

The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study

Eric M. Uslaner

Department of Government and Politics

University of Maryland–College Park

College Park, MD 20742

euslaner@gvpt.umd.edu

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (1)

The ANES and the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NSLY) will begin a long-term collaboration focusing on parent-child socialization. This collaboration offers a unique opportunity to trace the roots of youth socialization on political and social attitudes. The ANES-NSLY surveys will include key measures of social capital, most notably generalized trust. The ANES and NSLY have traditionally used different questions to measure generalized trust. The 2006 ANES Pilot survey asked both questions (as well as two new measures). The ANES may change the wording of the traditional “standard” question to the NLSY measure—or perhaps to one of the two new measures. In this report, I investigate how well these measures perform—in comparison with each other and with the theoretical expectations about the determinants and consequences of trust. Would a change in question wording make a difference?

Trust, on my view (Uslaner, 2002, chs. 2, 4, 6) is a value that is transmitted from parents to children and is highly stable over time. This perspective stands in contrast to other conceptualizations of trust that emphasize the fragility of trust and its roots in immediate experience. Hardin (2002) sees trust as reflecting an “encapsulated interest.” I will trust you if I believe that you will act in my interests. Brehm and Rahn (1997), among others, argue that trust in other people reflects a broader faith in social and political institutions. As people’s behavior changes—if I see you acting against my interests—so will my trust, not only in you, but in people in general. And if I believe that government is not acting in a trustworthy manner, I will lose faith in fellow citizens as well.

My alternative argument is based upon a view of trust as a value that is stable over long

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (2)

periods of time and is transmitted from parents to children. In Uslaner (2002, 60-68, 162-165), I show that: (1) generalized trust is stable over time—across several panels, at least three-quarters of Americans give the same response to the trust question over periods as long as four years; and (2) young people’s trust in 1965, as reflected in the Niemi-Jennings socialization panel study, is one of the strongest determinants of their faith in others 17 years later—as is their parents’ trust nine years earlier. The ability to track trust for young people and their parents in a larger number of surveys over time offers a superb opportunity to examine how core values are transmitted from one generation to another.

I shall discuss the issue of measuring trust and then compare the ANES and NLSY measures, as well as the two new measures in the 2006 Pilot Study. First, I shall examine the comparability of the four measures. Even though the standard question—“Generally speaking, do you believe that most people can be trusted, or can’t you be too careful in dealing with people”—was only asked of half of the sample and the other three questions were asked of the other half, I can compare these measures since the standard question was asked in the 2004 ANES and the 2006 Pilot is a panel including respondents from the 2004 survey. The merged data set will also give me a much wider range of variables to compare the four measures. Beyond testing how strongly related the three new questions are with the standard question, I shall also examine how well each performs with respect to the theoretical expectations I have set out in Uslaner (2002).

I present an overall theory of what generalized trust is and how it matters and test the claims from this theory using the “standard” trust question (as asked by the ANES as well as other organizations). Most of the claims receive strong support in my book. If the ANES moves

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (3)

to a new trust question, would that measure show similar patterns of association to the older indicator?

The Trust Questions

The standard question was first asked in the United States by Rosenberg (1956) in surveys of college students as part of a broader misanthropy scale. The first time the trust question was asked in a national survey was as part of the five-nation Civic Culture study in 1960 (Almond and Verba, 1963). The ANES has included this question in 1964, 1966, 1968, 1972, 1974, and 1976 and resumed asking the question in 1992; since 1996, it has been asked in each biennial survey. The standard question has also been asked by a variety of other organizations, including the Quality of Life Survey, the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Pew Center on the Internet in American Life, the Niemi-Jennings socialization study, and many others—especially the General Social Survey (GSS), which has asked the question since 1972 and all four waves of the World Values Survey, which makes cross-national comparisons possible (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 8), as have the Afrobarometer, the Asian Barometer, and the Latinobarometer.

The widespread use of the standard question has provided an important time series for examining changes, especially the strong decline in trust from almost 60 percent in the 1960s to less than 40 percent in the early 21st century, according to the GSS estimates. The ANES estimates have been consistently higher than those for the GSS (cf. Uslaner, 2002, 58-59). Smith (1997) finds a question order effect for the trust question. Trust levels are higher when the question is asked after a battery of other “prosocial” indicators (volunteering, working on community projects, optimism)—and this is likely the reason why the ANES estimates are

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (4)

consistently higher than those of the GSS (Uslaner, 2002, 68-69).

