

# Do Perceptions of Inequality Negatively Affect Interpersonal Trust?

Chandré Jacobs

January 2022

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Commerce specialising in Economic Science

*Supervisor:*

Professor Martin Wittenberg

School of Economics

Faculty of Commerce

University of Cape Town

The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

## Plagiarism Declaration

### COMPULSORY DECLARATION:

1. This dissertation has been submitted to Turnitin (or equivalent similarity and originality checking software) and I confirm that my supervisor has seen my report and any concerns revealed by such have been resolved with my supervisor.
2. I certify that I have received Ethics approval (if applicable) from the Commerce Ethics Committee.
3. This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree in this or any other university. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Student number	JCBCHA015
Student name	Chandré Jacobs
Signature of Student	<input type="text" value="Signed by candidate"/>
Date:	25/01/2022

## **Abstract**

Most studies that investigate the relationship between interpersonal trust and inequality make use of objective or societal measures such as the Gini coefficient, and the effect of individual assessments of inequality has thus far received much less academic attention. Using data from the Round 5 Afrobarometer survey, I estimate the effect of perceived inequality on interpersonal trust in South Africa. Though the Round 5 Afrobarometer survey does not include an income variable, I construct an asset index using Principal Component Analysis and find that individual perceptions of socio-economic rank deviate from this measure of objective wealth. In line with the general conclusions in the literature, I find that perceived inequality has a negative effect on interpersonal trust and that individuals who believe that their living conditions are either better or worse compared to those of other South Africans' are less likely to express trust in others. This effect is more prominent in rural areas, which suggests that individuals have biased reference groups influenced by their area of residence.

# Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Background .....	3
2.1. Trust and inequality .....	3
2.2. Perceptions of inequality.....	6
2.3. Trust in South Africa.....	8
3. Data and variables.....	9
3.1. Sample .....	9
3.2. Trust .....	9
3.3. Perceived inequality .....	10
3.4. Descriptive statistics.....	11
4. Method and results.....	14
4.1. Bias in perception.....	16
4.2. Perceived inequality and trust.....	18
5. Conclusion .....	22
References.....	24
Appendix .....	28

## 1. Introduction

Trust is a key element of social and economic progress. Apart from having a positive influence on economic growth and development (Algan & Cahuc, 2013; Bjornskov, 2012; Knack & Keefer, 1997), trust has been found to predict other social outcomes such as health (Jen et al., 2010; Poortinga, 2006) and subjective wellbeing (Boarini et al., 2012; Helliwell & Wang, 2011). Trustful societies are also better at solving collective problems (Putnam, 2000). Given that trust is correlated with several desirable outcomes, it is not surprising that it has received considerable attention from many social scientists.

A general conclusion in the literature on the determinants of trust is that heterogeneity in the form of economic inequality exerts a negative influence on trust in others (see Jordahl (2007) for a review). Economic inequality creates high socio-economic barriers which stratify society into distinct groups that are unlikely to interact. Imbalances in economic resources may also foster the perception that people do not face the same challenges in life or share a common fate. This hinders the formation of affective bonds and interpersonal trust.

Most of the studies that identify economic inequality as a significant predictor of trust use societal measures of inequality such as the Gini coefficient (Bjørnskov, 2007; Gould & Hijzen, 2016; Rothstein & Uslaner, 2005) and assessments of inequality at the individual level have thus far been neglected. Since subjective measures of inequality often deviate from objective measures (Hauser & Norton, 2017; Knell & Stix, 2020; Niehues, 2016), the question of whether individual perceptions of inequality also affect trust negatively is an empirical one. Using objective measures of inequality to proxy for subjective assessments is only reasonable if individuals have identical reference groups and their reference groups include everyone in the society under consideration (Knell & Stix, 2021). However, individuals are more likely to interact with those from their own geographical location and socio-economic status, such that they have biased and heterogeneous reference groups. This means that individuals in the same society may have diverse perceptions of inequality, and the effect on generalised trust is not immediately clear.

To fully understand the impact of inequality on trust (and on other factors more generally), therefore, the subjective aspect of inequality needs to be considered as well. This paper contributes to the scarce literature in this area while shedding light on how perceived inequality affects interpersonal trust in the South African context.

The motivation for studying this topic in the South African context is twofold. First, South Africa is a low-trust society (Mmotlane, Struwig & Roberts, 2010) with extremely high levels of economic

inequality (World Bank Group, 2018). Given the country's history, this is unsurprising. Apartheid-era policies prioritised the social and economic development of the white population while orchestrating the destruction of families and forced relocation of the black population<sup>1</sup> to "homelands" which had little infrastructure and resources. Many black individuals still live in the rural areas of the former homelands. If inequality (and perceptions of it) have a negative impact on interpersonal trust, we might expect to observe a strong relationship between these two factors in the South African context. Furthermore, if individuals have biased reference groups influenced by their area of residence, we might expect the effect of perceived inequality on interpersonal trust to differ across geographical locations. Second, perceptions of inequality have important policy implications. To the extent that pro-social attitudes and behaviour are influenced by perceptions, redistributive policies that seek to create a more fair and cohesive society may not be effective if the distribution of resources is modified but perceptions of how equally resources are distributed remain unchanged.

Drawing on data from the Round 5 Afrobarometer survey, I investigate whether perceived inequality has a negative impact on interpersonal trust as the theory and other empirical evidence suggests. I find that individuals who perceive their living conditions to be either worse or better compared to those of other South Africans are less likely to express trust in others, though this effect is more prominent in rural areas. I find that individuals in rural areas who believe they are worse off compared to others and those who believe that they are better off compared to others are less likely to trust (by 9 percentage points and 11 percentage points, respectively) when compared to individuals who believe their living conditions are the same as other South Africans'. This effect is large considering that the average probability of expressing trust in others in South Africa is just 0.18. Though this level of trust is not unusual in the Southern African region, where average trust is 15%<sup>2</sup>, it is considerably lower than the levels of interpersonal trust found in other democracies like the US (40%), Australia (57%) and Austria (45%) (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Leigh, 2006b; Knell & Stix, 2021).

Although individuals in rural areas are typically more trusting overall, and the extended family in these areas is still a site of solidarity (Chipkin & Ngqulunga, 2008), the findings in this paper suggest that perceptions of inequality in rural areas are detrimental to generalised trust. One explanation for why a strong negative effect is observed in rural areas is that individuals have biased reference groups for assessing inequality, and these groups are influenced by their area of

---

<sup>1</sup> About 3.5 million people were relocated under the apartheid government (Office of the President, 2014, p. 40).

<sup>2</sup> Own calculation from Afrobarometer Round 5. Sub-Saharan Africa (as well as Latin America) is characterised by low levels of generalised trust (Mattes & Moreno, 2018). This is to be expected, as nations that have experienced a period of economic and social upheaval are generally less trusting (Newton, 2013).

residence (Cruces, Perez-Truglia & Tetaz, 2013). As rural areas are more racially homogenous<sup>3</sup>, other dimensions of dissimilarity may be more salient, and small material differences compared to another's living situation could be perceived as large. Biased reference groups may lead to biased judgements of overall inequality, and the more severe inequality is perceived to be, the larger the negative effect it has on interpersonal trust (Knell & Stix, 2021).

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 discusses the theoretical background and empirical literature on trust and inequality, while section 3 describes the data and presents some descriptive statistics. The Round 5 Afrobarometer survey does not have an income variable, so in section 4 I construct an asset index as a measure of objective wealth using Principal Component Analysis. In line with evidence from other studies, I find that subjective economic status does not coincide with objective economic status, which suggests that objective measures are not good proxies for subjective ones. Subjective measures of inequality can therefore reveal characteristics of the relationship between inequality and interpersonal trust that measures of inequality at a societal level cannot. The main results are also discussed in section 4, and Section 5 concludes.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Trust and inequality

Trust is typically defined as an individual's belief that another person will behave in a way that is consistent with their expectations of positive behaviour (Murtin et al., 2018). Interpersonal trust is made up of limited or particularised trust (trust in family members, friends, and neighbours) and generalised trust or trust in strangers (Uslaner, 2002).<sup>4</sup> Most empirical studies that use survey data focus on generalised trust, which is thought to be more important since modern society involves daily interaction with strangers.

There are two broad schools of thought concerning the determinants of trust (Delhey & Newton, 2003; Uslaner, 2002). The first is the individual-oriented view, which argues that trust is a personal disposition influenced by risk propensity, optimism, and a sense of control over one's life. The second perspective suggests that trust is instead formed by an evaluation of society and that

---

<sup>3</sup> This is not necessarily the case in commercial farming areas where farmers are typically white and farm workers are black.

<sup>4</sup> Interpersonal trust is distinct from institutional trust which focuses on trust in institutions and organisations such as government, police, and business.

history, culture, and diversity shape trust. Of the social factors that seem to matter for interpersonal trust, economic inequality is particularly important, with the theory and empirics supporting a negative relationship between the two factors.

### *Theoretical background*

There are several theories linking economic inequality to low interpersonal trust. One of the common explanations contained within the literature involves aversion to heterogeneity (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002) and the homophily principle (McPherson, Lynn Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001). People tend to distrust those who are dissimilar from themselves, and interaction between similar people occurs at a higher rate than between dissimilar people. This means that in unequal societies, people from different social classes are less likely to interact and connect, hindering the formation of affective bonds and trust between members of different groups.

Another common line of reasoning makes the distinction between those who are relatively deprived and those who are relatively well-off (Fairbrother & Martin, 2013). According to this perspective, people who feel disadvantaged by their relative income position may resent their current situation or feel that they are being exploited by those who are relatively better off (Fischer & Torgler, 2013). At the same time, those who are well-off are wary of the resentment of the poor and worry that the relatively deprived may have economic incentives to behave dishonestly toward them. In this case, the overall effect is a reduction in interpersonal trust at the societal level.

### *Empirical literature*

While research on the causal mechanisms linking economic inequality and trust is not conclusive, most empirical studies find that more unequal societies are less trusting. A general conclusion from cross-country studies is that economic inequality exerts a strong negative influence on trust (Bjørnskov, 2007; Leigh, 2006a; Barone & Mocetti, 2016). For example, on a sample of 74 countries, Bjørnskov (2007) estimates the determinants of trust and finds that a 10-percentage point reduction in income inequality (measured by the Gini coefficient<sup>5</sup>) would increase generalised trust by approximately 3 percentage points, and this effect is significant at the five per cent level. However, the evidence for a negative relationship between generalised trust and income inequality that is found in cross-country studies is typically weaker in single-country studies.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Gini coefficient is the normalised average distance between any two randomly chosen individuals. It ranges from 0 to 1 and a higher value indicates more inequality.

Within countries, racial and linguistic heterogeneity seem to have a stronger negative impact on trust than income inequality (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Leigh, 2006b). Using data from localities in the United States, Alesina & La Ferrara (2002) show that an increase in the Gini coefficient (calculated at the metropolitan level) by one standard deviation (0.027) decreases the probability to trust by about 2.5 percentage points or 6% of the mean value of trust (0.4 in their sample), while an increase by one standard deviation in racial fragmentation (0.147) decreases the probability of trusting others by approximately 3 percentage points, or almost 10% of the average level of trust. Furthermore, once racial fragmentation is accounted for, the Gini coefficient is no longer statistically significant, while the former is statistically significant at the five per cent level. The authors argue that these findings are in line with the aversion to heterogeneity hypothesis – people distrust those who are dissimilar, and the more fragmented a community is in terms of race and income, the less trusting are individuals in that community. Leigh (2006b) finds a similar result using Australian survey data, though linguistic heterogeneity rather than racial heterogeneity is significantly related to trust in that study.

