with the Federal District for the longest period of residence).

Table 10 - ASSOCIATION BETWEEN QUESTIONS IN THE CONFIDENCE AND THE RESPONDENT'S PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS DIMENSIONS

Questions	χ^2 – initial test	p-value – initial test	χ^2 – second test	p-value – second test	Sign 95%	Sign 95%: initial	Sign 95%: second	
1	20	0.463575953	0.926817566	0.463575953	0.962018991	NO	NO	NO
1	21	13.43835598	0.568478924	13.43835598	0.575212394	NO	NO	NO
1	22	21.45981667	0.010758044	21.45981667	0.011994003	YES	YES	YES
1	23	35.85333613	0.001855978	35.85333613	0.004497751	YES	YES	YES
1	24	10.7413854	0.293853046	10.7413854	0.287856072	NO	NO	NO
1	25	15.71421037	0.204679154	15.71421037	0.188405797	NO	NO	NO
2	20	1.541778146	0.67266206	1.541778146	0.772113943	NO	NO	NO
2	21	11.97600319	0.680844522	11.97600319	0.724637681	NO	NO	NO
2	22	28.05988088	0.000932137	28.05988088	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
2	23	39.46894942	0.000545161	39.46894942	0.011494253	YES	YES	YES
2	24	11.57753741	0.238186524	11.57753741	0.186406797	NO	NO	NO
2	25	15.27542246	0.226718866	15.27542246	0.195402299	NO	NO	NO
3	20	1.125676475	0.770879574	1.125676475	0.809595202	NO	NO	NO
3	21	13.12956189	0.592291245	13.12956189	0.609195402	NO	NO	NO
3	22	12.5129225	0.185912402	12.5129225	0.178910545	NO	NO	NO
3	23	29.59000872	0.013488845	29.59000872	0.018990505	YES	YES	YES
3	24	11.5337177	0.240889832	11.5337177	0.232383808	NO	NO	NO
3	25	15.71883544	0.20445593	15.71883544	0.191904048	NO	NO	NO

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

NOTE: Answers = Questions: Pair of questions whose answers were correlated

χ^2 – initial test = value of the chi-square statistic of the conventional test

p-value – initial test = p-value resulting from the conventional test

χ^2 – second test = value of the chi-square statistic of the test with the Montecarlo simulation

p-value – second initial test = p-value resulting from the test with the Montecarlo simulation

Sign 95% = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for both tests (that is, both tests were significant)

Sign 95%: initial = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the conventional test

Sign 95%: second = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the second test, with the Montecarlo simulation

The trust scenario is almost entirely mirrored when the Chamber's general assessment questions are crossed with the same knowledge and interest in politics ones (Table 11): only questions 8 and 15 are not related to each other (impact of the CLDF decisions in the respondent's life and access to the Chamber's means of political information). Once again, the profile of a citizen dedicated to knowing and following the political life will have a vision of the Chamber that will clearly differ from those who do not present such mobilization.

Table 11 - ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ISSUES IN THE GENERAL ASSESSMENT AND KNOWLEDGE/INTEREST IN POLITICS DIMENSIONS