Beyond these question order effects are two other concerns with the standard question. First, some critics have charged that the two parts of the question—“most people can be trusted” and “you can’t be too careful in dealing with people” are actually two separate questions and not two sides of the same coin. Wuthnow (1998, 221) conducted a survey in which the two questions were asked separately—and found that substantial majorities agreed that “most people can be trusted” (62 percent) *and that* “you can’t be too careful in dealing with people” (71 percent)—and that 66 percent of people who said that most people can be trusted agreed on the need to be careful. About the same share of people (47 percent) gave consistent as inconsistent answers to the two questions. Miller and Mitamura (2003) raise largely the same issues.

Second, other critics argue that the core problem is not question wording, but rather viewing trust as a simple dichotomy. The Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) surveys (<http://www.mzes.uni-mannheim.de/projekte/cid/>) and the European Social Surveys (ESS) (www.europeansocialsurvey.org) both shifted to eleven-point scales (from 0 to 10) while retaining the traditional question wording. The Pew survey of Metropolitan Philadelphia in 1996 used a four-point scale.

I have offered a vigorous defense of the standard question elsewhere (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 3; Uslaner, 2005). Briefly, the principal reason to maintain the dichotomy between “most people can be trusted” and “you can’t be too careful in dealing with people” is that survey respondents *do understand the question and the two poles*. The 2000 ANES Pilot survey included a “think aloud” experiment in which respondents were asked what the trust question (and the other components of the “misanthropy” measure—fairness and helpfulness) means. The overwhelming

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (5)

share of respondents to this experiment had little difficulty explicating what they thought the trust question means—and they interpreted much as my framework expected that they would, in terms of a general world view rather than as reflecting their personal experiences (Uslaner, 2002, 72-75). The GSS and its parent organization, the National Opinion Research Center, asked the trust question without the “you can’t be too careful” alternative in the 1940s and again in a split sample in 1983—and the share of trusting respondents was much higher than when both alternatives were offered.

While a scale with more values is intuitively attractive, there is the danger that values might cluster, perhaps artificially, at the extremes or in the middle. The CID and ESS surveys use 11 point scales, as does the CID/ESS survey in the United States (www.uscidsurvey.org) and Delhy and Newton (2005) have argued that such scales are superior. The United States survey, as the European ones, used the 11 point scale—and there are strong indications of positivity bias for specific trust questions and a clumping at the middle for the generalized trust question. These were absent in the 1996 Pew survey of Metropolitan Philadelphia which used a four-point scale for most of the trust questions, including the generalized trust measure (Uslaner, 2005).

The issues of question wording and the dichotomous scale are double-edged swords. The advantages of a simpler trust measure with more points on the scale are not clearly established. The standard question makes sense to many people and the 11 point scale may ask people to make too fine a judgment (Miller, 1956). In Romania, the CID survey [I was part of the team] asked both the 11-point scale and the dichotomy and the correlation (tau-c) between the two measures was only .405, largely because people who answered that “you can’t be too careful” to the dichotomy were almost three times as likely as “trusters” to choose the middle

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (6)

ranking.

When evaluating alternative questions, there are at least three key issues that we should keep in mind. First, do any of the three new measures outperform the standard question? Do they yield predictions in line with theoretical expectations? If the new measures are more strongly correlated with both determinants and outcomes compared to the standard question, then this is clearly evidence in their favor—and, of course, if the standard measure performs better, this would count as support for that question.

Second, how much better do the new measures need to be to be preferable to the standard question. The dichotomy has something powerful going for it—it has been asked in multiple national surveys since 1960 and in cross-national surveys since 1980. Changing question wording would inhibit comparisons over time. The decline in trust (according to most surveys) is a hotly contested issue in both academic and civil society debates—with causes linked to television viewing (Putnam, 2000; Gerbner *et al.* 1980), falling membership in civic organizations (Putnam, 2000; Shah, 1998), less faith in political institutions (Brehm and Rahn, 1997), and increasing economic inequality (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 7). Explaining the decline in trust and what its effects has become a growth industry not only in political science, but across disciplines (especially also in economics and sociology) and in many different countries. Giving up question comparability might make researchers in this area even more dependent upon the GSS and other surveys.

Third, while not directly related to the task at hand, the ANES should recognize that the levels of trust in its surveys are generally far higher than in other surveys. Most other surveys find trust levels much closer to the estimates in the GSS for the early 21st century—between 33

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (7)

and 38 percent. The consistently higher estimates in the ANES are likely attributable to question order effects, but these effects may not account for the full range of the disparities.

The 2006 ANES Pilot asked the standard question as well as a five-point question about how often people can be trusted (see Table 1) and the percentages of people you can trust “all of the time” and “never” (see Tables 2 and 3). The standard question shows that 51.3 percent believe that most people can be trusted (using the sample weights), much higher than the 42.3 percent in the 2004 ANES, the 38.2 percent in the 2004 GSS, and the 34.9 percent in a Pew Internet and American Life Spam survey in 2003). There are clearly some issues of sampling attrition, since 49.8 percent of the 2006 panel answered the trust dichotomy positively in 2004.