*Is the Gini the best measure of inequality?*

Most studies that investigate the effect of economic inequality on trust use the Gini coefficient as a measure of inequality. The Gini coefficient is probably the most popular measure of income inequality, though it is not necessarily the best one. First, while the Gini coefficient captures inequality in the whole income distribution, it does not tell us about the shape of the income distribution or capture absolute differences in income.<sup>6</sup> This means that two countries could have different distributions, but the same Gini index.

Second, using the regional Gini coefficient in single-country studies might underestimate the effect that inequality has on trust since there is often little variation in regional Gini coefficients within the same country (Knell & Stix, 2021). Knell and Stix (2021) argue that the use of the regional Gini coefficient in single-country studies is only reasonable if one assumes that all individuals use identical reference groups to make income comparisons; that these reference groups include all people from their own region; and no one from other regions. In this case, the individual's expectation of inequality based on pairwise income comparisons with every other individual in their reference group will correspond exactly to the regional Gini coefficient. However, since individuals' reference groups are biased towards people of similar socio-

---

<sup>6</sup> How income is measured (individual level or household level, before or after tax) will also affect the coefficient and its comparability across countries.

economic status or in the same geographical region as them, this assumption is unlikely to hold, and the effect of inequality on trust will be underestimated.

Other measures of income inequality such as percentile ratios or top income shares may reveal different features of the income distribution and how it relates to interpersonal trust. For example, Gustavsson & Jordahl (2008) use Swedish panel data and find that the Gini coefficient is only weakly related to trust, while the 50/10 percentile ratio (income at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile over income at the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile) has a substantial impact on trust: an increase in the 50/10 percentile ratio from its mean (1.82) to its maximum (2.05) would decrease trust by 1.4 units on a 0 – 10 scale.<sup>7</sup> This study suggests that differences among people at the bottom of the distribution primarily drive the negative relationship between trust and inequality.

Although the theory and available empirical evidence point toward a negative relationship between trust and inequality, the choice of inequality measure appears to matter, and we cannot be certain that the same negative relationship will hold if different measures of inequality are used. Specifically, subjective measures of inequality could reveal features of the relationship between inequality and interpersonal trust that objective measures at a societal level cannot.

## 2.2. Perceptions of inequality

Subjective assessments of inequality often deviate from objective measures (Hauser & Norton, 2017; Knell & Stix, 2020). Perceptions of inequality have been shown to predict a variety of social outcomes, including subjective well-being (Schneider, 2012; Buttrick, Heintzelman & Oishi, 2017) and self-reported health (Han, 2014; Gugushvili, Reeves & Jarosz, 2020). Moreover, perceived inequality has been shown to exert a stronger impact on some outcomes than objective measures (Gimpelson & Treisman, 2018; Knell & Stix, 2021). In particular, what an individual believes about the extent of inequality (rather than the actual income distribution) is strongly correlated with their preferences for redistribution and individuals who perceive greater inequality indicate a greater demand for redistribution (Niehues, 2016; Kuhn, 2013).

### *What influences perceptions of inequality?*

Acceptance of hierarchy, values and ideology, as well as media coverage shape perceptions of inequality (Hauser & Norton, 2017). For example, individuals who believe that outcomes are the result of personal choice and that they will move up the social ladder are more likely to perceive fairness in the mobility process and be averse to redistribution (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2005). On

---

<sup>7</sup> Trust in this study is based on the question, “On a scale from 0 to 10, where would you place people in general when it comes to whether people cannot or can be trusted?”

the other hand, people with egalitarian values and left-wing individuals tend to be more sensitive to inequality and are more pro-redistribution (Clark & D'Ambrosio, 2015; Alesina & Giuliano, 2011).

Apart from values and ideology, people's living environments exert a strong influence on their perceptions of societal inequality. Since people tend to interact more with individuals in their own income bracket or of similar socio-economic status, these individuals will be over-represented in their reference groups, which can lead to biased judgements of overall inequality.<sup>8</sup> Research by Cruces, Perez-Truglia & Tetaz (2013) suggests that these biased judgements are correlated with an individual's relative position within their geographical reference group (proxied by area of residence in their study).

#### *Perceived inequality and trust*

The effect of perceptions of inequality on interpersonal trust has received very little academic attention, but a general conclusion in the existing literature is that individual judgements of inequality reduce interpersonal trust. Knell and Stix (2021) use Austrian survey data to test how the extent of inequality perceived by individuals affects whether they believe that most people can be trusted. The question used to analyse the individual's assessment of inequality asks, "What is your assessment about how income – the total sum of annual earnings – is distributed in Austria?" Answers to this question include "extremely unequally distributed", "very unequally distributed", "rather unequally distributed" and "rather equally distributed". The authors find that the more severe an individual perceives inequality to be, the lower the probability that they express trust in other individuals: the probability to trust others decreases by 19 percentage points (10 percentage points) for someone who perceives incomes to be extremely (very) unequally distributed, compared to someone who sees incomes as being rather unequally or rather equally distributed. Considering that the average probability of expressing trust in their study is 0.45, these effects are quite large. Interestingly, two objective measures of inequality – the municipal Gini coefficient and 90/10 ratio – exert no significant effect on generalised trust in their study, while the subjective perceptions are highly significant.

The role of subjective inequality in determining trust has also been studied across countries. Using the sixth wave of the World Values Survey, Hu (2017) tests whether individuals who believe that there is too little, or too much inequality, are less trusting. The underlying assumption in this study is that it is not so much the level of inequality that matters to people, but the legitimacy of it: if

---

<sup>8</sup> It is possible that when people are asked about overall inequality they have the entire distribution in mind, but that they place more weight on those with whom they regularly interact.

people believe that there are individuals in society who are not deserving of their wealth (either because they are free-riders or that they have accumulated their wealth through dishonest means), it harms their trust in others. The empirical results suggest an inverted-U shape relation between perceived inequality and trust: those who believe that incomes should be made more equal and those who believe that income differences need to be larger to incentivise individual effort are less trusting than those who believe that incomes are distributed the right way. Other empirical evidence supports the idea that it is the legitimacy or the fairness of inequality that matters, not necessarily the extent or existence of inequality (Ahrens, 2020; Cappelen, Falch & Tungodden, 2020).

### 2.3. Trust in South Africa

With a long history of systematic discrimination and socio-economic inequality along racial lines, it is not surprising that South Africa is classified as a low-trust society (Mmotlane, Struwig & Roberts, 2010). Previous trust research in South Africa has focused especially on race differences in interpersonal trust. A trust game experiment run by Burns (2006) on a sample of high school students revealed that while coloured participants exhibited strong positive insider bias, the offers made by white participants did not depend on the race of their partner, and black participants made and received lower offers than the other participants. On the other hand, a study by Posel & Hinks (2013) using data from the National Income Dynamics Study (NIDS)<sup>9</sup>, finds no significant difference between blacks and whites in their willingness to trust their neighbours or strangers, while coloureds exhibit the lowest levels of trust in neighbours and strangers.

#### *Geographic differences in perceptions of inequality*

Though South Africans are acutely aware of how unequal their society is (Roberts, 2014), the effect of perceived inequality on interpersonal trust has not yet been studied in South Africa. Considering that South Africa is a high-inequality society, we might expect to find an overall negative relationship between perceived inequality and interpersonal trust. Moreover, given the political history of racial discrimination, forced relocation of the black population, and deliberate underdevelopment of the “homelands”, we might expect the effect of perceived inequality on trust to differ between rural and urban areas, as individuals in these areas will have different frames of reference for assessing inequality. Though the dataset used in this study does not allow for disaggregation beyond the rural-urban binary, it should be noted that there are differences within

---

<sup>9</sup> In NIDS, a question on whether the respondent believes a lost wallet is likely to be returned, was asked. This type of question differs from traditional trust questions which ask people directly about their trust in others, in that it attempts to measure trust through the respondent’s expectations about behaviour.

these two broad classifications (Zimbalist, 2017). There are formal and informal urban areas, and rural areas are roughly speaking made up of commercial farms and tribal authorities (ex-homelands). Thus, perceptions of inequality may be very different within each of these geotypes, but these effects are not investigated here.<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Data and variables

#### 3.1. Sample

The data used in this study come from the Round 5 Afrobarometer survey (Afrobarometer Project, 2011-2013), conducted in South Africa in 2011. The Afrobarometer surveys are public attitude surveys carried out in several African countries every 3 to 5 years and explore the themes of democracy, governance, and society. Samples are designed to generate a representative cross-section of citizens of voting age within a given country, and data are weighted to correct for deliberate or inadvertent over- or under-sampling. Survey questions are not consistent across Rounds, and Round 5 is the most recent in which questions about interpersonal trust were asked. While 2399 South African citizens of voting age (18 and older) were interviewed, just over 2000 observations are considered in this study, due to missing data for some of the independent variables.<sup>11</sup>

#### 3.2. Trust

Most studies that use attitudinal data to evaluate the correlates of trust in others rely on the standard survey question in the World Values Survey, which asks, “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?” However, several issues have been raised about whether this question measures what it aims to measure.

First, it is unclear whether this question measures trust or trustworthiness.<sup>12</sup> For example, experimental research by Glaeser et al., (2000) finds that the standard survey question seems to be a good measure of the respondent’s own trustworthy behaviour, but Johnson & Mislin (2012)

---

<sup>10</sup> Most people living in rural areas live in tribal authorities, however, so the findings in this study are particularly relevant to that context.

<sup>11</sup> Table A2 in the appendix compares the summary statistics for the estimation sample and the “full” sample (which includes all available data for the calculation of the summary statistics). There do not seem to be any large differences.

<sup>12</sup> Trustworthiness refers to the trustee’s integrity or voluntary behaviour to not take advantage of the trustor (Özer & Zheng, 2018).

show that this question measures the same thing that experimenters in the lab call “trust” (rather than trustworthiness).

Another issue that has been pointed out is that the trust question leaves the interpretation of “most people” open to the survey respondents. How an individual answers this question depends on whether they may be thinking of people within their own community or group, or not. Delhey, Newton & Welzel (2011) show that respondents generally tend to think of people belonging to an out-group when they answer the trust question, though the radius of “most people” varies across countries (it is narrower in Confucian countries and wider in wealthy countries). Despite these concerns, the trust question is widely used in the literature as an indicator of trust in general others (Murtin et al., 2018; Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Bjørnskov, 2007; Knack & Keefer, 1997; Knack, 2001).

### 3.3. Perceived inequality

The concept of perceived inequality can be interpreted in various ways, and each interpretation is legitimate (Bavetta, Li Donni & Marino, 2019). Perceived inequality may refer to how unequal an individual considers some distribution of outcomes to be, whether an individual believes opportunities are distributed equally, or whether an individual considers some distribution to be fair and justifiable. Different measures of perceived inequality will therefore reveal different aspects of an individual’s assessment of inequality in a society.

