

ING 3

EXAME DE PROFICIÊNCIA EM INGLÊS PARA PROCESSOS SELETIVOS DE PROGRAMAS DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO DA UFMG

ÁREA Nº 03: CIÊNCIAS HUMANAS, CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS APLICADAS

IDENTIFICAÇÃO

CPF:

PASSAPORTE:

DATA: / /

NOTA:

INSTRUÇÕES:

1. Esta prova é constituída de 1 (um) texto em língua inglesa, seguido de 5 (cinco) questões abertas, totalizando, com esta folha de rosto, 6 (seis) páginas. Caso identifique algum problema, solicite a substituição da prova.
2. Leia atentamente o texto e responda às questões propostas. As questões deverão ser respondidas em **português, a tinta** (cor azul ou preta. Provas respondidas a lápis **não serão corrigidas**) e com letra **legível**.
3. A duração da prova é de **3 (três) horas**.
4. **É** permitido o uso de dicionário impresso. O candidato deverá utilizar seu próprio exemplar.
5. Os rascunhos deverão ser entregues ao examinador, junto com a prova: texto e questões.
6. Responda às questões **de acordo com o texto**.

Texto:

Where You Come From or Where You Live: Examining the Cultural and Institutional Explanation of Generalized Trust Using Migration as a Natural Experiment

by Peter Thisted Dinesen
Department of Political Science, University of Southern Denmark.
Email: ptd@sam.sdu.dk

Introduction

Generalized trust in other people concerns our beliefs about the generalized other when no specific information exists (Rotter, 1980: p. 4; Yamagishi, 2001: pp. 123, 124 and 144; Sønderskov, 2008: pp. 17 and 18). In this regard—and from being inherently social—it differs from political trust, which tends to be based more on concrete evaluations of government performance (Uslaner, 2002). Similarly, by not being based on personal knowledge of the trusted, generalized trust differs in nature from ‘thicker’ forms of trust in people whom we have prior knowledge about such as our colleagues, friends, and family (Bahry et al., 2005). Finally, generalized trust differs from trust in specific ethnic and social groups by being more general and unconditional in nature and hence holds greater potential for promoting cooperation and various desirable outcomes (Uslaner, 2008a). As Putnam (1993) argued in his classic book *Making Democracy Work*, civic virtues such as generalized trust underpin the well-functioning of democracy and it has been shown empirically that societies with high levels of generalized trust experience better government, have higher economic growth and are more capable of solving collective action dilemmas (Zak and Knack, 2001; Knack, 2002; Tavits, 2006; Sønderskov, 2008, 2009). Similarly, individual-level evidence shows that trusters are more tolerant, more likely to make donations to charity and more frequent joiners of common interest associations (Uslaner, 2002; Nannestad, 2007). In short, generalized trust in others promotes democratic government and other desirable collective outcomes and consequently we should try to understand how it is formed.

One central debate in the expanding literature on the causes of generalized trust has been the question of whether trust is mainly a cultural trait passed on from one generation to the next or rather the result of living in a context of fair and impartial institutions. However, distinguishing between the two explanations is difficult empirically as a culture of trust to a large extent coincides with fair and impartial institutions. While the problem of distinguishing between the cultural and institutional roots of trust prevails in studies focusing on people who grew up and are presently living in the same context, it can be overcome by analysing immigrants who are born in a different country than where they are presently living. In this case, the culture internalized at an early age is not related to the institutional context experienced later on. This is the logic applied in this article, which analyses immigrants in a number of Western European countries utilizing the European Social Survey in which the country of origin of each immigrant can be identified. Hence, the main contribution of this article lies in contrasting the role of cultural heritage and institutional context in explaining generalized trust.

