

Trust as an Alternative to Risk\*

Eric M. Uslaner

Department of Government and Politics

University of Maryland–College Park

College Park, MD 20742

[euslaner@umd.edu](mailto:euslaner@umd.edu)

## Trust as an Alternative to Risk

### ABSTRACT

Many students of trust see it as a way to mitigate risk through the development of strong institutions that create trust. I offer an alternative view of trust, moralistic or generalized trust, that depends upon a psychological foundation of optimism and control. This form of trust, in contrast to arguments by Paldam and others, has “value” independent of experience. Using data from a survey of metropolitan Philadelphia in 1996, I show that if you believe that “most people can be trusted,” you are substantially more likely to see your neighborhood as safe at night *even controlling for both the objective level of crime* as well having been the victim of a crime, having had parents who were the victims of crime, watching local television news (which exposes people to violent news), where you live (central city and suburb), and gender. Trust thus “reduces” perceptions of risk independently of personal experience.

JEL Codes:

Z13: Cultural economics

K42: Illegal behavior and the enforcement of law

## 1: Introduction

Trust presupposes risk. Yet, it is also an alternative to risk.

The most common conception of trust, which I shall call “strategic trust,” views trust as managing risk. Another form of trust, “moralistic” or “generalized” trust, discounts risk.

Moralistic trust waves away risk by downplaying evidence.

Generalized trusters don’t dismiss risk. They interpret evidence in a more positive light and are less prone to see high levels of risk. This form of trust is based upon an world view of optimism and control: The world is a good place, is going to get better, and we can make it better (Rosenberg, 1956; Lane, 1959, 163-166). Moralistic trust does not depend upon evidence, but upon the belief that *we ought to trust others because they are part of our moral community*. When we believe that “most people can be trusted”—as opposed to “you can’t be too careful in dealing with people” (in the standard survey question), we discount contrary evidence unless it is overwhelming. This optimistic sense of trust leads us to see the world as less risky, even in the face of contrary evidence (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 2).

These two variants of trust have different ways of “managing” risks. We reduce risk under strategic trust through a strong legal system. Strong institutions make us feel more secure (Rothstein, 2000). Moralistic trust does not depend upon strong legal structures, which are really needed most (and less likely to be available) when trust is low.

Two questions follow from this distinction. First, is there such a thing as “moralistic

trust”? Many find this concept ephemeral, including Martin Paldam (2009, 2010). Second, if there is a basis for moralistic trust, how might it lead to lower perceptions of risk? Generalized trusters’ optimistic world view make them less likely to perceive risk. I show, using a 1996 survey of metropolitan Philadelphia residents by Pew, that generalized (moralistic) trusters—who believe that most people can be trusted—are less likely to see their neighborhoods as unsafe *even controlling for the actual level of violence* as well as personal and family experiences with crime.

## 2: Are There Multiple Types of Trust?

A bond of trust lets us put greater confidence in other people’s promises that they mean what they say when they promise to cooperate (Elster, 1989, 274-275). The “standard” account of trust presumes that trust depends on information and experience.

Both strategic and generalized trust rest upon foundations of risk. I will not loan money to people I don’t trust—where there is a risk that I won’t get paid by back. We decide whether to trust others by previous experience with the person or people like her as a measure of our present level of risk (Misztal, 1996, 18). We may overcome risk by strong institutions such as courts—if you don’t pay me back, I can sue you.

Moralistic or generalized trust is *not* based upon institutional enforcement. It reflects a is a commandment to treat people *as if* they were trustworthy, to take risks in the absence of information about people who are different from ourselves (Mansbridge, 1999). Moralistic trust is based upon “some sort of belief in the goodwill of the other” (Seligman, 1997, 43; cf. Yamigishi and Yamigishi, 1994, 131). Elsewhere I show that the “standard” question on trust reflects: (1) generalized rather than strategic trust and (2) trust of people you don’t know rather than people you know (family, friends, co-workers, neighbors; Uslaner, 2002, ch. 2). The

question clearly implies risk, since the alternative to “most people can be trusted” is “you can’t be too careful dealing with people.”