The key explanatory variable in this study is perceived inequality, assessed by the question “In general, how do you rate your living conditions compared to those of other South Africans?”<sup>13</sup> There are five possible answers to this question: (1) “much worse”, (2) “worse”, (3) “same”, (4) “better”, (5) “much better”. I assume that individuals who rate their living conditions as the “same” compared to other South Africans’ are those who do not perceive themselves as being significantly different from the average citizen, while individuals who perceive their living conditions to be “much worse”/ “worse” and “much better”/ “better” are aware of inequality and perceive themselves to be at one of the ends of the distribution.<sup>14</sup>

This perception measure may be classified as one of perceived inequality of outcome, as it does not tell us anything about individuals’ beliefs about inequality of opportunity in South Africa, how

---

<sup>13</sup> Njozela & Burns (2019) use a similar ranking question as a measure of perceived inequality in the South African context. Social-ladder and ranking type questions can help us gauge individual views on the shape of the distribution, and answers to these types of questions should not contradict other measures of perception (Knell & Stix, 2020).

<sup>14</sup> For the regression analysis, I combine the “much worse”/ “worse” and “much better”/ “better” categories of the perceived inequality variable respectively and create a new variable with three distinct groups, due to relatively small sample sizes for the two extreme categories.

severe they believe inequality to be, or whether they consider it to be fair.<sup>15</sup> However, Bavetta et al., (2019) show that the three different interpretations of perceived inequality are manifestations of the same latent concept and that individuals who perceive a high level of inequality in one dimension are likely to report a high level in the other dimensions.

Much like the trust question leaves the interpretation of “most people” open to the respondent, the perceived inequality question does not specify who “other South Africans” are. It is unlikely that the respondent has the entire South African population in mind: it is more plausible that they imagine only a subgroup of South Africans, which may be influenced by their area of residence, age, level of education, or some other observable characteristic. Geographic reference groups have been found to play a particularly important role in the formation of distributional perceptions (Cruces, Perez-Truglia & Tetaz, 2013). Consequently, I assume that when individuals answer the perceived inequality question, they compare themselves to others in the same geographical area.

### 3.4. Descriptive statistics

Table 1 reports summary statistics of the variables of interest for the estimation sample. The sample is approximately 76% African, 11% White, 10% Coloured and 3% Indian. Females are slightly overrepresented in this sample (53% female vs 47% male). The average age is 37.5 years, and 63% of individuals in the sample reside in urban areas.

Trust falls as the trust radius widens: people are far more likely to trust their relatives and neighbours than they are to trust strangers or general others. Overall, only about 18% of South Africans respond that most people can be trusted to the standard trust question. Though this level of trust is not unusual in the Southern African region where average trust is about 15%, it is considerably lower than average trust found in other democracies like the US (40%), Australia (57%) and Austria (45%) (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Leigh, 2006b; Knell & Stix, 2021).

Although most respondents reported that they never felt unsafe walking in their neighbourhood, almost a quarter said that they often felt unsafe. Likewise, though most people reported that they never feared crime in their own homes, over 20% responded that they often did.

Turning to how individuals assess various institutions, Table 1 shows that just over half of South African citizens trust the police, and just under half believe that people are often treated unequally under the law. Almost 61% of respondents are satisfied with the way democracy works in South

---

<sup>15</sup> Moreover, someone who sees themselves as being in the middle of the distribution might answer that their living conditions are the “same” compared to others, but this does not necessarily mean that they do not believe that inequality exists and that there are people better off and worse off than they consider themselves to be.

Africa. Finally, just over a fifth of respondents feel that the government is handling narrowing the income gap between the rich and the poor well.

**Table 1:** Summary statistics

	Mean	Standard error
<i>Individual-level variables</i>		
Trust in relatives	0.782	(0.010)
Trust in neighbours	0.563	(0.013)
Trust in others you know	0.397	(0.012)
Generalised trust	0.178	(0.010)
Female	0.531	(0.013)
Age	37.54	(0.354)
African*	0.756	(0.010)
White	0.114	(0.007)
Coloured	0.101	(0.006)
Indian	0.029	(0.004)
No formal schooling*	0.045	(0.006)
Primary school	0.168	(0.010)
Secondary school	0.658	(0.012)
Post-secondary school	0.129	(0.008)
Not economically active*	0.232	(0.010)
Unemployed	0.419	(0.013)
Employed	0.349	(0.012)
Asset index	-0.000	(0.056)
Urban	0.630	(0.013)
Member of religious group	0.285	(0.011)
Member of community group	0.134	(0.009)
<i>Community-level/experience variables</i>		
Never felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood	0.405	(0.012)
Sometimes felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood	0.364	(0.012)
Often felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood	0.231	(0.011)
Never feared crime in home	0.462	(0.013)
Sometimes feared crime in home	0.332	(0.012)
Often feared crime in home	0.206	(0.010)
Had something stolen from house in past year	0.267	(0.011)
Physically attacked in the past year	0.113	(0.008)
<i>Institutional variables</i>		
Trust police	0.504	(0.013)
Satisfied with democracy	0.609	(0.012)
People often treated unequally under the law	0.497	(0.013)
Government handling narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor well	0.226	(0.011)
Government handling reducing crime well	0.387	(0.012)
Observations	2003	

Source: Own calculations, Afrobarometer Round 5

Notes: All data are weighted.

\*Omitted categories in the linear regressions

Table 2 below presents the proportion of South Africans who express trust in other people by socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Individuals in the 18 – 35 age category are more likely to express trust in others than older individuals, and those with formal schooling are typically more trusting than those without. Females are more likely than males to express trust in others, and those who are not in the labour force are also more trusting.

**Table 2:** Generalised trust by demographic and socio-economic characteristics

	Proportion responding that most people can be trusted <sup>16</sup>	Standard error	[95% Confidence interval]
<b>Overall</b>	0.178	0.010	[0.159, 0.197]
<i>Age</i>			
18 - 35	0.187	0.014	[0.160, 0.214]
36 - 50	0.171	0.018	[0.135, 0.207]
51 and above	0.164	0.020	[0.124, 0.203]
<i>Education</i>			
No formal schooling	0.077	0.036	[0.008, 0.147]
Primary school	0.216	0.026	[0.165, 0.268]
Secondary school	0.177	0.012	[0.154, 0.200]
Post-secondary school	0.168	0.024	[0.120, 0.216]
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	0.173	0.014	[0.146, 0.199]
Female	0.182	0.014	[0.156, 0.209]
<i>Population group</i>			
African	0.181	0.012	[0.158, 0.204]
White	0.162	0.022	[0.119, 0.206]
Coloured	0.157	0.023	[0.112, 0.203]
Indian	0.233	0.051	[0.133, 0.334]
<i>Employment status</i>			
Not economically active	0.209	0.020	[0.169, 0.249]
Unemployed	0.183	0.016	[0.152, 0.214]
Employed	0.151	0.015	[0.122, 0.180]
<i>Rural/Urban</i>			
Rural	0.188	0.017	[0.154, 0.222]
Urban	0.172	0.011	[0.149, 0.194]
<i>Living conditions compared to other South Africans</i>			
Worse	0.172	0.018	[0.136, 0.208]
Same	0.192	0.017	[0.160, 0.225]
Better	0.168	0.015	[0.138, 0.199]

Source: Own calculations, Afrobarometer Round 5.

Notes: all data are weighted. The standard errors are not adjusted for survey design as a cluster variable was not included in the data release. The standard errors presented here may, therefore, be too small.

<sup>16</sup> “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you must be very careful in dealing with people?”

Unsurprisingly, the average level of trust in rural areas is higher than the level of trust in urban areas, but this difference is not statistically significant. As expected, individuals who perceive their living conditions to be either better or worse are less likely to respond that most people can be trusted than individuals who rate their living conditions as the same as other South Africans'. In the next section, I examine whether individuals' assessments of their living conditions compared to others affects interpersonal trust while controlling for several covariates.

## 4. Method and results

The outcome variable of interest is trust in strangers, based on the standard trust question which takes on a value of 1 if the respondent answers that "most people can be trusted" and 0 otherwise. While we cannot be sure that there is not some latent psychological construct that influences both interpersonal trust and perceptions of inequality, experimental evidence suggests that the causality runs from perceived inequality to trust (Gallego, 2016). Furthermore, other studies that use objective measures of inequality suggest that the relationship runs from inequality to trust and not the other way round (Barone & Mocetti, 2016; Jordahl, 2007). It is, therefore, reasonable to put the trust variable on the left-hand side of a regression. Given the binary nature of the dependent variable, the linear regression model of the effect of perceived inequality on trust has to be interpreted as a linear probability model.<sup>17</sup>

### *Independent variables*

In addition to the perceived inequality variable, I include demographic variables such as age, gender and education as controls. Studies have shown that individuals with more education are more trusting (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Hu, 2017), while age has been found to have a U-shape relation with trust (Knell & Stix, 2021). The results concerning gender, on the other hand, are mixed – Leigh (2006b) and Gustavsson & Jordahl (2008) find gender to be statistically insignificant with coefficients of negligible size, while Alesina & La Ferrara (2002) find a statistically significant result that women are less trusting than men. In addition to these characteristics, I control for the race of the individual, whether they reside in an urban or rural area and the province of residence.

A range of independent variables in line with the theories of the determinants of trust is also considered. Employment status has been shown to affect interpersonal trust, with the unemployed being less likely to express trust in general others (Leigh, 2006b; Fischer & Torgler, 2013). Since

---

<sup>17</sup> Linear probability models offer straightforward interpretations and the best linear approximation to the true probability model.

membership of voluntary organisations may positively influence trust (Putnam, 2000), dummy variables for whether an individual is a member of a religious or a community group are also included. To account for core personality characteristics such as optimism, I include two categorical variables: one which indicates how the respondent expects their living conditions to be in the next twelve months (much worse, worse, same, better, much better), and another for subjective assessment of living conditions (very bad, bad, fair, good, very good). These variables have been used as measures of optimism elsewhere (Murtin et al., 2018; Knell & Stix, 2021). A recent history of traumatic experiences has been shown to negatively affect a person's propensity to trust (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002). As such, I consider indicators for whether an individual was physically attacked or had something stolen from their home in the last year, as well as variables for how often the respondent felt unsafe walking in their neighbourhood or feared crime in their own home.

An individual's assessment of local and national institutions may also affect interpersonal trust (Delhey & Newton, 2003; Murtin et al., 2018). Consequently, I include the following binary variables: trust in the police (0 = not at all/just a little; 1 = somewhat/a lot), how often the individual believes that all are treated unequally before the law (0 = rarely/never; 1 = often/always), and how satisfied the individual is with democracy in South Africa (0 = not at all/not very; 1 = fairly/very). Variables for how well the individual believes that the government is handling narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor (0 = very badly/ fairly badly; 1 = fairly well/ very well) and is handling reducing crime are also included. Overall, we might expect that positive assessments of institutions that ought to be fair and trustworthy will have a positive effect on trust, while negative assessments will have a negative effect. Finally, since particularised trust may spill over to generalised trust (Freitag & Traunmüller, 2009) I include dummy variables for whether an individual trusts their relatives, their neighbours and other people they know as predictors in the generalised trust regression.