The “trust often” question from the NLSY survey is a five category measure: always, most of the time, half of the time, once in a while, and never. The two extreme values—always and never—are almost empty. Each has five respondents (1.5 percent of the cases) of the 332 respondents. The five point scale is effectively a three category measure, with the largest share representing “most of the time.” Fewer than 20 percent of respondents indicate that most of the time they do not trust other people—less than half of the amount for the standard question.

[Tables 1, 2, 3 about here](#)

The distribution for the share of people you can trust all of the time (Table 2) is clustered at the bottom (at 10 percent) and in the middle (at 50 percent). Otherwise, the only pattern is few cases at either extreme. There is a similar pattern in Table 3 for the share of people you never trust, except that the largest share of respondents (26 percent) say that can never trust 10 percent of people. Yet 36 percent of those who say that they can trust 10 percent or fewer of their fellow

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (8)

citizens also say that “most people can be trusted” and 38 percent trust others half the time or less.

The standard question (from 2004) and the NLSY “trust often” question also only modestly related ($\tau\text{-}c = -.314$, $\gamma = -.528$, see Tables 4 and 5). While there is a monotonically decreasing share of trusting respondents across the five categories of the “trust often” question, the standard deviations of the responses is high for all but the “never” category (see Table 5). For “half of the time” and “once in a while,” the standard deviations are larger than the means: Forty percent of the respondents who say that they trust others half of the time say that “most people can be trusted” and 30 percent who say that they only can trust people “once in a while” believe that “most people can be trusted.” A third who say that they trust people “most of the time” believe that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people, as does one of the five respondents (20 percent) who say that they always trust people.

Cross-tabulations cast further doubt on the utility of these new questions: People who said that most people can be trusted in 2004 on average trusted 47 percent of people all of the time and 20 percent none of the time. Respondents who said that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people trusted 36 percent all of the time and 36 percent of the people none of the time (see Table 6). The trust often question is more strongly related to the shares of people one trusts always or never—at $-.463$ for always trust and $.535$ for never trust. But even for these questions, there are considerable variations in the responses (see Table 7). If you say that you trust people most of the time, you will trust half of the people all of the time. People who trust people half of the time believe that a third of the people should always be trusted and almost a third should never be trusted (but both with large standard deviations).

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (9)

[Tables 4, 5, 6, 7 about here](#)

Now, the logical conclusion might seem to be frustration with all of the trust questions. Yet, this would be too hasty. Table 8 reports the stability of the standard question over the panel. Seventy five percent of respondents give consistent responses to the standard question in 2004 and 2006, *almost identical to the shares of stable responses in the 1972-74-76 ANES panel and in the 1965-73-82 Niemi-Jennings youth sample—and greater than for the Niemi-Jennings parent panel and only marginally less than for the 1998-2000 ANES panel* (Uslaner, 2002, 60-67). The standard question shows strong continuity from 2004 to 2006, which none of the other three questions do. The simple correlations between these “new” measures and the 2004 standard question (see the first row of Table 9 below) are modest, even for survey data ($r = -.330$ for trust often, $-.312$ for trust never, and $.193$ for trust always).

[Tables 8, 9 about here](#)

The “trust always” and “trust never” questions seem to demand more precise estimates than many people are willing (or able) to make (Miller, 1956). People may not think of trust in terms of absolutes such as “always” and “never.” The same problem arises for the extreme values for the NLSY question, where only a handful (quite literally) of respondents choose the “always” or “never” options. A five-point scale is effectively reduced to a three point scale—and even here, we see little continuity with the standard question.

Sacrificing continuity over time and nations for wording that does not appear to be superior to the standard question seems questionable. That is the bad news about the NLSY

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (10)

wording. A more optimistic view comes in the pattern of correlations for both determinants and consequences below.

The Causes and Consequences of Trust

Aside from issues of question design, which question wording is preferable also depends upon performance. How well do the new questions—and the old—do as both dependent and independent variables, following the logic I have established in Uslaner (2002)?