Questions	χ^2 – initial test	p-value – initial test	χ^2 – second test	p-value – second test	Sign 95%	Sign 95%: initial	Sign 95%: second
8 4	11.18932404	0.0245167	11.18932404	0.04047976	YES	YES	YES
8 5	18.54179523	1.66E-05	19.72638739	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 6	21.76971665	3.07E-06	23.04295155	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 7	17.03156056	3.68E-05	18.39623163	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 10	13.36634336	0.0002562	14.43285491	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 11	11.50374065	0.0006946	12.70832977	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 12	8.237801755	0.0041027	9.292817173	0.003998	YES	YES	YES
8 13	13.83304126	0.0001998	14.91123195	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 14	20.41602149	6.23E-06	21.49453428	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 15	2.36976068	0.123706	2.8765055	0.13093453	NO	NO	NO
8 16	52.06169632	5.24E-10	52.06169632	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 17	45.85124639	9.74E-09	45.85124639	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 18	46.94147078	5.84E-09	46.94147078	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
8 19	47.71412532	4.06E-09	47.71412532	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 4	526.4941099	5.06E-105	526.4941099	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 5	37.5748158	3.48E-08	37.5748158	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 6	34.36469469	1.66E-07	34.36469469	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 7	73.29967811	8.38E-16	73.29967811	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 10	31.47721014	6.74E-07	31.47721014	0.0009995	YES	YES	YES
9 11	43.21397012	2.22E-09	43.21397012	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 12	35.71421762	8.61E-08	35.71421762	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 13	49.44202353	1.05E-10	49.44202353	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 14	61.30381382	3.09E-13	61.30381382	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 15	39.05485997	1.69E-08	39.05485997	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 16	92.75623609	3.03E-13	92.75623609	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 17	48.21589661	2.35E-05	48.21589661	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 18	61.54925172	1.36E-07	61.54925172	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES
9 19	48.98965016	1.76E-05	48.98965016	0.00049975	YES	YES	YES

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

NOTE: Answers = Questions: Pair of questions whose answers were correlated

χ^2 – initial test = value of the chi-square statistic of the conventional test

p-value – initial test = p-value resulting from the conventional test

χ^2 – second test = value of the chi-square statistic of the test with the Montecarlo simulation

p-value – second initial test = p-value resulting from the test with the Montecarlo simulation

Sign 95% = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for both tests (that is, both tests were significant)

Sign 95%: initial = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the conventional test

Sign 95%: second = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the second test, with the Montecarlo simulation

The intersection between the CLDF global assessment and socioeconomic data (Table 12) is a little more nuanced: from the outset, the deputies' work assessment (question 9) did not show associations with any of the respondents' objective characteristics. The estimate of the impact degree of the CLDF decisions (question 8) is related to items 21, 22, 23 and 25 (age range, education, income and dwelling time, respectively). Once again, such differentiation is compatible with the expectation that a greater degree of information and knowledge about the local political-administrative reality (which may, as a conjecture, also be associated with the personal factors listed) corresponds to a greater awareness of possible effects of the district legislature actions (in this case, only regarding the degree of impact, which excludes a judgment scale in positive or negative terms, opposite to the previous survey on trust).

Table 12 - ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ISSUES IN THE GENERAL ASSESSMENT AND THE RESPONDENT'S PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS DIMENSIONS

Questions	χ^2 – initial test	p-value – initial test	χ^2 – second test	p-value – second test	Sign 95%	Sign 95%: initial	Sign 95%: second
8 20	1.054863058	0.304389733	1.310344262	0.294852574	NO	NO	NO
8 21	15.26878593	0.009273526	15.26878593	0.016991504	YES	YES	YES
8 22	8.453548921	0.037511725	8.453548921	0.030984508	YES	YES	YES
8 23	21.5010064	0.000651198	21.5010064	0.00149925	YES	YES	YES
8 24	7.403209181	0.060098278	7.403209181	0.056971514	NO	NO	NO
8 25	12.86982429	0.011929686	12.86982429	0.013493253	YES	YES	YES
9 20	2.585574348	0.460024165	2.585574348	0.509245377	NO	NO	NO
9 21	19.73804235	0.182213655	19.73804235	0.167916042	NO	NO	NO
9 22	15.40819535	0.080316649	15.40819535	0.071464268	NO	NO	NO
9 23	21.92776107	0.109712131	21.92776107	0.11844078	NO	NO	NO
9 24	14.59077015	0.102807728	14.59077015	0.088455772	NO	NO	NO
9 25	17.94589682	0.117343182	17.94589682	0.113943028	NO	NO	NO

Source: elaborated by the authors from the research results.