It is worth noting that this analysis may suffer from endogeneity, particularly as there are factors that could potentially affect both trust and assessments of institutions and one's living environment. Accordingly, I estimate the regressions without the community-level/experience and institutional variables (see Tables A3 – A6 in the appendix). The inclusion of these variables does not drastically change the signs, sizes, or statistical significance of perceived inequality. However, tests for joint significance of the community-level/experience variables and institutional variables respectively reveal that only the institutional variables are jointly significant at the five per cent level. As such, I exclude the community-level/experience variables from the analysis.

### *Constructing an asset index using Principal Component Analysis*

Though income is related to interpersonal trust in other studies (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Delhey & Newton, 2003), questions about income were not asked in the Round 5 survey of the Afrobarometer<sup>18</sup>. To control for the effect of objective living standards on trust, therefore, I construct an asset index using Principal Component Analysis, an approach first suggested by Filmer & Pritchett (2001). A quadratic in the asset index is also included in the regressions since individuals at the extremes of the distribution may perceive more inequality than those in the middle (indeed, Knell & Stix (2021) find a U-shaped pattern of the perception of inequality with respect to income).

The variables used to create the index include the ownership of certain consumer durables (radio, television, mobile phone, car/ motorcycle/ motor vehicle) and characteristics of the household's dwelling (type of shelter, location of toilet, location of water source, roof material). As the range of assets is quite limited, the asset index is not an accurate measure of total wealth. However, it does provide us with an idea of who lies where in the distribution. The ownership of each asset by quintile is shown in Table A1 of the appendix.

The Lived Poverty Index (LPI) in the Afrobarometer dataset is an experiential measure of poverty based on a series of questions about the frequency with which people have had to go without basic necessities (such as food, clean water, medical treatment, heating fuel, and cash income) over a year.<sup>19</sup> The LPI scores indicate the average responses across the dimensions for each individual so that a higher score indicates a greater frequency with which an individual has had to go without these basics. The correlation between the LPI and the created asset index is  $r = -0.41$  ( $p < 0.001$ ). This means that the more often an individual has had to go without necessities, the lower their socio-economic status as classified by the asset index.<sup>20</sup>

#### 4.1. Bias in perception

Table 3 compares the perceived and actual economic rank of individuals in the estimation sample. Each cell in the table contains the percentage of people who rank in each segment of the asset index (approximately 5<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup>, 65<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles) and who also fall in each category of the

---

<sup>18</sup> In the Round 2 survey of the Afrobarometer, a question about household income was asked but the standard trust question was not included.

<sup>19</sup> Respondents are asked: "Over the past year, how often, if ever, have you or anyone in your family: Gone without enough food to eat? Gone without enough clean water for home use? Gone without medicines or medical treatment? Gone without enough fuel to cook your food? Gone without a cash income?" Responses to this question range from "never" for those who experienced no shortages to "always".

<sup>20</sup> The asset index is a weak proxy for wealth, which may be a better indication of long-term standard of living and avoids issues such as recall bias which may affect the LPI.

perceived living conditions variable. The cut-offs for the asset index were chosen to match the distribution of responses to the perceived living conditions question and to get a clearer idea of how much perceived ranking differs from objective ranking. The cells on the main diagonal show the percentage of people who are classified as being in more or less the same group by both measures (those who perceive their living conditions are “much worse” compared to others correspond to those ranked as the bottom 5% by the asset index, those who believe they are “worse” off correspond to those who are ranked between 5% and 30%, etc.).

Only 28.5 per cent of South Africans in the sample are classified as being roughly in the same position by both the subjective and objective measures.<sup>21</sup> That the objective measure does not correspond with the subjective measure is not surprising – people frequently misjudge their position in the income distribution (Niehues, 2016; Hauser & Norton, 2017). Poorer individuals are more likely to place themselves in higher positions than they actually are, while richer individuals tend to underestimate their rank (Gimpelson & Treisman, 2018; Knell & Stix, 2020).

**Table 3:** Correspondence of asset index distribution and perceived living conditions compared to other South Africans

Asset index cumulative share (approximate)	Perceived living conditions compared to others					
	Much worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much better	Total objective
0 - 5%	0.66	1.65	1.60	0.83	0.05	4.79
5% - 30%	2.07	7.40	8.20	5.67	1.34	24.68
30% - 65%	1.32	7.57	11.01	9.60	2.00	31.49
65% - 90%	0.82	6.37	11.15	7.84	1.58	27.77
90% - 100%	0.34	1.09	2.93	5.32	1.59	11.27
Total subjective	5.21	24.08	34.89	29.27	6.56	100

*Source:* Own calculations, Afrobarometer Round 5.

*Notes:* All data are weighted. N = 2003.

Over a third of individuals in the sample believe that their living conditions are the same compared to others, yet only 11% of the sample are consistently classified as being in the “middle” of the distribution (between the 30<sup>th</sup> and 65<sup>th</sup> percentiles). About 52% of individuals classified as being in the bottom 5% by the asset index perceive their living conditions to be either the same, better, or much better compared to other South Africans’, while the same may be said for just over 61% of individuals classified as being between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> percentiles. Similarly, more than 60% of individuals between the 65<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles believe their standard of living is the same or

<sup>21</sup> A similar conclusion has been reached by Posel & Casale (2011) who use NIDS data to show that perceptions of relative income differ significantly from objective measures of income ranking.

worse compared to other South Africans', and only about 14% of individuals in the top 10% believe that they are much better off.

On the whole, Table 3 demonstrates that individual perceptions do not match objective ranking. While this finding is not atypical, it is important to note that part of the mismatch between the subjective and objective rankings observed here may be due to how the asset index was constructed and the fact that the index is not an accurate measure of total wealth.

#### 4.2. Perceived inequality and trust

Do perceptions of inequality negatively affect interpersonal trust? The results of the estimation on the full sample presented in column 1 of Table 4 suggest that perceiving one's living conditions to be either better or worse compared to those of other South Africans has an adverse effect on the probability to express trust in others.<sup>22</sup> However, the effect sizes are quite small (between 1 and 3 percentage points) and statistically insignificant. As expected, the relationship between trust and age is U-shaped: the probability of answering that most people can be trusted decreases with age until the turning point is reached at around 42 years of age, after which the probability increases. Education also appears to have a large positive effect on the probability to trust, with individuals who have at least primary school being significantly more trusting than people with no formal schooling. Specifically, individuals with post-secondary education are almost 12 percentage points more likely to express trust in general others than individuals with no formal schooling. This effect is large given that the baseline level of trust is 18 per cent. Contrary to what Alesina & La Ferrara (2002) find in the US, the coefficient on the *Female* variable is positive. However, the size of the coefficient is quite small, and the result is not statistically significant.

To analyse how the effect of perceived inequality on generalised trust may vary for individuals who have different geographic reference groups, I focus on the rural and urban subpopulations in South Africa. Columns 2 and 3 report the results for the rural and urban samples respectively. About 94% of individuals in the rural sample are black, and over 80% are classified as being in the bottom two quintiles by the asset index. In the urban sample, on the other hand, about 65% are black, a little over 17% are white, about 13% are coloured and just over 4% are Indian. Over half of those in the urban sample are ranked as being in quintile four or five.

In the rural sample, people who believe that they are worse or better off than other South Africans are significantly less likely to express trust in others than those who believe that their standard of

---

<sup>22</sup> Whether an individual believes their living conditions are better or worse compared to others might have the same detrimental effect on trust, as whether income comparisons are positive or negative might not be relevant (Knell & Stix, 2017).

living is the same compared to other citizens. Specifically, individuals in rural areas who believe that their living conditions are worse compared to others and those who believe that their living conditions are better compared to others are less likely to trust (by 9 percentage points and 11 percentage points, respectively) when compared to those who believe their conditions are the same as other South Africans'. Again, given that the average probability of expressing trust in South Africa is just 0.18, this effect is large. In the urban sample, perceiving one's living conditions to be different to those of other South Africans' increases the probability of expressing trust, though the positive coefficients are not statistically significant.

**Table 4:** Trust in strangers

	(1) Full Sample	(2) Rural subsample	(3) Urban subsample	(4) Full Sample with Interaction
Perceived living conditions worse	-0.011 (0.025)	-0.086* (0.046)	0.024 (0.029)	-0.067 (0.043)
Perceived living conditions better	-0.026 (0.023)	-0.112*** (0.040)	0.022 (0.028)	-0.104*** (0.039)
Urban	0.014 (0.025)			-0.054 (0.036)
Worse*Urban				0.091* (0.050)
Better*Urban				0.121*** (0.046)
Age	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.003 (0.007)	-0.005 (0.004)	-0.004 (0.003)
Age <sup>2</sup>	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Primary	0.128*** (0.042)	0.111* (0.067)	0.145*** (0.042)	0.120*** (0.042)
Secondary	0.101*** (0.038)	0.111* (0.061)	0.118*** (0.036)	0.096** (0.038)
Post-secondary	0.118*** (0.046)	0.083 (0.082)	0.150*** (0.046)	0.112** (0.046)
Female	0.011 (0.019)	0.008 (0.035)	0.016 (0.022)	0.012 (0.019)
White	-0.009 (0.031)		-0.006 (0.033)	-0.010 (0.031)
Coloured	-0.002 (0.030)		-0.001 (0.034)	-0.002 (0.030)
Indian	0.046 (0.050)		0.047 (0.051)	0.048 (0.050)
Asset index	-0.002 (0.006)	-0.005 (0.013)	0.002 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.006)
Asset index <sup>2</sup>	0.001 (0.003)	0.004 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.004)	0.001 (0.003)

Table 4 cont.

Unemployed	-0.007 (0.027)	0.003 (0.049)	0.003 (0.032)	-0.005 (0.027)
Employed	-0.048* (0.028)	0.035 (0.055)	-0.070** (0.032)	-0.047* (0.028)
Member of religious group	-0.002 (0.023)	-0.063 (0.042)	0.030 (0.027)	-0.001 (0.023)
Member of community group	0.068** (0.034)	0.121* (0.062)	0.029 (0.039)	0.067** (0.034)
Trust police	0.017 (0.019)	0.025 (0.034)	0.012 (0.023)	0.016 (0.019)
Satisfied with democracy	0.065*** (0.020)	0.106*** (0.035)	0.038 (0.024)	0.066*** (0.020)
People treated unequally under the law	-0.027 (0.020)	-0.000 (0.034)	-0.038 (0.024)	-0.025 (0.020)
Gov handling narrowing the income gap well	0.017 (0.026)	0.005 (0.042)	0.041 (0.033)	0.019 (0.026)
Gov handling reducing crime well	0.037* (0.022)	0.026 (0.036)	0.047 (0.029)	0.039* (0.022)
Trust in others you know	0.115*** (0.022)	0.164*** (0.039)	0.078*** (0.026)	0.114*** (0.022)
Trust neighbours	0.039* (0.022)	0.019 (0.040)	0.055** (0.027)	0.039* (0.022)
Trust relatives	0.041* (0.023)	-0.018 (0.042)	0.059** (0.027)	0.036 (0.023)
Constant	0.004 (0.093)	0.038 (0.177)	-0.023 (0.101)	0.057 (0.095)
Observations	2,003	629	1,374	2,003
R-squared	0.106	0.149	0.115	0.110

Source: Afrobarometer Round 5.

Notes: The estimations control for the province of residence, perceived living conditions, and perceived mobility. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Education has a strong positive effect on the probability to trust in the urban sample, but not in the rural sample. This may be due to those in the urban sample typically having more formal schooling than those in the rural sample. Being a member of a religious group decreases the probability of expressing trust in others in the rural sample but increases it in the urban sample, while being a member of a community group has a positive effect on the probability to trust (though this effect is much larger in the rural sample).