This is not the place to lay out my overall framework for why trust is so stable—or why it is so critical. Briefly, generalized trust rests upon a foundation of optimism and control. The world is a good place and is going to get better and I can help make it better. So measures of optimism are clearly central to trust. Generalized trust connects us to people who are different from ourselves, so trusting people are:

- less likely to be religious fundamentalists, more likely to tolerate different lifestyles, and less likely to see a declining moral climate.
- less likely to interpret religious doctrine literally.
- less likely to feel strongly patriotic and nationalistic.
- more likely to do good deeds that connect them to people who are unlike themselves, such as giving to charity and volunteering.
- more tolerant and supportive of groups that have faced discrimination such as African-Americans, Latinos, and illegal immigrants—as well as minority groups more generally (Jews, Asian-Americans, Muslims).
- more likely to believe that minority groups have faced—and still face—discrimination by society and by authorities, such as the police, and that they should not be blamed for their

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (11)

economic problems.

- more likely to see themselves as less materialistic, more favorable to economic and social equality, and more tolerant and secure overall.
- more likely to want their children to espouse anti-authoritarian values (independence, curiosity, self-reliance, considerate) and less likely to believe that material success is critical for life.
- more willing to accept risk, since trusting people minimize the risks as part of their optimistic worldview (see Uslaner, 2005).

While some have argued that generalized trust should be linked to trust in government (especially Lane, 1959, and more recently Brehm and Rahn, 1997 and Rothstein, 2005), I argue that the two types of trust should not be related to each other and have not been in surveys in the United States (Uslaner, 2002, 151-158). Trust in other people is a stable, long-term value that does not depend upon short-term ups and downs. Trust in government, on the other hand, largely reflects satisfaction with economic performance, government policies, and leaders—and these shift (sometimes quickly) over time.

Another question that some will find important is the construction of a “trust” (or, more appropriately, a “misanthropy”) scale, including the trust question and measures of fairness (would people be fair or take advantage of you) and helpfulness (would people be helpful or are they just looking out for themselves). While I have argued that survey respondents interpret these questions differently from the standard trust measure—and that the time trends for each is different (Uslaner, 2002, 68-74), others insist upon using Rosenberg’s (1956) misanthropy scale (see esp. Brehm and Rahn, 1997; Shah, 19998) and even calling it a “trust scale.” How strongly

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (12)

related are the new measures to fairness and helpfulness compared to the standard question?

I present correlations with a wide range of questions from the 2006 Pilot and the 2004 ANES in Table 9 below. I decided to be more inclusive than might otherwise be warranted rather than being too restrictive. Some of the questions may bear little clear relationship to trust or my theoretical framework, but here we should find low correlations for all measures (such as how much like you is a “person who seeks out fun”). I don’t expect anyone to have the patience to consider all of these correlations (98 in all) so I concentrate on:

- Variables that are of core concern to my argument in Uslaner (2002)
- Variables that show significantly different patterns between the standard question and the NLSY “trust often” measure as determined by two regressions. First, I regressed the correlations of each of the 98 measures for trust often on the same correlations for the standard question; then I regressed the correlations for the standard questions on the correlations for trust often. For each regression, I obtained studentized residuals. Residuals that were significantly different from zero (on a two-tailed test) for *either regression* at the .05 level are highlighted in **bold** in Table 9; significant residuals at the .10 level are *italicized*.

The key results are:

- For all trust measures except percent always trust, African-Americans are less trusting than whites.
- Optimism for one’s own future, regardless of the construct of the measure in the Pilot survey, leads to higher levels of trust across most measures (though the correlations with always trust are generally lower). The trust often measure displays consistently higher

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (13)

correlations than the standard question in either 2004 or 2006, though none of these differences is statistically significant. Optimism for one’s own future is less consistently significant. For one version, the differences are significant at $p < .05$ and the relationship is strong for trust often and almost zero for the standard question in 2006.

- Measures of moral traditionalism display modest correlations with all of the measures except for always trust—though no measure predominates with consistently higher correlations.
- There is little support in these data for a link between trust and religiosity. The chief exception is the stronger link between helping others as a good Christian and trust for the NLSY measure. Mistrusters would focus on avoiding sin—similar to the moral traditionalism measures above. This measure is strongly related to the share of people one always trusts.
- The same pattern predominates for tolerance. The always trust measure fares poorly, but the other indicators are all modestly correlated with attitudes toward immigrants and attitudes toward minority groups. The correlations seem slightly higher for the NLSY trust often question, but the strongest correlations for most measures are for the 2004 ANES measure. The standard question performs significantly better (though only at $p < .10$) than the NLSY wording on whether whites and Asian-Americans are trustworthy (with respondents for each group excluded).
- For the one question on equality (how much like you that everyone is treated equally), the standard question performs best, though the relationship is not strong. The standard question also works better ($p < .05$) for seeking risk and for the anti-authoritarian values

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (14)

for children, most notably being considerate ($p < .10$). Trusting people want to make their own decisions, do not like it when people must do as they are told, care less about being successful, and do not find it important to be in charge of others. For each of these personality measures, the correlations are stronger for the standard question.