NOTE: Answers = Questions: Pair of questions whose answers were correlated

χ^2 – initial test = value of the chi-square statistic of the conventional test

p-value – initial test = p-value resulting from the conventional test

χ^2 – second test = value of the chi-square statistic of the test with the Montecarlo simulation

p-value – second initial test = p-value resulting from the test with the Montecarlo simulation

Sign 95% = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for both tests (that is, both tests were significant)

Sign 95%: initial = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the conventional test

Sign 95%: second = statistical significance indication, with a 95% confidence level, for the second test, with the Montecarlo simulation

Final considerations

The article aimed at discussing some characteristics of the social perceptions data about the Federal District Legislative Chamber (CLDF), based on the association of three factors: political trust, public image and the citizen's interest in politics and local power. As demonstrated, the main conclusions reveal that the informants' perception in the sample reached is very negative regarding the three aspects analyzed. The public image is considered "bad" and "terrible" (89.16%). The political trust level is "low" and "very low" (94.06%). Interest in district politics is also "low" and "very low" (83.22%).

It is important to emphasize the negative convergence in relation to the three assessed aspects. As previously highlighted, the public image is fundamental to the reputation capital of a political institution. Such image has the representations built by the individuals as main substrate. These representations constitute visions that become collective and can influence trust or mistrust (NOLETO FILHO, 2014).

The symbolic capital of political trust is the institutions credibility before society and its audiences. In this study, the high level of the Federal District citizens' distrust in the CLDF work and the one from the district deputies draws attention. The lack of confidence is, therefore, a component very strongly related to the negative assessment on the CLDF image and reputation.

The same applies to the interest matter. As discussed in the first part of the text, the literature highlights three factors that most influence the citizens' level of interest or disinterest in politics. The first one is political socialization, that is, the process of political learning that the citizen experiences, whether in the family, at school, in unions, in churches etc. This factor seems to indicate that the Brazilian political socialization, especially in this study, has serious deficiencies.

The second factor is the sense of belonging. In the Federal District case, it is worth noting that the majority of its population came from other Brazilian regions. The population born in the FD is still not very expressive. The third factor is the level of knowledge about politics, which directly influences the citizens' degree of interest. Although it is not a general rule, a higher level of knowledge about the political system leads citizens to show greater interest. In this study, these three elements were deficient, with the responses convergence of the CLDF negative image, the population's lack of confidence and disinterest in local politics, especially in the CLDF activities, being very suggestive.

It should also be noted that, from a statistical perspective, this is a first approximation to the data collected, stressing the independence probabilities between the variables and exposing some of their most relevant associations. Fundamentally, it allows taking advantage of the respondents' universe to extract plausible relationships between variables, which subsidize future work on the theme. A further development agenda may include the quantification of more precise association measures between these variables, such as relative risk and odds ratio (REIS; REIS,

2001, p. 21-24), as well as developing the analysis of residues in the contingencies tables already formed in the current correlation analytics (FIELD; FIELD; FIELD, 2012, p. 2075-2080), to continue exploring the information obtained in this sample. Another aspect may be the survey refinement based on the variables shown to be more strongly linked, with a view to the broader application in a random sample and obtaining generalizable results.