#### *Geographical reference groups*

Since the area of residence may influence an individual's reference group and lead to biased judgements of inequality (Cruces, Perez-Truglia & Tetaz, 2013), I run another regression with an interaction term between the perceived inequality and rural/urban variables. The addition of the

interaction term allows the effect of perceived inequality to depend on the area of residence and broaden our understanding of the relationship between perceived inequality and geographical reference groups. The estimates are presented in column 4 of Table 4. The base case for all interpretations is individuals who live in rural areas and believe their living conditions are the same compared to others.

Individuals in rural areas who perceive their living conditions to be worse compared to other South Africans' are, on average, 7 percentage points less likely to express trust in general others, while individuals who perceive their living conditions to be better are 10 percentage points less likely to express trust in others. For people in urban areas, the negative effect is smaller: compared to individuals in rural areas who see themselves as the same as others, individuals in urban areas who see themselves as better or worse off are in either case approximately 3 percentage points<sup>23</sup> less likely to report that most people can be trusted. Whites and coloureds are less likely to express trust in strangers than blacks (the omitted category), but the coefficients are of a negligible size and not statistically significant.

Though the signs of the coefficients on the institutional variables are as expected, the magnitudes are small and mostly statistically insignificant. People who express trust in the police are also more trusting of people in general, and believing that people are often treated unequally before the law decreases the probability that an individual reports that most people can be trusted, on average. Perceiving the government to be handling crime and narrowing income differences between the rich and the poor well increases the probability to trust others. In the full sample regressions, people who are satisfied with democracy are about 6 percentage points more trusting than those who are not, and this result is highly significant. Finally, particularised trust and generalised trust are positively related to each other, and those who express trust in other people they know are almost 12 percentage points more likely to express trust in people they do not know.

Why is the negative effect of perceptions of inequality more prominent in rural areas? One explanation is that individuals have biased reference groups which are influenced by their area of residence. Rural areas are typically more racially homogenous, such that other dimensions of dissimilarity between individuals in these areas may be more salient.<sup>24</sup> It is possible that in rural

---

<sup>23</sup> For those in urban areas who perceive themselves as being worse off, the probability to trust decreases by -0.0535019 (the coefficient on urban) plus -0.0667519 (the coefficient on perceived living conditions worse) plus 0.0908747 (the coefficient on the interaction) i.e.,  $0.0908747 - 0.0535019 - 0.0667519 \approx -0.03$ . I followed the same approach for those in urban areas who believe they are better off.

<sup>24</sup> In a public goods game experiment conducted in South Africa, Burns & Keswell (2015) find that racial homogeneity in a group does not necessarily imply higher contributions to a public good. They argue that when there is no visible

areas, small material differences compared to another's living situation could be amplified, leading to biased assessments of inequality. Since the negative effect on interpersonal trust is larger the more severe inequality is perceived to be (Knell & Stix, 2021), this could explain the large impact of perceptions of inequality on trust observed in rural areas.

## 5. Conclusion

A general conclusion in the literature on the determinants of trust is that heterogeneity in the form of economic inequality exerts a negative influence on trust in others. Most studies make use of objective or societal measures of inequality such as the Gini coefficient, and the effect of individual perceptions of inequality on trust has thus far received much less academic attention.

This paper explored the relationship between perceptions of inequality and interpersonal trust in South Africa using data from the Round 5 Afrobarometer survey. Consistent with the general findings of the empirical literature on the trust-inequality relationship, I find that individuals who perceive their living conditions to be either worse or better compared to those of other South Africans' are less likely to express trust in others. However, this effect is only large and significant in rural areas. Specifically, I find that individuals in rural areas who believe they are worse off compared to others and those who believe that they are better off compared to others are less likely to trust (by 9 percentage points and 11 percentage points, respectively) when compared to individuals who believe their living conditions are the same as other South Africans'. Given that the average probability of expressing trust in South Africa is just 0.18, these effects are large.

The results presented in this paper have three main implications. First, perceptions of inequality are important for understanding the level of trust in a society, as subjective measures of inequality reveal features of the relationship between inequality and interpersonal trust that objective measures of inequality at a societal level do not. While this study focussed only on how perceived inequality of outcome affects trust, future research might consider the effect of other dimensions of perceived inequality. Second, subjective assessments of inequality may differ across groups in the population, and geographical location may be used as a proxy for an individual's reference group. Finally, since perceptions of inequality have a strong effect on trust, redistributive policies that aim to create a more fair and cohesive society will not necessarily be effective if the distribution of resources is modified but perceptions of the severity of inequality remain

---

racial heterogeneity in a group, other dimensions of difference (such as language) become important in the identification of out-group members.

unchanged. On the other hand, if redistributive efforts are combined with attempts to alter perceptions of the severity of inequality, interpersonal trust may improve.

## References

- Afrobarometer Project. Afrobarometer 5 Merged 20 Country Survey 2011-2013 [dataset]. Version 1. International: Afrobarometer [producer], 2015. Cape Town: DataFirst [distributor], 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25828/vz8c-af95>
- Ahrens, L. 2020. Unfair inequality and the demand for redistribution: why not all inequality is equal. *Socio-Economic Review*. DOI:10.1093/ser/mwaa051 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwaa051>.
- Alesina, A. & Giuliano, P. 2011. Chapter 4 - Preferences for Redistribution. *Handbook of Social Economics*. 1:93-131. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53187-2.00004-8> Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444531872000048>.
- Alesina, A. & La Ferrara, E. 2002. Who trusts others? *Journal of Public Economics*. 85(2):207-234. DOI:10.1016/S0047-2727(01)00084-6.
- Alesina, A. & La Ferrara, E. 2005. Preferences for Redistribution in the Land of Opportunities. DOI:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2004.05.009.
- Algan, Y. & Cahuc, P. 2013. Trust and Growth. *Annual Review of Economics*. 5(1):521-549. DOI:10.1146/annurev-economics-081412-102108.
- Barone, G. & Mocetti, S. 2016. Inequality and Trust: New Evidence from Panel Data. *Economic Inquiry*. 54(2):794-809. DOI:10.1111/ecin.12309.
- Bavetta, S., Li Donni, P. & Marino, M. 2019. An Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Perceived Inequality. *The Review of Income and Wealth*. 65(2):264-292. DOI:10.1111/roiw.12351.
- Bjornskov, C. 2012. How Does Social Trust Affect Economic Growth? *Southern Economic Journal*. 78(4):1346-1368. DOI:10.4284/0038-4038-78.4.1346.
- Bjørnskov, C. 2007. Determinants of Generalized Trust: A Cross-Country Comparison. *Public Choice*. 130(1):1-21. DOI:10.1007/s11127-006-9069-1.
- Boarini, R., Comola, M., Smith, C., Manchin, R. & de Keulenaer, F. 2012. *What Makes for a Better Life?* .
- Burns, J. 2006. Racial stereotypes, stigma and trust in post-apartheid South Africa. *Economic Modelling*. 23(5):805-821. DOI:10.1016/j.econmod.2005.10.008.
- Burns, J. & Kessel, M. 2015. Diversity and the provision of public goods: Experimental evidence from South Africa. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 118:110-122. DOI:10.1016/j.jebo.2015.02.018.
- Buttrick, N.R., Heintzelman, S.J. & Oishi, S. 2017. Inequality and well-being. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 18:15-20. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.07.016>
- Cappelen, A.W., Falch, R. & Tungodden, B. 2020. Fair and Unfair Income Inequality. In *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*. K.F. Zimmermann, Ed. Cham: Springer International Publishing. 1-25. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57365-6\\_130-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57365-6_130-1).
- Chipkin, I. & Ngqulunga, B. 2008. Friends and Family: Social Cohesion in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*. 34(1):61-76. DOI:10.1080/03057070701832882.
- Clark, A.E. & D'Ambrosio, C. 2015b. Chapter 13 - Attitudes to Income Inequality: Experimental and Survey Evidence. *Handbook of Income Distribution*. 2:1147-1208. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-59428-0.00014-X>

- Cruces, G., Perez-Truglia, R. & Tetaz, M. 2013. Biased perceptions of income distribution and preferences for redistribution: Evidence from a survey experiment. *Journal of Public Economics*. 98:100-112. DOI:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2012.10.009.
- Delhey, J. & Newton, K. 2003. Who trusts?: The origins of social trust in seven societies. *European Societies*. 5(2):93-137. DOI:10.1080/1461669032000072256.
- Delhey, J., Newton, K. & Welzel, C. 2011. How General Is Trust in "Most People"? Solving the Radius of Trust Problem. *American Sociological Review; Am Sociol Rev.* 76(5):786-807. DOI:10.1177/0003122411420817.
- Fairbrother, M. & Martin, I.W. 2013. Does inequality erode social trust? Results from multilevel models of US states and counties. *Social Science Research; Soc Sci Res.* 42(2):347-360. DOI:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.09.008.
- Filmer, D. & Pritchett, L.H. 2001. Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data-or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrollments in States of India. *Demography*. 38(1):115. DOI:10.2307/3088292.
- Fischer, J.A.V. & Torgler, B. 2013. Do Positional Concerns Destroy Social Capital: Evidence from 26 Countries. *Economic Inquiry*. 51(2):1542-1565. DOI:10.1111/j.1465-7295.2011.00441.x.
- Freitag, M. & Traunmüller, R. 2009. Spheres of trust: An empirical analysis of the foundations of particularised and generalised trust. *European Journal of Political Research*. 48(6):782-803. DOI:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.00849.x.
- Gallego, A. 2016. Inequality and the erosion of trust among the poor: experimental evidence. *Socio-Economic Review*. :mww010. DOI:10.1093/ser/mww010.
- Gimpelson, V. & Treisman, D. 2018. Misperceiving inequality. *Economics and Politics*. 30(1):27-54. DOI:10.1111/ecpo.12103.
- Glaeser, E.L., Laibson, D.I., Scheinkman, J.A. & Soutter, C.L. 2000. Measuring Trust. DOI:10.1162/003355300554926.
- Gould, E.D. & Hijzen, A. 2016. Growing Apart, Losing Trust? The Impact of Inequality on Social Capital. *IMF Working Paper; IMF Working Papers*. 16(176):1. DOI:10.5089/9781475529487.001.
- Gugushvili, A., Reeves, A. & Jarosz, E. 2020. How do perceived changes in inequality affect health? *Health & Place*. 62:102276-9. DOI:10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.102276.
- Gustavsson, M. & Jordahl, H. 2008. Inequality and trust in Sweden: Some inequalities are more harmful than others. *Journal of Public Economics*. 92(1):348-365. DOI:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2007.06.010.
- Han, C. 2014. Health Implications of Socioeconomic Characteristics, Subjective Social Status, and Perceptions of Inequality: An Empirical Study of China. *Social Indicators Research*. 119(2):495-514. DOI:10.1007/s11205-013-0514-5.
- Hauser, O.P. & Norton, M.I. 2017. (Mis)perceptions of inequality. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 18:21-25. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.07.024> Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352250X17300465>.
- Helliwell, J.F. & Wang, S. 2011. Trust and Wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*. 1(1) DOI:10.5502/IJW.V1I1.3.
- Hu, A. 2017. On the relationship between subjective inequality and generalized trust. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. 49:11-19. DOI:10.1016/j.rssm.2017.03.003.