- The NSLY question is more strongly related to volunteering. Neither question has a strong relationship to giving to religious charity. These results are not as surprising as they might seem, since the connection of trust to good deeds holds primarily for *secular* giving and volunteering (Uslaner, 2002, 135-141. 203-210).
- People who have faith in their fellow citizens, by all of the measures except always trust, also trust their governments to make *fair* decisions and trust the police to treat suspects (of different races) fairly. The simple correlations with trust in government are less consistent—and this makes sense since fairness and egalitarian values are a key component of trust (Uslaner, 2002, 38, 43-48). However, there is no clear “winner” among the measures for fair treatment and fair decisions.
- For researchers who want to create a trust scale, the standard question and the NLSY wording work equally well. The alpha values for the scale of trust, helpfulness, and fairness are .712 for the 2004 standard question, .637 for the 2006 standard question, and .616 for the trust often wording. For the always trust measure, alpha is only .020 and for never trust it is just .036.

Three of the four trust questions perform equally well overall. In Table 10 I present a correlation matrix *of the correlations* reported in Table 9. The strongest relationship is, not surprisingly, between the 2004 and 2006 standard questions ($r = .845$), but the trust often

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (15)

question is also powerfully related to the 2004 standard question ($r = -.819$), though not as strongly connected to the 2006 dichotomy ($r = -.671$). The trust never measure is also strongly related to the other measures—though the trust always wording has much weaker correlations with the standard question.

Table 10 about here

Reprise

What then, paraphrasing Lenin, are we to do? The patterns of correlations are ambiguous. There is no clear “winner” among the measures, though the “trust always” wording is clearly inferior to the others. There is little reason to pose such a demanding question as the “trust never” percentage. But the standard question sometimes provides clearer support for predictions based upon the theoretical arguments I have made in Uslaner (2002), yet at other times the NLSY trust often measure performs better. And there is no clear criterion for choosing one rather than the other on theoretical grounds. Neither measure clearly trumps the other as doing better in predicting types of determinants or outcomes.

That said, there are four reasons to be careful in jettisoning the standard question. First, as I have noted several times, would be the loss of continuity over time—and across nations. Second, the stronger correlation in Table 10 between trust often and trust for 2004 compared to trust for 2006 is cause for some concern. Why the correlation between the trust often correlations is $-.819$ for the 2004 standard measure and only $-.671$ for the 2006 standard measure is unclear. The oversampling of trusting respondents in the 2006 Pilot study may be part of this reason. Third, the standard question seems to be the most stable over time. And fourth—and

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (16)

most critically—the NLSY measure was supposed to give us more information than the dichotomy in the standard question through a five point scale. Instead, we have what is effectively a three point scale with a third of all respondents in a less interesting and less interpretable middle category (trust people half of the time). Does the new measure “buy” more information? The case for abandoning the standard question remains in doubt.

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (17)

TABLE 1

Distribution of Trust in 2006 ANES Pilot Survey

Standard Question: "Generally speaking, do you believe that most people can be trusted or can't you be too careful in dealing with people?"

	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
You can't be too careful in dealing with people	160	48.7
Most people can be trusted	168	51.3

Trust Often: How often can respondent trust other people?

Always	5	1.5
Most of the time	153	45.9
Half of the time	109	32.7
Once in a while	60	18.2
Never	5	1.5

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (18)

TABLE 2

Distribution of Responses to “Trusting All the Time”

% Trusted All of the Time	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	18	5.54	5.54
1	7	2.18	7.72
2	4	1.16	8.88
3	2	.50	9.38
5	19	5.83	15.21
10	4	13.35	28.56
15	4	1.23	29.80
20	27	8.13	37.92
25	13	4.00	41.92
30	19	5.58	47.50
33	1	.24	47.74
35	4	1.24	48.97
40	8	2.26	51.24
45	2	.72	51.96
50	52	15.66	67.62
60	16	4.68	72.30
65	3	.83	73.12
70	10	3.15	76.27
75	28	8.38	84.65
80	27	8.00	92.65
85	5	1.39	94.04
88	1	.28	94.32
90	13	3.81	98.13
95	2	.57	98.70
98	1	.39	99.08
99	3	.92	100

N = 332

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (19)

TABLE 3

Distribution of Responses to "Never Trusting"