REFERENCES

- ALDÉ, A; MENDES, G; FIGUEIREDO, M. Imprensa e eleições presidenciais. In: LIMA, Venício A. de (Org.) **A mídia nas eleições de 2006**. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2007.
- ARENDT, H. **A condição humana**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1983
- BAQUERO, Marcello; CREMONESE, Dejalma. **Eleições municipais 2008: uma análise do comportamento eleitoral brasileiro**. Editora UNIJUÍ, 2009.
- BARROS, Antonio Teixeira de. O projeto de transparência do Senado Federal: entre a accountability e a propaganda política. **Sociologias**, Porto Alegre, v.17, n.39, mai/ago 2015, p.338-368.
- BARROS, Antonio Teixeira de, BERNARDES, Cristiane Brum; RODRIGUES, Malena Rehbein. Brazilian Parliament and digital engagement. **Journal of Legislative Studies**, v. 22, no. 4 (2016): 540-558.
- BALDISSERA, Rudimar. Significação e comunicação na construção da imagem-conceito. **Fronteiras**, v. 10, n. 3, p. 193-200, set./dez. 2008.
- CASTRO, M. M.M. Sujeito e estrutura no comportamento eleitoral. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 20, p. 7-19, 1992.
- CERVI, E. U. **Opinião pública e política no Brasil: o que o brasileiro pensa sobre política e por que isso interessa à democracia**. Rio de Janeiro: Iuperj, 2006. 359 f. Tese (Doutorado em Ciência Política) – Instituto Universitário de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro.
- CHAMPAGNE, P. **Formar a opinião**. São Paulo: Vozes, 1998.
- COFFEY, Amanda. Socialização. In: SCOTT, John. **Sociologia: conceitos-chave**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2010, p.192-195.
- COLEN, M. C. L. As covariantes da confiança política na América Latina. **Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v.16, n.1, 2010, p.1-27.
- DALTON, R. J. **Democratic challenges, democratic choices: the erosion of political support in advanced industrial democracies**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- DIAS, Wagner Lopes; REYES JUNIOR, Edgar; REIS, André Luiz Nascimento. Análise da atuação da Câmara Legislativa do Distrito Federal na Era da Informação. **Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política**, n. 24, p.159-190, 2017.
- DOWNS, A. **An economic theory of democracy**. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- DARMON, M. **La socialisation**. Paris: Colin, 2006.
- DOWBOR, Ladislau. **O que é poder local**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2017.
- EVERITT, B. S. **The Cambridge Dictionary of Statistics: third edition** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006
- FIGUEIREDO, M. **A decisão do voto: democracia e nacionalidade**. São Paulo: editora Sumaré, 1991.

- FIELD, Andy; FIELD, Jeremy; FIELD, Zoë. **Discovering statistics using R**. London: SAGE publications, 2012
- FINURAS, António Paulo Menezes de Carvalho. **Confiança nas Instituições e Valores Culturais**. Tese de doutoramento (Ciência Política). Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias. Faculdade de Ciências Sociais, Educação e Administração. Lisboa, 2013, 430f.
- FIORINA, M. **Retrospective voting in american national elections**. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- GAO – US GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE. **Quantitative data analysis: an introduction**: GAO/PEMD/10.1.11. Washington: GAO, 1992.
- GIDDENS, A. **As consequências da modernidade**. São Paulo: Unesp, 2001.
- GOMES, Wilson. **Transformação da Política na era da comunicação de massa**. São Paulo: Paulus, 2004.
- GOMES, Marcelo Bolshaw. **Hermenêutica, Teoria Política e Imagem Pública**. Anais do I Congresso da Associação Brasileira de Pesquisadores em Comunicação e Política – Novembro/2006 – Salvador – BA. Disponível em: http://www.compolitica.org/home/?page_id=70. Acesso em: 4/3/2015.
- HABERMAS, J. Opinião pública e poder. In: COHN, Gabriel. **Comunicação e indústria cultural**. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1971.
- HABERMAS, J. **Mudança estrutural na esfera pública**. São Paulo: Tempo Brasileiro, 1984.
- HABERMAS, J. **Historia y crítica de la opinión pública**. Barcelona: G. Gili, 1994.
- HARDIN, R. The street-level epistemology of trust. *Politics and Society*, v. 21, n.4, p.505-29, 1992.
- INGLEHART, R. Trust between nations: primordial ties, societal learning and economic development. In K. Reif & R. Inglehart (Eds.) **Eurobarometer**. London: Macmillan, 1991, p.145-85.
- INNERARITY, D. **O futuro e os seus inimigos**. Alfragide: Teorema, 2011.
- KEY, V. O. **The responsible electorate: rationality in presidential voting, 1936-1966**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- LEANDRO, Maria Engrácia; LEANDRO, Ana Sofia; NOGUEIRA, Fernanda. A confiança em questão. Raias de confiança, confiança das raias nas sociedades modernas. **Sociologia: Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto**, v. 21, 2011, p. 215-232.
- LOPES, D. M. N. N. Para pensar a confiança e a cultura política na América Latina. **Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 10, n. 1, 2004, p. 162-187.
- LOPEZ, Felix e ALMEIDA, Acir. Legisladores, captadores e assistencialistas: a representação política no nível local. **Revista de Sociologia e Política**, v.25, n.62, p.157-181, 2017.
- MCCOY, J. **Political learning and democratization in Latin America: do politicians learn from crisis?** Miami: University of Miami Press, 2000.
- MANFREDA, Katija, Losar; VEHOVAR, Vasja (2002). Do mail and web surveys provide the same results? **Metodološki Zvezki**. Ljubljana: FDV, 2002 18,p. 149-69.
- MIGUEL, Luis F. Representação política em 3-D. Elementos para uma teoria ampliada da representação política. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais**, v. 18, n. 51, p. 123-140, fev. 2003.
- MIGUEL, Luis F. Impasses da accountability: dilemas e alternativas da representação política. **Revista de Sociologia Política, Curitiba**, s.v, n. 25, p. 25-38, nov. 2005.
- MOISÉS, J.A. **Democracia e desconfiança de instituições democráticas**. Edição do autor,