- Jen, M.H., Sund, E.R., Johnston, R. & Jones, K. 2010. Trustful societies, trustful individuals, and health: An analysis of self-rated health and social trust using the World Value Survey. *Health & Place*. 16(5):1022-1029. DOI:10.1016/J.HEALTHPLACE.2010.06.008.
- Johnson, N.D. & Mislin, A. 2012. How much should we trust the World Values Survey trust question? *Economics Letters*. 116(2):210-212. DOI:10.1016/j.econlet.2012.02.010.
- Jordahl, H. 2007. Inequality and Trust. In *Handbook of Social Capital*. G.T. Svendsen & G.L.H. Svendsen, Eds. Edward Edgar Publishing.
- Knack, S. 2001. *Trust, associational life, and economic performance*. Available: [https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27247/1/MPRA\\_paper\\_27247.pdf](https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27247/1/MPRA_paper_27247.pdf).
- Knack, S. & Keefer, P. 1997. Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics; the Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 112(4):1251-1288. DOI:10.1162/003355300555475.
- Knell, M. & Stix, H. 2017. *Inequality, Perception Biases and Trust*. Vienna, Austria: OeNB, Oesterreichische Nationalbank.
- Knell, M. & Stix, H. 2020. Perceptions of inequality. *European Journal of Political Economy*. 65:101927. DOI:10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2020.101927.
- Knell, M. & Stix, H. 2021. Inequality, perception biases and trust. *Journal of Economic Inequality*. 19(4):801-824. DOI:10.1007/s10888-021-09490-x.
- Kuhn, A. 2013. Inequality Perceptions, Distributional Norms, and Redistributive Preferences in East and West Germany. *German Economic Review (Oxford)*. 14(4):483-499. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-0475.2012.00577.x.
- Leigh, A. 2006a. Does equality lead to fraternity? *Economics Letters*. 93(1):121-125. DOI:10.1016/j.econlet.2006.04.003.
- Leigh, A. 2006b. Trust, Inequality and Ethnic Heterogeneity. *The Economic Record*. 82(258):268-280. DOI:10.1111/j.1475-4932.2006.00339.x.
- Mattes, R. & Moreno, A. 2018. Social and political trust in developing countries: Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. In *Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust*. 357-382. Oxford University Press.
- McPherson, M., Lynn Smith-Lovin & Cook, J.M. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 27(1):415-444. DOI:10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415.
- Mmotlane, R., Struwig, J. & Roberts, B. 2010. *The glue that binds or divides: social trust in South Africa*. *HSRC Review*. 8(3):4-5. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11910/4106>
- Murtin, F., Fleischer, L., Siegerink, V., Aassve, A., Algan, Y., Boarini, R., González, S., Lonti, Z. et al. 2018. Trust and its determinants: Evidence from the Trustlab experiment. *OECD Statistics Working Papers, No. 2018/02*, OECD Publishing, Paris. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1787/869ef2ec-en>.
- Newton, K. 2013. 'Social and political trust', Norwegian Social Science Data Services, retrieved from the website of European Social Survey Education Net. Available at: <http://essedunet.nsd.uib.no/cms/topics/2/>
- Niehues, J. 2016. Perception of Inequality and Reality: An International Comparison. *Wirtschaftsdienst (Hamburg)*. 96:13-18.
- Njozela, L. & Burns, J. 2019. Building social cohesion in South Africa. *SALDRU Working Paper Number 237, Version 1 / NIDS Discussion Paper 2019/4*.

- Office of the President. 2014. Twenty Year Review South Africa 1994-2014. Retrieved from <http://www.poa.gov.za/news/Pages/Twenty%20Year%20Review%20South%20Africa%201994%20to%202014.aspx>
- Özer, Ö & Zheng, Y. 2018. *Trust and Trustworthiness*. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119138341.ch14>.
- Poortinga, W. 2006. Social relations or social capital? Individual and community health effects of bonding social capital. *Social Science & Medicine*. 63(1):255-270. DOI:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2005.11.039.
- Posel, D. & Casale, D. 2011. Relative Standing and Subjective Well-Being in South Africa: The Role of Perceptions, Expectations and Income Mobility. *Social Indicators Research*. 104(2):195-223. DOI:10.1007/s11205-010-9740-2.
- Posel, D. & Hinks, T. 2013. Trusting Neighbours or Strangers in a Racially Divided Society: Insights from Survey Data in South Africa. *Journal of African Economies*. 22(1):136-162. DOI:10.1093/jae/ejs018.
- Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling alone : the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Roberts, B.J. 2014. Your Place or Mine? Beliefs About Inequality and Redress Preferences in South Africa. *Social Indicators Research*. 118(3):1167-1190. DOI:10.1007/s11205-013-0458-9.
- Rothstein, B. & Uslaner, E.M. 2005. All for All: Equality, Corruption, and Social Trust. *World Politics; World Pol*. 58(1):41-72. DOI:10.1353/wp.2006.0022.
- Schneider, S.M. 2012. Income Inequality and its Consequences for Life Satisfaction: What Role do Social Cognitions Play? *Social Indicators Research*. 106(3):419-438. DOI:10.1007/s11205-011-9816-7.
- Uslaner, E.M. 2002. *The Moral Foundations of Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511614934. Available: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/moral-foundations-of-trust/435FF8463168CD17A7AA141644BEA051> [2021/06/24].
- World Bank Group. 2018. *Overcoming Poverty and Inequality in South Africa: An Assessment of Drivers, Constraints and Opportunities*. World Bank, Washington, DC. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/29614> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- Zimbalist, Z. 2017. Breaking down rural and urban bias and interrogating spatial inequality, evidence from South Africa. *Development Policy Review*. 35:O246-O269. DOI:10.1111/dpr.12331.

## Appendix

**Table A1:** Results from PCA - ownership by quintile

Variable description	Quintile				
	1	2	3	4	5
Radio	0.447	0.818	0.774	0.848	0.961
Television	0.301	0.903	0.803	0.857	0.996
Car	0.024	0.162	0.162	0.163	1.000
<b>Ownership and usage of mobile phone</b>					
Never use a mobile phone	0.092	0.056	0.081	0.05	0.017
Use own mobile phone	0.842	0.859	0.841	0.898	0.969
Use someone else's mobile phone	0.066	0.085	0.078	0.052	0.014
<b>Location of toilet</b>					
No toilet	0.227	0.09	0.045	0.004	0.000
Toilet inside house	0.000	0.011	0.607	0.988	1.000
Toilet inside compound	0.504	0.651	0.242	0.005	0.000
Toilet outside compound	0.269	0.248	0.107	0.003	0.000
<b>Source of water</b>					
Water inside house	0.003	0.027	0.682	0.996	1.000
Water inside compound	0.373	0.548	0.193	0.000	0.000
Water outside compound	0.624	0.425	0.124	0.004	0.000
<b>Roof material</b>					
Metal, tin or zinc	0.815	0.854	0.527	0.106	0.000
Tiles	0.003	0.029	0.23	0.57	0.915
Thatch or grass	0.129	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Asbestos	0.025	0.089	0.223	0.289	0.085
Other materials	0.029	0.027	0.021	0.034	0.000
<b>Type of shelter</b>					
Formal house	0.324	0.91	0.874	0.943	0.971
Traditional house/hut	0.338	0.008	0.04	0.006	0.000
Temporary structure/shack	0.269	0.027	0.016	0.002	0.000
Flat	0.021	0.019	0.056	0.042	0.029
A room, hostel or other	0.049	0.035	0.014	0.008	0.000

Source: own calculations from Afrobarometer Round 5 data.

Notes: all data are weighted

**Table A2: Summary statistics comparison**

	Estimation sample			"Full" sample		
	Mean	Standard error	Obs.	Mean	Standard error	Obs.
<b><i>Individual-level variables</i></b>						
Trust in relatives	0.782	(0.010)	2003	0.784	(0.010)	2,334
Trust in neighbours	0.563	(0.013)	2003	0.558	(0.012)	2,390
Trust in others you know	0.397	(0.012)	2003	0.385	(0.011)	2,387
Generalised trust	0.178	(0.010)	2003	0.172	(0.009)	2,382
Female	0.531	(0.013)	2003	0.526	(0.012)	2,399
Age	37.543	(0.354)	2003	37.687	(0.329)	2,361
African*	0.756	(0.010)	2003	0.763	(0.009)	2,395
White	0.114	(0.007)	2003	0.112	(0.006)	2,395
Coloured	0.101	(0.006)	2003	0.096	(0.006)	2,395
Indian	0.029	(0.004)	2003	0.029	(0.003)	2,395
No formal schooling*	0.045	(0.006)	2003	0.049	(0.005)	2,396
Primary school	0.168	(0.010)	2003	0.179	(0.009)	2,396
Secondary school	0.658	(0.012)	2003	0.65	(0.011)	2,396
Post-secondary school	0.129	(0.008)	2003	0.122	(0.007)	2,396
Not economically active*	0.232	(0.010)	2003	0.242	(0.010)	2,394
Unemployed	0.419	(0.013)	2003	0.413	(0.012)	2,394
Employed	0.349	(0.012)	2003	0.345	(0.011)	2,394
Asset index	-0.000	-0.056	2003	-0.000	(0.056)	2,003
Urban	0.63	(0.013)	2003	0.62	(0.011)	2,399
Member of religious group	0.285	(0.011)	2003	0.284	(0.010)	2,371
Member of community group	0.134	(0.009)	2003	0.13	(0.008)	2,369
<b><i>Community-level/experience variables</i></b>						
Never felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood	0.405	(0.012)	2003	0.403	(0.011)	2,396
Sometimes felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood	0.364	(0.012)	2003	0.356	(0.011)	2,396
Often felt unsafe walking in neighbourhood	0.231	(0.011)	2003	0.241	(0.010)	2,396
Never feared crime in home	0.462	(0.013)	2003	0.461	(0.012)	2,395

Sometimes feared crime in home	0.332	(0.012)	2003	0.328	(0.011)	2,395
Often feared crime in home	0.206	(0.010)	2003	0.211	(0.010)	2,395
Had something stolen from house in past year	0.267	(0.011)	2003	0.268	(0.010)	2,399
Physically attacked in the past year	0.113	(0.008)	2003	0.113	(0.007)	2,399
<b><i>Institutional variables</i></b>						
Trust police	0.504	(0.013)	2003	0.498	(0.012)	2,378
Satisfied with democracy	0.609	(0.012)	2003	0.604	(0.011)	2,375
People often treated unequally under the law	0.497	(0.013)	2003	0.506	(0.012)	2,368
Government handling narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor well	0.226	(0.011)	2003	0.226	(0.010)	2,359
Government handling reducing crime well	0.387	(0.012)	2003	0.383	(0.011)	2,382

*Source:* Own calculations, Afrobarometer Round 5.

*Notes:* all data are weighted. The standard errors are not adjusted for survey design as a cluster variable was not included in the data release. The standard errors presented here may therefore be too small.