% Never Trusted	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	4	1.32	1.32
1	8	2.42	3.74
2	6	1.91	5.65
3	1	.15	5.79
5	26	7.93	13.73
6	1	.12	13.84
8	2	.55	14.39
10	85	25.72	4.11
15	12	3.65	43.76
20	36	1.90	54.66
25	36	11.02	65.68
30	16	4.94	70.62
35	1	.17	70.79
40	8	2.50	73.30
50	46	13.82	87.12
55	1	.28	87.39
60	6	1.92	89.31
70	3	.95	90.27
75	6	1.89	92.16
80	7	2.23	94.38
85	1	.44	94.83
90	10	2.97	97.80
95	1	.44	98.24
99	2	.49	98.73
100	4	1.27	100

N = 332

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (20)

TABLE 4

Crosstabulation of Standard Question from 2004 ANES and Trust Often

How often can R trust other people	L1. Would R say most people can be trusted Careful	Trust	Total
always	1	4	5
	20.00	80.00	100.00
	0.64	2.45	1.57
	0.31	1.25	1.57
most of time	50	101	151
	33.11	66.89	100.00
	32.05	61.96	47.34
	15.67	31.66	47.34
half of time	62	42	104
	59.62	40.38	100.00
	39.74	25.77	32.60
	19.44	13.17	32.60
once in while	39	16	55
	70.91	29.09	100.00
	25.00	9.82	17.24
	12.23	5.02	17.24
never	4	0	4
	100.00	0.00	100.00
	2.56	0.00	1.25
	1.25	0.00	1.25
Total	156	163	319
	48.90	51.10	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00
	48.90	51.10	100.00

Cramér's V = 0.3376
 gamma = -0.5275 ASE = 0.073
 Kendall's tau-b = -0.3144 ASE = 0.048

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (21)

TABLE 5

Distribution of Standard Question from 2004 ANES and Trust Often

Trust Often	Standard Question (2004)		
	Mean	Std Dev.	N
Always	.710	.507	5
Most of time	.668	.472	137
Half of time	.382	.488	101
Once in while	.285	.455	54
Never	.000	.000	4

N 319 F ratio 10.50

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (22)

TABLE 6

The Standard Question (2004) and the Trust Always/Never Measures 2006

Trust	Trust Always Percentage			Trust Never Percentage		
	Mean	Std Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Careful	35.533	27.848	152	36.046	27.779	152
Trusted	46.584	30.396	149	20.321	18.577	148
F ratio		11.47			35.05	

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (23)

TABLE 7

The Trust Often Question and the Trust Always/Never Measures 2006

Trust Often	Trust Always Percentage			Trust Never Percentage		
	Mean	Std Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Always	76.126	19.511	5	6.172	3.559	5
Most of time	53.236	29.920	144	17.449	14.220	143
Half of time	33.382	24.108	103	30.775	23.433	103
Once in while	21.409	21.917	57	49.657	30.049	59
Never	8.058	6.156	5	78.883	37.011	5
F		33.65			23.03	

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (24)

TABLE 8

Stability of Standard Question Over Time: 2006 Versus 2004

Can most people be trusted or can you not be too careful	Would R say most people can be trusted (2004)		Total
	Careful	Trust	
Can't be too careful	113 74.83	40 25.16	153 49.35
Most people can be trusted	38 25.17	119 74.84	157 50.65
Total	151 100.00	159 100.00	310 100.00

Cramér's V = 0.4966
 gamma = 0.7969 ASE = 0.048
 Kendall's tau-b = 0.4966 ASE = 0.049

TABLE 9

Correlations of Trust Measures With Selected Variables

Variable	Trust 2004	Trust 2006	Trust Often	% Always Trust	% Never Trust
Trust 2004	1.000	.497	-.330	.193	-.312
Trust 2006	.497	1.000	.	.	.
Trust Often	-.330	.	.	-.463	.535
% Always Trust	.193	.	-.463	1.000	-.270
% Never Trust	-.312	.	.535	-.270	1.000
Most people are fair	-.525	-.322	.305	-.177	.289
Most people are helpful	.355	.207	-.301	.168	-.255
Black	-.141	-.120	.134	-.047	.179
Hispanic	-.033	-.031	.051	-.015	.060
Optimistic for own future (version 1)	.148	.171	-.270	.195	-.239
Optimistic for own future (version 2)	.211	.197	-.292	.107	-.150
Optimistic for own future (version 1) dummy	.132	.099	-.168	.108	-.182
Optimistic for own future (version 2) dummy	.204	.170	-.259	.06	-.152
Optimistic for own future (versions 1 & 2 merged)	.182	.185	-.283	.149	-.196
Optimistic for future of U.S. (version 1)	.079	.119	-.075	.133	-.068
Optimistic for future of U.S. (version 2)	.104	-.001	-.214	.192	-.137
Optimistic for future of U.S. (versions 1 & 2 merged)	.092	.060	-.152	.165	-.102
Give to charity (house of worship)	.140	.177	-.049	.102	-.079
Volunteer	-.117	-.058	.186	-.075	.254
Most people get what they deserve	-.101	-.206	.228	-.104	.169
How good feel when see flag	.043	.070	.141	-.004	-.043
Things about US make you feel ashamed (disagree)	.036	.049	-.048	.068	.049
Things about US make you feel angry (disagree)	.117	.059	-.149	.154	-.013
How strong love for US	.044	.013	.105	.021	-.103
How important to be an American	.095	.064	.066	-.083	-.018
New lifestyles causing moral breakdown (disagree)	.126	.105	-.097	.042	-.104
Tolerate new and different lifestyles (disagree)	-.127	-.023	.092	-.055	.108
More emphasis on traditional lifestyles	.104	.180	-.065	-.008	-.157
Thermometer: illegal immigrants	.142	.136	-.115	.063	-.128
How important control immigration	.101	.104	-.101	.058	-.205
Decrease immigration	-.173	-.123	.198	-.088	.138
Hispanic immigrants take jobs away	.196	.237	-.133	.077	-.223