2009.

MOISÉS, José Álvaro. A desconfiança nas instituições democráticas. **Opinião pública**, v. 11, n. 1, p. 33-63, 2005.

MOISES, José Álvaro; CARNEIRO, Gabriela Piquet. Democracia, desconfiança política e insatisfação com o regime: o caso do Brasil. **Opinião Pública**. Campinas, v. 14, n. 1, p. 1-42, June 2008.

NOLETO FILHO, Pedro Aquino. **Mídia e política na imagem do Congresso**. Brasília: Edições Câmara, 2014.

NOOTEBOOM, B. Towards a dynamic theory of transactions. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, n.2, 281-99, 1992.

NORRIS, P. **Critical citizens: global support for democratic government**. USA: Oxford University Press, 1999.

NORRIS, P. *The growth of critical citizens?* New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

NORRIS. **Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

PORTO, M. A crise de confiança política e suas instituições: os mídia e a legitimidade da democracia. In: BAQUERO, Marcello (Org.). **Condicionantes da consolidação democrática: ética, mídia e cultura política**. Porto Alegre: Ed. da UFRGS, 1996.

POWER, T.J.; JAMINSON, G.D. Desconfiança política na América Latina. **Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 11, n. 1, p.64-93, mar. 2005.

PUTNAM, R. **Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.

REIS; Ilka A.; REIS. Edna A. **Associação entre Variáveis Qualitativas: Teste Qui-Quadrado, Risco Relativo e Razão das Chances (Notas de Aula e Exercícios): Relatório Técnico RTE-05/2001: Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais - Instituto de Ciências Exatas - Departamento de Estatística. 2001**

RIBEIRO, Ednaldo E. A. Confiança política na América Latina: evolução recente e determinantes individuais. **Revista de Sociologia e Política**, Curitiba, v. 19, n. 39, p. 167-182, 2011.

RIBEIRO JR., José Ivo. **Análises estatísticas no Excel: guia prático**. Viçosa: Editora UFV, 2013

RODRIGUES, Leôncio Martins. Eleições, fragmentação partidária e governabilidade. **Novos Estudos**, n. 41 p. 78-90, 1995.

SÁ, Fernando A. Opinião pública, imprensa e parlamento. **Achegas.net**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 15, 2004. Disponível em: http://www.achegas.net/numero/quinze/fernando_sa_15.htm. Acesso em: 7/7/2014.

SERAFIM, Lizandra. Controle social: que caminhos. **Observatório dos Direitos do Cidadão**. Equipe de Participação Cidadã–Instituto Pólis, Julho, 2008.

SIMMEL, G. **Sociologie: Études sur les formes de la socialisation**. Paris: PUF, 1999 [1908].

STOKER, G. **Why politics matters: making democracy work**. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2006.

THOMPSON, J. B. **Ideologia e cultura moderna**. Petropolis: Vozes, 1995.

VAINER, Carlos Bernardo. As escalas do poder e o poder das escalas: o que pode o poder local. **Cadernos IPPUR**, Rio de Janeiro, v.15, n.2, p.13-32, 2002.