Previous research has shown that the level of trust of the country of origin is associated with trust of immigrants or their children and grandchildren (Rice and Feldman, 1997; Soroka, Helliwell and Johnston, 2007; Uslaner, 2008b). While this is an important and striking finding, other factors may also play a part in forming trust of immigrants, and previous research has shown that the institutional context is a likely candidate (Rothstein and Stolle, 2008; Freitag and Bu’hlmann, 2009). If institutions also matter for generalized trust, we would expect the institutional context of the destination country of immigrants to matter for their level of trust in other people. By looking at a number of different destination countries, the present study diverges from earlier studies, which have kept the institutional context of the destination country of immigrants constant by examining

only one destination country. As a consequence of this design, variation in the institutional context of the destination country exists, hence, it is possible to examine the role of the institutional surroundings in forming trust of immigrants.

The Foundations of Trust: Cultural Versus Institutional Explanations

The distinction between cultural and institutional explanations of generalized trust has emerged as one of the central dividing lines in the literature on the causes of trust. The cultural explanation focuses on the stability of trust, which is seen as a durable cultural trait passed on from parents to their children through socialization during childhood. Conversely, the institutional explanation claims that institutions, by providing transparency of the actions of others, exhibiting important behavioural norms and giving way to positive experiences of being treated fair and equally, can lay the foundation of a trustful relationship between citizens.

The cultural perspective on trust dates back at least to the work of Almond and Verba (1963) and gained renewed momentum with Robert Putnam's (1993) seminal book 'Making Democracy Work'. In the book, Putnam argued that trust forms an integral part of the broader concept of social capital, which he found to be a persistent cultural feature dating back centuries in Italy. As a consequence, the southern regions in Italy, historically deprived of social capital and trust, are still to this day lagging behind their northern counterparts in these civic virtues. In recent years, Eric Uslaner has been the main proponent of the cultural perspective on trust, arguing that trust is founded early in life primarily through parental socialization of optimism and that it remains largely stable throughout life and over generations (Uslaner, 2002, 2008b). Hence, in this perspective, trust is a part of our cultural heritage, which is transmitted from one generation to the next (Uslaner, 2002; Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales, 2008). In essence, this means that a cultural heritage founded long ago still has profound consequences for the trust of individuals to this day.

Empirically the cultural perspective has found considerable support in studies showing a high degree of stability in trust over time across nations (Bjørnskov, 2006) as well as over the life course of individuals (Claibourn and Martin, 2000). Moreover, empirical studies have shown a significant transmission of trust from parents to their children (Uslaner, 2002; Dohmen et al., 2006; Guiso Sapienza and Zingales, 2008) thereby testifying to the underlying mechanism at the individual level posited to account for the stability in trust by the cultural perspective. Finally, some of the strongest support in favour of the cultural perspective is the finding that the level of trust of various ethnic groups in the United States to a large extent tracks the levels of trust of the home countries of their grandparents like mentioned earlier (Rice and Feldman, 1997; Tabellini, 2008; Uslaner, 2008b). However, while the cultural thesis appears to have strong support in the American context, the results from Canada are not as unequivocal. Soroka, Helliwell and Johnston, (2007) show a strong relationship between immigrants' present-day trust and the level of trust in their home country, but no equivalent relationship between the trust of the home country of the respondents' parents and the respondents' present-day trust. Hence, other factors appear to wash out the long-term influence of cultural heritage on trust in the Canadian context. This shows that while trust may to some extent be culturally inherited and sticky, it is still subject to change under certain conditions—at least in some contexts. This raises the question about which factors contribute to the washing out of the effect of cultural heritage.

Uslaner (2008b) suggests that experiences in terms of the ethnic composition of the context in which people live may matter for trust. The assumption is that trusting people display more trustworthiness and hence living among high-trust groups may 'rub off' and generate trust among groups who were initially less-trusting. Uslaner only finds limited empirical support for this claim as only the fraction of a state's population being of (traditionally high-trusting) British or German descent has a positive impact on trust at the individual level for out-groups (i.e. for people with a different ethnicity than German or British). While the ethnic composition of the context in which one lives may not be of great importance, other features of this context may well matter for generalized trust. In this regard, the institutional quality of this context seems a likely candidate as institutional accounts of generalized trust have gained prominence in recent years (Levi, 1996; Rothstein and

Stolle, 2008; Freitag and Bühlmann, 2009). The features of institutions which have been shown to be most consistently (positively) associated with generalized trust are procedural fairness, incorruptibility and impartiality, or in short; freedom from corruption (Delhey and Newton, 2005; Rothstein and Uslaner, 2005; You, 2005; Rothstein and Stolle, 2008; Freitag and Bühlmann, 2009).