**Table A3:** Trust in strangers - full sample, no interaction

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Perceived living conditions worse	-0.0286 (0.0252)	-0.0297 (0.0251)	-0.0213 (0.0253)	-0.0220 (0.0255)	-0.0115 (0.0251)	-0.0107 (0.0249)
Perceived living conditions better	-0.0173 (0.0229)	-0.0185 (0.0231)	-0.0324 (0.0232)	-0.0333 (0.0233)	-0.0263 (0.0231)	-0.0255 (0.0230)
Age	-0.00231 (0.00344)	-0.00347 (0.00343)	-0.00280 (0.00351)	-0.00304 (0.00349)	-0.00364 (0.00344)	-0.00352 (0.00345)
Age <sup>2</sup>	3.27e-05 (3.91e-05)	4.42e-05 (3.90e-05)	3.65e-05 (3.97e-05)	3.94e-05 (3.97e-05)	4.33e-05 (3.88e-05)	4.19e-05 (3.88e-05)
Primary	0.125*** (0.0432)	0.125*** (0.0436)	0.135*** (0.0434)	0.131*** (0.0436)	0.124*** (0.0427)	0.128*** (0.0424)
Secondary	0.0952** (0.0389)	0.0955** (0.0394)	0.109*** (0.0388)	0.109*** (0.0392)	0.101*** (0.0388)	0.101*** (0.0384)
Post-secondary	0.124*** (0.0465)	0.115** (0.0464)	0.128*** (0.0458)	0.125*** (0.0458)	0.116** (0.0456)	0.118*** (0.0455)
Female	0.00794 (0.0186)	0.00879 (0.0192)	0.00954 (0.0192)	0.0101 (0.0194)	0.0100 (0.0191)	0.0106 (0.0189)
Urban	-0.0114 (0.0251)	-0.000332 (0.0250)	-0.00242 (0.0253)	0.00224 (0.0253)	0.0182 (0.0248)	0.0143 (0.0247)
White	-0.0124 (0.0305)	-0.00800 (0.0307)	0.00336 (0.0310)	0.00427 (0.0311)	-0.00771 (0.0311)	-0.00884 (0.0309)
Coloured	-0.0206 (0.0303)	-0.0200 (0.0306)	-0.00575 (0.0303)	-0.00521 (0.0303)	-0.00108 (0.0302)	-0.00186 (0.0301)
Indian	0.0213 (0.0512)	0.0424 (0.0521)	0.0547 (0.0516)	0.0605 (0.0516)	0.0504 (0.0498)	0.0455 (0.0498)
Asset index	-0.00133 (0.00612)	-0.00207 (0.00617)	0.000280 (0.00623)	-0.000591 (0.00625)	-0.00253 (0.00612)	-0.00169 (0.00611)
Asset index <sup>2</sup>	0.000194 (0.00287)	0.000633 (0.00288)	0.00152 (0.00293)	0.00161 (0.00294)	0.00129 (0.00283)	0.00126 (0.00282)
Unemployed	-0.0116	-0.0112	-0.00927	-0.00743	-0.00541	-0.00662

	(0.0265)	(0.0266)	(0.0273)	(0.0273)	(0.0273)	(0.0272)
Employed	-0.0444	-0.0473*	-0.0516*	-0.0494*	-0.0471*	-0.0481*
	(0.0273)	(0.0277)	(0.0282)	(0.0283)	(0.0278)	(0.0277)
Member of religious group		0.00624	0.00126	0.00306	-0.00143	-0.00196
		(0.0231)	(0.0232)	(0.0232)	(0.0230)	(0.0230)
Member of community group		0.0830**	0.0849**	0.0844**	0.0673**	0.0681**
		(0.0330)	(0.0344)	(0.0342)	(0.0339)	(0.0342)
Felt unsafe sometimes		-0.0648**		-0.0508**	-0.0423*	
		(0.0252)		(0.0254)	(0.0254)	
Felt unsafe often		-0.0778**		-0.0594*	-0.0546	
		(0.0355)		(0.0357)	(0.0363)	
Feared crime in home sometimes		0.0422*		0.0378	0.0255	
		(0.0249)		(0.0251)	(0.0252)	
Feared crime in home often		0.0385		0.0458	0.0475	
		(0.0366)		(0.0365)	(0.0365)	
Something stolen at least once in the past year		-0.00165		-0.00526	0.00383	
		(0.0235)		(0.0236)	(0.0234)	
Physically attacked at least once in the past year		0.0159		0.00602	-0.00634	
		(0.0336)		(0.0338)	(0.0337)	
Trust police			0.0332*	0.0346*	0.0183	0.0168
			(0.0194)	(0.0197)	(0.0193)	(0.0191)
Satisfied with democracy			0.0719***	0.0691***	0.0629***	0.0650***
			(0.0199)	(0.0199)	(0.0197)	(0.0197)
People treated unequally under the law			-0.0328*	-0.0309	-0.0251	-0.0268
			(0.0198)	(0.0199)	(0.0198)	(0.0197)
Gov handling narrowing the income gap well			0.0179	0.0201	0.0189	0.0168
			(0.0261)	(0.0263)	(0.0259)	(0.0257)
Gov handling reducing crime well			0.0415*	0.0404*	0.0371*	0.0371*
			(0.0227)	(0.0228)	(0.0225)	(0.0224)
Trust in others you know					0.115***	0.115***
					(0.0221)	(0.0219)

Trust neighbours					0.0377*	0.0388*
					(0.0225)	(0.0222)
Trust relatives					0.0399*	0.0405*
					(0.0231)	(0.0229)
Constant	0.119	0.146	0.0686	0.0794	0.0111	0.00383
	(0.0890)	(0.0922)	(0.0911)	(0.0935)	(0.0944)	(0.0925)
Observations	2,105	2,075	2,008	2,004	1,999	2,003
R-squared	0.046	0.057	0.072	0.075	0.109	0.106

Source: Afrobarometer Round 5.

Notes: The estimations control for the province of residence, perceived living conditions, and perceived mobility. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**Table A4:** Trust in strangers, rural subsample

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Perceived living conditions worse	-0.0886*	-0.0944**	-0.0916**	-0.0969**	-0.0922**	-0.0863*
	(0.0465)	(0.0460)	(0.0466)	(0.0471)	(0.0461)	(0.0457)
Perceived living conditions better	-0.110***	-0.114***	-0.122***	-0.123***	-0.111***	-0.112***
	(0.0392)	(0.0394)	(0.0409)	(0.0410)	(0.0406)	(0.0404)
Age	-0.000258	-0.00487	-0.00239	-0.00354	-0.00412	-0.00331
	(0.00657)	(0.00662)	(0.00675)	(0.00675)	(0.00661)	(0.00660)
Age <sup>2</sup>	1.97e-05	7.30e-05	4.45e-05	5.86e-05	6.23e-05	5.20e-05
	(7.73e-05)	(7.82e-05)	(7.89e-05)	(7.96e-05)	(7.81e-05)	(7.74e-05)
Primary	0.124*	0.110*	0.143**	0.137**	0.109	0.111*
	(0.0648)	(0.0663)	(0.0661)	(0.0683)	(0.0686)	(0.0665)
Secondary	0.0941	0.0996	0.126**	0.130**	0.116*	0.111*
	(0.0596)	(0.0611)	(0.0599)	(0.0631)	(0.0636)	(0.0607)
Post-secondary	0.142	0.114	0.121	0.119	0.0858	0.0833
	(0.0878)	(0.0876)	(0.0853)	(0.0864)	(0.0839)	(0.0824)
Female	-0.00279	0.00762	0.00659	0.00826	0.00683	0.00757
	(0.0333)	(0.0349)	(0.0358)	(0.0366)	(0.0356)	(0.0348)
Asset index	-0.00665	-0.00521	-0.00632	-0.00507	-0.00502	-0.00514
	(0.0139)	(0.0130)	(0.0133)	(0.0133)	(0.0131)	(0.0130)
Asset index <sup>2</sup>	0.00297	0.00314	0.00435	0.00456	0.00463	0.00438
	(0.00529)	(0.00548)	(0.00572)	(0.00586)	(0.00570)	(0.00557)
Unemployed	-0.0162	-0.00235	-0.0111	-0.00896	0.00571	0.00252
	(0.0474)	(0.0467)	(0.0491)	(0.0490)	(0.0494)	(0.0494)
Employed	0.0107	0.0176	0.0151	0.00936	0.0307	0.0348
	(0.0535)	(0.0542)	(0.0565)	(0.0566)	(0.0550)	(0.0552)
Member of religious group		-0.0534	-0.0703	-0.0581	-0.0544	-0.0626
		(0.0420)	(0.0432)	(0.0437)	(0.0428)	(0.0425)
Member of community group		0.144**	0.155**	0.143**	0.110*	0.121*
		(0.0568)	(0.0608)	(0.0606)	(0.0611)	(0.0619)

Felt unsafe sometimes	-0.0660 (0.0424)			-0.0353 (0.0428)	-0.0216 (0.0437)		
Felt unsafe often	-0.135** (0.0650)			-0.103 (0.0676)	-0.0802 (0.0694)		
Feared crime in home sometimes	-0.00430 (0.0431)			-0.00556 (0.0429)	-0.0130 (0.0438)		
Feared crime in home often	0.0479 (0.0626)			0.0514 (0.0639)	0.0602 (0.0650)		
Something stolen at least once in the past year	-0.0119 (0.0411)			-0.0252 (0.0428)	-0.0208 (0.0418)		
Physically attacked at least once in the past year	0.0857 (0.0593)			0.0689 (0.0607)	0.0577 (0.0616)		
Trust police		0.0314 (0.0350)		0.0337 (0.0359)	0.0293 (0.0354)	0.0255 (0.0344)	
Satisfied with democracy		0.108*** (0.0354)		0.102*** (0.0358)	0.102*** (0.0356)	0.106*** (0.0352)	
People treated unequally under the law		0.00164 (0.0348)		0.00843 (0.0351)	0.00590 (0.0344)	-0.000362 (0.0342)	
Gov handling narrowing the income gap well		0.0136 (0.0430)		0.0104 (0.0433)	0.00225 (0.0419)	0.00472 (0.0417)	
Gov handling reducing crime well		0.0152 (0.0372)		0.0101 (0.0388)	0.0230 (0.0372)	0.0256 (0.0357)	
Trust in others you know					0.163*** (0.0399)	0.164*** (0.0393)	
Trust neighbours					0.0163 (0.0409)	0.0191 (0.0399)	
Trust relatives					-0.0144 (0.0427)	-0.0179 (0.0416)	
Constant		0.162 (0.165)	0.266 (0.170)	0.0807 (0.174)	0.128 (0.179)	0.0580 (0.177)	0.0384 (0.177)

Observations	678	665	631	628	626	629
R-squared	0.070	0.103	0.109	0.117	0.155	0.149

---

Source: Afrobarometer Round 5.