VEHOVAR, V.; MANFREDA, Lozar; BATAGELJ, Z. Sensitivity of Ecommerce measurement to survey instrument. **International Journal of Electronic Commerce**, 6, 31-52, 2001.

WEBER, Maria Helena. A imagem pública. In: RUBIM, Albino (Org.) **Comunicação e política: conceitos e abordagens**. Salvador: EdUFBA, 2004. p. 262-278.

WEBER, Maria Helena. O estatuto da imagem pública na disputa política. **Eco-Pós**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 12, n. 3, p. 11-26, set./dez. 2009.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – SURVEY QUESTIONS

	TYPE	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1	C	In your opinion, the public image of the Federal Legislative Chamber is...:	EXCELLENT / GOOD / REGULAR / BAD / TERRIBLE
1.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
2	C	Your level of trust in the FD Legislative Chamber is...:	VERY HIGH / HIGH / AVERAGE / LOW / VERY LOW
2.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
3	C	Your level of trust in the laws passed by the FD Legislative Chamber is...:	VERY HIGH / HIGH / AVERAGE / LOW / VERY LOW
3.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
4	C	How do you classify your level of personal knowledge on the FD Legislative Chamber?	VERY HIGH / HIGH / AVERAGE / LOW / VERY LOW
4.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
5	C	Do you remember the name of any district deputies in office?	YES/NO
5.1	O	If you do, inform it/them.	<i>Open answer</i>
6	C	Do you remember which district deputy you voted for in the 2014 elections?	YES/NO
7	C	Do you follow the mandate of the deputy you voted for?	YES/NO
8	C	Do you believe the decisions made by the FD Legislative Chamber affect your life?	YES/NO
8.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
9	C	How do you assess the district deputies' work?	EXCELLENT/GOOD/REGULAR/BAD/TERRIBLE
9.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
10	C	Do you remember any law passed by the Federal Legislative Chamber in the last four years?	YES/NO
10.1	O	If you do, inform which ones.	<i>Open answer</i>
11	C	Do you remember any bill under discussion in the Federal Legislative Chamber at the moment?	YES/NO
11.1	O	If you do, inform which ones.	<i>Open answer</i>
12	C	Have you read the Federal District Organic Law?	YES/NO
12.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
13	C	Did you follow the election campaign for district deputies in the 2014 elections?	YES/NO
13.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
13.2	C	If you did, inform how.	ON FREE CAMPAIGN ADVERTISING ON RADIO AND TV / ON THE INTERNET / COMMUNITIES/OTHER MEDIA
14	C	Do you listen to/watch the local politics news?	YES/NO
14.1	O	Why?	<i>Open answer</i>
14.2	C	If you do, inform how.	ON TV / ON THE RADIO / ON PRINTED NEWSPAPERS / ON SOCIAL MEDIA / ON POLITICS BLOGS
15	C	Have you accessed the means of political information of the Federal District Legislative Chamber?	YES/NO
15.1	C	If so, inform which ones.	FD LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER PORTAL / FD LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER SOCIAL MEDIA / FD LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER TV CHANNEL / FD LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER BULLETIN
16	C	Inform your level of interest in the FD local politics.	FROM 1 TO 5
17	C	Inform your level of interest in your home state policy.	FROM 1 TO 5
18	C	Inform your level of interest in national politics.	FROM 1 TO 5

Social perceptions about the Legislative Chamber of the Brazilian Federal District: public image, political trust and local power