Compared to fair and impartial institutions, corrupt institutions are less credible in enforcing law and order and hence provide weaker incentives for trustworthy behaviour. Knowing that the expected costs of engaging in untrustworthy behaviour are lower will raise the costs of trusting other people (Levi, 1996; You, 2005). Corrupt institutions are also more likely to give way to negative experiences of discrimination and unfair treatment, which is likely to increase suspicion about the motives of other people and consequently decrease trust in the generalized other (Rothstein and Stolle, 2008). Corrupt institutions are manifested at the individual level in the behaviour of street-level bureaucrats and people's perceptions of institutional fairness are formed through experiences with these officials including policemen, doctors and tax officials. As representatives of institutions, these officials exhibit important behavioural norms that citizens use as a yardstick for the moral stock of the general population. If street-level bureaucrats, who are supposed to administer and implement the law in an unbiased way, do not themselves follow the rules that they administer, it sends the signal that they cannot be trusted. Moreover, as people tend to infer from representatives of institutions to people in general, this also implies that other people in general are not to be trusted (Rothstein and Stolle, 2008; Rothstein and Eek, 2009; Dinesen, P. T. Submitted for publication). Hence, when people experience discrimination and unfair treatment by street-level bureaucrats, they will reason according to the logic presented above and conclude that institutional fairness is low and, consequently, that most people cannot be trusted. Empirically, the predicted association between freedom from corruption and trust is well documented (Delhey and Newton, 2005; Rothstein and Uslaner, 2005; You, 2005). The problem is, however, that the direction of causality is not clear and remains debated (Uslaner, 2009).

Design

To examine the impact of institutional quality on generalized trust, one would ideally randomly assign one group of individuals to live in a specific institutional context, while at the same time assigning another comparable group to live in another institutional context. In this case, we would attribute any difference in generalized trust after living in different institutional contexts to different institutional experiences. Such an experiment is obviously not possible and as a consequence, one has to resort to other means for analysing the relationship between institutional quality and trust. In this regard, the process of immigration provides a natural experiment in the sense that variation in institutional context is induced when immigrants move to different countries and thus, institutional contexts. This provides an opportunity for examining if this variation in the institutional context of the destination country has an impact on trust. If the institutional context matters for trust, we would expect that having migrated to a country with little corruption would be more conducive to generalized trust than having migrated to a country where corruption is widespread. Two previous studies have applied the natural experiment of immigration when examining the effect of institutional quality on trust of immigrants. Nannestad and Svendsen (2005) find that mean differences in institutional quality between the country of origin and the destination country track differences in trust between immigrants and people living in their country of origin. This is seen as an argument in favour of the role of the institutional context in shaping trust. In contrast to this approach, which examines aggregate changes in institutional quality and trust, Bagno (2006) compares differences in trust at the individual level for Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Germany and Israel to that of Jews in Ukraine. She finds that Jewish immigrants in Germany display significantly higher levels of trust than that of Jews in Ukraine, which also supports the notion that individuals' trust in others remains open to changes in context.

Questões:

1. Qual foi o argumento de Putnam sobre virtudes cívicas e democracia, apresentado em seu livro *Making Democracy Work*?

2. Em que o presente estudo difere de estudos anteriores sobre a confiança em imigrantes e qual é a consequência disso?

3. O que Eric Uslaner argumentou em relação à perspectiva cultural da confiança?

4. A que conclusão chegou o estudo da tese cultural da confiança no Canadá?

5. Qual seria o experimento ideal para se medir o impacto da qualidade institucional na confiança e por quê?