Notes: The estimations control for the province of residence, perceived living conditions, and perceived mobility. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**Table A5: Trust in strangers - urban subsample**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Perceived living conditions worse	0.00180 (0.0282)	0.00120 (0.0284)	0.0114 (0.0286)	0.0118 (0.0288)	0.0255 (0.0289)	0.0243 (0.0287)
Perceived living conditions better	0.0341 (0.0279)	0.0370 (0.0283)	0.0221 (0.0280)	0.0209 (0.0282)	0.0204 (0.0280)	0.0215 (0.0279)
Age	-0.00394 (0.00395)	-0.00390 (0.00398)	-0.00427 (0.00398)	-0.00448 (0.00400)	-0.00494 (0.00402)	-0.00481 (0.00401)
Age <sup>2</sup>	4.54e-05 (4.38e-05)	4.22e-05 (4.39e-05)	4.76e-05 (4.40e-05)	4.92e-05 (4.42e-05)	5.16e-05 (4.40e-05)	5.12e-05 (4.38e-05)
Primary	0.124*** (0.0456)	0.127*** (0.0466)	0.131*** (0.0445)	0.134*** (0.0450)	0.149*** (0.0427)	0.145*** (0.0416)
Secondary	0.107*** (0.0391)	0.107*** (0.0403)	0.117*** (0.0382)	0.120*** (0.0388)	0.122*** (0.0370)	0.118*** (0.0357)
Post-secondary	0.133*** (0.0481)	0.130*** (0.0492)	0.144*** (0.0477)	0.146*** (0.0482)	0.152*** (0.0467)	0.150*** (0.0457)
Female	0.0167 (0.0224)	0.00979 (0.0229)	0.0141 (0.0227)	0.0113 (0.0227)	0.0122 (0.0224)	0.0157 (0.0224)
White	-0.00266 (0.0324)	-0.00524 (0.0330)	0.00555 (0.0332)	0.00376 (0.0334)	-0.00857 (0.0332)	-0.00623 (0.0329)
Coloured	-0.0174 (0.0335)	-0.0215 (0.0339)	-0.00649 (0.0338)	-0.00630 (0.0337)	-0.000917 (0.0338)	-0.00129 (0.0339)
Indian	0.0232 (0.0524)	0.0402 (0.0538)	0.0554 (0.0530)	0.0625 (0.0531)	0.0528 (0.0512)	0.0468 (0.0511)
Asset index	0.00398 (0.00757)	0.00278 (0.00770)	0.00523 (0.00768)	0.00493 (0.00772)	0.00180 (0.00760)	0.00221 (0.00758)
Asset index <sup>2</sup>	-0.00189 (0.00384)	-0.00165 (0.00386)	-0.00119 (0.00384)	-0.00148 (0.00385)	-0.00116 (0.00375)	-0.000844 (0.00375)
Unemployed	0.00280 (0.0319)	-0.00318 (0.0324)	0.00554 (0.0322)	0.00567 (0.0325)	0.00214 (0.0325)	0.00284 (0.0321)

Employed	-0.0630** (0.0316)	-0.0682** (0.0325)	-0.0692** (0.0323)	-0.0666** (0.0328)	-0.0687** (0.0326)	-0.0699** (0.0322)
Member of religious group		0.0486* (0.0280)	0.0383 (0.0277)	0.0402 (0.0276)	0.0302 (0.0273)	0.0304 (0.0274)
Member of community group		0.0355 (0.0390)	0.0375 (0.0396)	0.0396 (0.0396)	0.0308 (0.0387)	0.0295 (0.0388)
Felt unsafe sometimes		-0.0377 (0.0315)		-0.0339 (0.0318)	-0.0299 (0.0314)	
Felt unsafe often		-0.0224 (0.0410)		-0.0194 (0.0409)	-0.0257 (0.0415)	
Feared crime in home sometimes		0.0376 (0.0308)		0.0318 (0.0308)	0.0217 (0.0309)	
Feared crime in home often		0.00908 (0.0432)		0.0222 (0.0431)	0.0274 (0.0429)	
Something stolen at least once in the past year		-0.000179 (0.0287)		0.00272 (0.0289)	0.0178 (0.0289)	
Physically attacked at least once in the past year		-0.0400 (0.0395)		-0.0458 (0.0395)	-0.0594 (0.0396)	
Trust police			0.0298 (0.0233)	0.0315 (0.0236)	0.0133 (0.0232)	0.0123 (0.0231)
Satisfied with democracy			0.0418* (0.0239)	0.0406* (0.0240)	0.0369 (0.0239)	0.0376 (0.0238)
People treated unequally under the law			-0.0477** (0.0239)	-0.0469** (0.0239)	-0.0378 (0.0240)	-0.0384 (0.0240)
Gov handling narrowing the income gap well			0.0372 (0.0332)	0.0402 (0.0332)	0.0439 (0.0329)	0.0408 (0.0328)
Gov handling reducing crime well			0.0530* (0.0291)	0.0529* (0.0294)	0.0479* (0.0289)	0.0471 (0.0287)
Trust in others you know					0.0802*** (0.0261)	0.0777*** (0.0260)
Trust neighbours					0.0558**	0.0548**

Trust relatives					(0.0272)	(0.0267)
					0.0575**	0.0592**
					(0.0277)	(0.0273)
Constant	0.0467	0.0506	0.0302	0.0411	-0.0127	-0.0227
	(0.0942)	(0.101)	(0.0992)	(0.105)	(0.106)	(0.101)
Observations	1,427	1,410	1,377	1,376	1,373	1,374
R-squared	0.055	0.065	0.085	0.087	0.118	0.115

Source: Afrobarometer Round 5.

Notes: The estimations control for the province of residence, perceived living conditions, and perceived mobility. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**Table A6:** Trust in strangers - full sample, with interaction

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Perceived living conditions worse	-0.0732*	-0.0724*	-0.0713	-0.0713	-0.0677	-0.0666
	(0.0433)	(0.0430)	(0.0439)	(0.0441)	(0.0432)	(0.0430)
Perceived living conditions better	-0.102***	-0.106***	-0.126***	-0.125***	-0.103***	-0.104***
	(0.0386)	(0.0385)	(0.0394)	(0.0396)	(0.0390)	(0.0387)
Urban	-0.0773**	-0.0663*	-0.0745**	-0.0681*	-0.0487	-0.0537
	(0.0374)	(0.0372)	(0.0374)	(0.0376)	(0.0364)	(0.0362)
Worse*Urban	0.0721	0.0688	0.0801	0.0790	0.0910*	0.0907*
	(0.0501)	(0.0501)	(0.0511)	(0.0513)	(0.0505)	(0.0503)
Better*Urban	0.133***	0.137***	0.145***	0.141***	0.118**	0.121***
	(0.0463)	(0.0466)	(0.0472)	(0.0475)	(0.0468)	(0.0464)
Age	-0.00236	-0.00351	-0.00298	-0.00321	-0.00383	-0.00371
	(0.00343)	(0.00341)	(0.00349)	(0.00348)	(0.00344)	(0.00345)
Age <sup>2</sup>	3.33e-05	4.46e-05	3.87e-05	4.14e-05	4.57e-05	4.44e-05
	(3.88e-05)	(3.87e-05)	(3.95e-05)	(3.94e-05)	(3.87e-05)	(3.87e-05)
Primary	0.119***	0.118***	0.127***	0.123***	0.116***	0.120***
	(0.0425)	(0.0430)	(0.0429)	(0.0431)	(0.0424)	(0.0421)
Secondary	0.0917**	0.0920**	0.104***	0.104***	0.0962**	0.0958**

	(0.0385)	(0.0389)	(0.0386)	(0.0389)	(0.0387)	(0.0384)
Post-secondary	0.120***	0.110**	0.122***	0.119***	0.110**	0.112**
	(0.0463)	(0.0462)	(0.0457)	(0.0457)	(0.0456)	(0.0455)
Female	0.00889	0.00944	0.0104	0.0110	0.0110	0.0115
	(0.0186)	(0.0192)	(0.0192)	(0.0194)	(0.0190)	(0.0188)
White	-0.0131	-0.00934	0.00214	0.00275	-0.00854	-0.00950
	(0.0306)	(0.0308)	(0.0311)	(0.0313)	(0.0313)	(0.0310)
Coloured	-0.0214	-0.0215	-0.00651	-0.00634	-0.00194	-0.00248
	(0.0301)	(0.0304)	(0.0302)	(0.0302)	(0.0301)	(0.0300)
Indian	0.0247	0.0459	0.0585	0.0639	0.0526	0.0482
	(0.0509)	(0.0518)	(0.0513)	(0.0513)	(0.0497)	(0.0496)
Asset index	-0.00154	-0.00234	0.000185	-0.000719	-0.00257	-0.00170
	(0.00611)	(0.00615)	(0.00620)	(0.00623)	(0.00611)	(0.00610)
Asset index <sup>2</sup>	-0.000174	0.000191	0.00110	0.00120	0.00114	0.00109
	(0.00287)	(0.00288)	(0.00294)	(0.00295)	(0.00284)	(0.00284)
Unemployed	-0.0103	-0.00991	-0.00736	-0.00584	-0.00383	-0.00480
	(0.0264)	(0.0265)	(0.0273)	(0.0273)	(0.0272)	(0.0271)
Employed	-0.0434	-0.0464*	-0.0506*	-0.0487*	-0.0457	-0.0466*
	(0.0272)	(0.0276)	(0.0282)	(0.0282)	(0.0278)	(0.0277)
Member of religious group		0.00874	0.00386	0.00528	-0.000381	-0.000530
		(0.0230)	(0.0231)	(0.0231)	(0.0229)	(0.0229)
Member of community group		0.0814**	0.0830**	0.0828**	0.0660**	0.0668**
		(0.0326)	(0.0340)	(0.0338)	(0.0335)	(0.0338)
Felt unsafe sometimes		-0.0618**		-0.0473*	-0.0389	
		(0.0252)		(0.0254)	(0.0254)	
Felt unsafe often		-0.0760**		-0.0581*	-0.0541	
		(0.0350)		(0.0352)	(0.0359)	
Feared crime in home sometimes		0.0367		0.0325	0.0207	
		(0.0250)		(0.0251)	(0.0252)	
Feared crime in home often		0.0335		0.0415	0.0447	
		(0.0360)		(0.0360)	(0.0361)	

Something stolen at least once in the past year		0.000321 (0.0234)		-0.00290 (0.0236)		0.00599 (0.0234)	
Physically attacked at least once in the past year		0.0152 (0.0335)		0.00538 (0.0337)		-0.00639 (0.0336)	
Trust police			0.0314 (0.0193)	0.0323* (0.0196)		0.0167 (0.0192)	0.0156 (0.0190)
Satisfied with democracy			0.0718** *	0.0693***		0.0636** *	0.0656***
People treated unequally under the law			-0.0313 (0.0198)	-0.0294 (0.0199)		-0.0231 (0.0198)	-0.0250 (0.0197)
Gov handling narrowing the income gap well			0.0204 (0.0259)	0.0226 (0.0261)		0.0207 (0.0258)	0.0187 (0.0256)
Gov handling reducing crime well			0.0434* (0.0226)	0.0426* (0.0227)		0.0397* (0.0224)	0.0393* (0.0223)
Trust in others you know						0.115*** (0.0221)	0.114*** (0.0219)
Trust neighbours						0.0385* (0.0225)	0.0393* (0.0222)
Trust relatives						0.0351 (0.0230)	0.0356 (0.0229)
Constant	0.166* (0.0915)	0.195** (0.0945)	0.123 (0.0937)	0.135 (0.0961)	0.0650 (0.0969)	0.0573 (0.0951)	
Observations	2,105	2,075	2,008	2,004	1,999	2,003	
R-squared	0.050	0.062	0.077	0.080	0.113	0.110	

Source: Afrobarometer Round 5.

Notes: The estimations control for the province of residence, perceived living conditions, and perceived mobility. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1