19	C	Inform your level of interest in international politics.	FROM 1 TO 5
19.1	O	In general, how do you assess the performance of the Federal District Legislative Chamber and the district deputies?	<i>Open answer</i>
RESPONDENTS' DATA			
20	C	Gender	MASCULINE/FEMININE
21	C	Age group	UP TO 20 YEARS OLD / 21 TO 30 YEARS OLD / 31 TO 40 YEARS OLD / 41 TO 50 YEARS OLD / 51 TO 60 YEARS OLD / OLDER THAN 60 YEARS OLD
22	C	Education	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL / HIGH SCHOOL / UNDERGRADUATE STUDY / POSTGRADUATION
23	C	Monthly family income	UP TO 3 MINIMUM WAGES / FROM 3 TO 6 MW / FROM 6 TO 10 MW / FROM 10 TO 15 MW / FROM 15 TO 20 MW / ABOVE 20 MW
24	C	Dwelling place	PLANO PILOTO / NEIGHBORHOODS AROUND PLANO PILOTO / SATELLITE CITIES / CITIES AROUND THE FD
25	C	Dwelling time in the FD	UP TO 5 YEARS / FROM 5 TO 10 YEARS / FROM 10 TO 15 YEARS / FROM 15 TO 20 YEARS / MORE THAN 20 YEARS

Source: elaborated by the authors from the applied websurvey structure.

Note – Type: Closed (C) or Open (O).

Appendix 2 – SURVEY QUESTIONS USED FOR CORRELATION, CLASSIFIED BY DIMENSION

	TYPE	TRUST	ANSWERS
1	C	In your opinion, the public image of the Federal Legislative Chamber is...:	EXCELLENT / GOOD / REGULAR / BAD / TERRIBLE
2	C	Your level of trust in the FD Legislative Chamber is...:	VERY HIGH / HIGH / AVERAGE / LOW/VERY LOW
3	C	Your level of trust in the laws passed by the FD Legislative Chamber is...:	VERY HIGH / HIGH / AVERAGE / LOW/VERY LOW
ASSESSMENT			
8	C	Do you believe the decisions made by the FD Legislative Chamber affect your life?	YES/NO
9	C	How do you assess the district deputies' work?	EXCELLENT / GOOD / REGULAR / BAD / TERRIBLE
KNOWLEDGE AND INTEREST			
4	C	How do you classify your level of personal knowledge on the FD Legislative Chamber?	VERY HIGH / HIGH / AVERAGE / LOW/VERY LOW
5	C	Do you remember the name of any district deputies in office?	YES/NO
6	C	Do you remember which district deputy you voted for in the 2014 elections?	YES/NO
7	C	Do you follow the mandate of the deputy you voted for?	YES/NO
10	C	Do you remember any law passed by the Federal Legislative Chamber in the last four years?	YES/NO
11	C	Do you remember any bill under discussion in the Federal Legislative Chamber at the moment?	YES/NO
12	C	Have you read the Federal District Organic Law?	YES/NO
13	C	Did you follow the election campaign for district deputies in the 2014 elections?	YES/NO
14	C	Do you listen to/watch the local politics news?	YES/NO
15	C	Have you accessed the means of political information of the Federal District Legislative Chamber?	YES/NO
16	C	Inform your level of interest in the FD local politics.	FROM 1 TO 5
17	C	Inform your level of interest in your home state policy.	FROM 1 TO 5
18	C	Inform your level of interest in national politics.	FROM 1 TO 5
19	C	Inform your level of interest in international politics.	FROM 1 TO 5
RESPONDENTS' DATA			
20	C	Gender	MASCULINE/FEMININE
21	C	Age group	UP TO 20 YEARS OLD / 21 TO 30 YEARS OLD / 31 TO 40 YEARS OLD / 41 TO 50 YEARS OLD / 51 TO 60 YEARS OLD / OLDER THAN 60 YEARS OLD
22	C	Education	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL / HIGH SCHOOL / UNDERGRADUATE STUDY / POSTGRADUATION
23	C	Monthly family income	UP TO 3 MINIMUM WAGES / FROM 3 TO 6 MW / FROM 6 TO 10 MW / FROM 10 TO 15 MW / FROM 15 TO 20 MW / ABOVE 20 MW
24	C	Dwelling place	PLANO PILOTO / NEIGHBORHOODS AROUND PLANO PILOTO / SATELLITE CITIES / CITIES AROUND THE FD
25	C	Dwelling time in the FD	UP TO 5 YEARS / FROM 5 TO 10 YEARS / FROM 10 TO 15 YEARS / FROM 15 TO 20 YEARS / MORE THAN 20 YEARS

Source: elaborated by the authors from Table 1.