Variable	Trust 2004	Trust 2006	Trust Often	% Always Trust	% Never Trust
Children taught respect/independence	-.032	-.120	.018	.103	.029
Children taught manners/curiosity	-.177	-.230	.141	.027	.133
Children taught obedience/self-reliance	.116	.087	-.105	-.004	-.191
Children taught to be well-behaved/considerate	-.180	-.229	.105	.006	.038
Moral climate gotten worse since 2000 (disagree)	-.059	-.001	.008	.003	-.010
How much worse has moral climate become since 2000	-.061	.012	.021	.024	-.003
How important religion in life	.056	.064	.060	-.103	-.012
Religion plays big role in guiding life	-.039	.002	-.020	.067	.029
How often pray	.006	.029	.002	-.064	-.031
Bible word of God	.132	.096	-.064	-.115	-.104
Like unpredictable situations	.007	.000	-.026	.011	-.063
How much like unpredictable situations	-.025	-.146	.110	.245	-.185
How much dislike unpredictable situations	.035	.014	-.128	.031	-.086
How many decisions can you make quickly and confidently	.032	-.075	.006	-.042	-.023
Feel uneasy when cannot understand	.060	.130	-.142	.090	-.151
How often can see both sides of argument	-.098	-.159	.104	-.041	.064
How important to Christian is divinity of Jesus	.041	.029	-.004	.054	-.110
Christians believe in transubstantiation	.086	.117	-.010	-.164	-.046
How important to Christian is transubstantiation	.004	-.008	.018	-.047	-.027
Tried to be a good Christian	-.036	.098	.001	.020	.063
Good Christian avoids sin or helps others	.032	-.023	-.196	.192	-.131
Good Christian helps one at a time or many at once	.003	.131	.067	.047	.113
Good Christian has responsibility to environment	-.032	-.048	.204	-.160	.143
Trust government	-.057	-.022	.116	-.072	.128
Trust national government	.009	-.020	.137	-.156	.112
Trust state government	-.108	-.213	.125	-.154	.120
Trust national government to make fair decisions	-.229	-.083	.239	-.066	.171
Trust state government to make fair decisions	-.209	-.098	.286	-.183	.294
Trust national government to do what is best for US	-.190	-.087	.224	-.037	.170
Trust state government to do what is best for US	-.220	-.239	.102	-.075	.239
Percent of all suspects treated fairly by police	.176	.223	-.245	.132	-.247
Percent of poor suspects treated fairly by police	.151	.168	-.262	.170	-.283
Percent of white suspects treated fairly by police	.203	.253	-.172	.122	-.132
Percent of African-American suspects treated fairly by police	.138	.151	-.210	.119	-.225
Everyone treated equally: How like you	-.045	-.128	-.052	-.041	-.060
Live secure surroundings: How like you	.100	.023	-.061	.052	-.161
Looks for adventure and risk: How like you	-.023	-.165	-.061	.051	.016

Variable	Trust 2004	Trust 2006	Trust Often	% Always Trust	% Never Trust
Follows tradition: How like you	.079	.152	.084	-.192	.074
Seeks out fun: How like you	.071	<i>-.081</i>	<i>-.130</i>	.061	-.005
People should do as told: How like you	.067	.198	.002	-.096	.025
Important to be successful: How like you	.123	.071	-.110	.135	-.144
Important to help others: How like you	.023	-.061	.052	-.161	-.052
Important to be in charge: How like you	-.017	-.050	.007	-.019	.057
Wants to make own decisions: How like you	.053	-.141	-.122	.105	-.066
How important that all have equal opportunities	.031	.017	.114	-.142	-.079
How important to feel safe from harm	.038	<i>-.018</i>	<i>.200</i>	-.159	.116
How important to have exciting life	.023	<i>.092</i>	<i>.114</i>	-.076	.068
How important to follow traditions	-.005	.025	-.105	-.054	-.192
How important to have fun whenever possible	.050	-.025	.047	.051	.034
How important that people always follow rules	.079	.066	-.065	-.060	-.249
How important to be very successful	.139	<i>.206</i>	<i>-.050</i>	-.022	-.148
How important to help others	-.055	-.101	.115	-.073	-.001
How important to be in charge of others	.105	<i>.215</i>	<i>-.037</i>	.019	-.076
How important to choose what one does in life	.052	-.019	-.006	.087	.005
How important is financial success in life	.173	.202	-.134	-.026	-.112
How important to get respect from others	.020	.124	.072	-.153	-.123
Blacks work way up like other groups*	.156	.166	-.162	.001	-.190
History makes it more difficult for blacks to succeed*	-.077	-.029	.079	-.002	.076
Blacks have gotten less than they deserve*	-.112	-.079	.048	-.044	.082
Blacks should try harder to succeed*	.206	.231	-.135	.007	-.202
Thermometer: poor people*	.065	.093	-.143	.139	-.078
Thermometer people on welfare*	.159	.078	-.141	.130	-.148
Thermometer gays and lesbians*	.170	.107	-.201	.071	-.182
Thermometer African-Americans*	.120	.126	-.162	.102	-.106
Thermometer: Illegal immigrants*	.161	.135	-.114	.095	-.135
Thermometer: Muslims*	.160	.089	-.128	.078	-.071
Thermometer: Jews*	.154	.046	-.098	.074	.000
African-Americans trustworthy*	-.159	-.170	.151	-.085	.186
Whites trustworthy (whites excluded)	-.062	<i>-.154</i>	<i>-.032</i>	-.052	-.014
Asian-Americans trustworthy (Asian-Americans excluded)	-.138	<i>-.207</i>	<i>.098</i>	-.025	.118
Hispanics trustworthy (Latinos excluded)	-.164	-.179	.201	-.099	.109

* African-Americans excluded from this analysis.

Bold entries indicate statistically significant differences at $p < .05$ between trust often and trust 2006 (studentized residuals); *italics* represent differences at $p < .10$ (all two-tailed). Analyses conducted with both trust often and trust 2006 as dependent variables.

TABLE 10

Aggregate Correlations for the Trust Measures

Measure	Trust 2004	Trust 2006	Trust Often	Trust Always Share
Trust 2006	.845	1.000		
Trust Often	-.819	-.671	1.000	
Trust Always Share	.526	.366	-.736	1
Trust Never Share	-.824	-.698	.840	-.602

Uslaner, "The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study" (29)

REFERENCES

Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. 1963. The Civic Culture. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brehm, John and Wendy Rahn. 1997. "Individual Level Evidence for the Causes and Consequences of Social Capital," American Journal of Political Science, 41:888-1023.

Delhy, Jan and Kenneth Newton. 2003. "Who trusts? The Origins of Social Trust in Seven Societies," European Societies, 5:93-137.

Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli. 1980. "The 'Mainstreaming' of America: Violence Profile No. 11," Journal of Communication, 30:10-29.

Hardin, Russell. 2002. Trust and Trustworthiness. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Miller, Alan and Tomoko Mitamura. 2003. "Are Surveys on Trust Untrustworthy?" Social Psychology Quarterly, 66:62-70.

Miller, George A. 1956. "The Magic Number 7, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information," Psychological Reports, 63:81-97.

Putnam, Robert. 2000. Bowling Alone. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rosenberg, Morris. 1956. "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociological Review, 21:690-695.

Rothstein, Bo. 2005. Social Traps and the Problem of Trust. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shah, Dhavan V. 1998. "Civic Engagement, Interpersonal Trust, and Television Use: An

Uslaner, “The Generalized Trust Questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study” (30)
Individual-Level Assessment of Social Capital,” Political Psychology, 19:469-496.

Smith, Tom W. 1997. “Factors Relating to Misanthropy in Contemporary American Society,”
Social Science Research, 26:170-96.

Uslaner, Eric M. 2002. The Moral Foundations of Trust. New York: Cambridge University
Press.

_____. 2005. “Dimensions of Trust.” Presented at the Workshop for Preliminary
Presentations of Findings from the Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) Survey
Project, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., December 12-13, 2005.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1998. Loose Connections: Joining Together in America’s Fragmented
Communities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.