Moralistic trust may seem as too much of a slippery concept. Hardin (1992) denies that trust can have a moral component. Glaeser et al. (2000) find that the standard survey question (cited above) doesn’t predict trusting behavior.

Paldam’s critiques are even stronger. He challenges Uslaner’s (2002, chs. 2, 4, 6, 8) argument that trust is stable over time. And he also argues that trust is largely a summary of good outcomes in a society such as high income, life satisfaction, and low corruption (Paldam, 2009, 363-364). On stability, Paldam shows (2009, 361-363) substantial variation across countries from 1990 to 2000 using the World Values Survey and notes that the variation in trust is particularly large in the transition countries of Central and Eastern Europe. There is no doubt that life satisfaction and corruption are strongly linked to generalized trust, but the evidence on income—rather than inequality—is weaker (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 8). Paldam’s more general point is that we can predict trust by some traditional variables. Yet, prediction of trust by economic measures doesn’t mean that it is simply the sum of experiences and thus, in Paldam’s (2009, 363) words, “perhaps it is not primary at all.” Paldam’s argument is that trust has no “added value” in solving social problems. Yet prediction of trust doesn’t establish any causal ordering—and it seems as if corruption is more likely to be both a cause and effect of trust (Uslaner, 2008).

It is also risky to compare trust levels from earlier years to measures in 2000. The 2000-2001 wave of the World Values Survey (WVS) has many anomalies, including—or especially—on the measurement of trust. Estimates for some countries seem implausible: Iran has one of the highest levels of interpersonal trust in the world, while trust in Canada supposedly fell precipi-

tously from 1995 in the WVS even as three other surveys show no such fall (Muller, Torgler, and Uslaner, 2012).

I take issue with Paldam's claim that trust has no "added value" and show that trust shapes people's perceptions of public safety *beyond the role of other factors that we would expect to shape such attitudes, including the actual level of safety in a neighborhood*. I show that people who believe that others can be trusted are *less likely to perceive risk even controlling for both subjective and objective indicators of hazard*. Perhaps, then, it may even be primary, contrary to Paldam's argument.

### 3: Why Trust Mitigates Risk

Why should moralistic trust lead to lower perceptions of risk? I offer two reasons.

First, strategic trust is fragile, since new experiences can change one's view of another's trustworthiness (Bok, 1978, 26). But moralistic trust is not fragile, *but quite stable over time*—and from one generation to the next. We learn generalized trust from our parents early in our lives and it doesn't change much over time. And, contrary to Paldam, it is stable over time across countries (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 6; cf. Berggren and Bjornskov, 2011). The stability of trust makes it a psychological anchor against risk.

Second, the social psychological roots of moralistic trust lie in perceptions of optimism and control of your own life (Uslaner, 2002, chs. 2, 4). Optimists are prone to discount bad news and give too much credence to good tidings. Pessimists overemphasize adversity and dismiss upbeat messages. Both groups look at evidence selectively. Their reasoning is a "cognitive 'leap' beyond the expectations that reason and experience alone would warrant" (Lewis and Weigart, 1985, 970; Mansbridge, 1999). Orbell and Dawes (1991, 521, 526) report results from

an experimental game showing that trusters are overly optimistic about the motivations of others. They use their own good intentions (rather than life experiences) to extrapolate about whether strangers would cooperate in a experimental games.

Moralistic trusters are also significantly more likely than mistrusters to say that other people trust them.<sup>1</sup> People who feel good about themselves interpret ambiguous events in a positive light, while people who have a poor self image and who look at life pessimistically interpret the same experiences negatively (Diener, Suh, and Oishi, 1997). Since moralistic trusters look at the world with (at least partial) blinders on, it should not be surprising that this type of trust is not at all fragile—and that **moralistic trust is largely dismissive of risk**. If you believe that things are going to get better—and that you have the capacity to control your life—trusting others isn't so risky.

For pessimists, a stranger is a competitor for what little you have. She may also represent the sinister forces that control your life (as pessimists believe). They suspect that outsiders are trying to exploit them. And, given their long-term history, they might be right. But pessimists might also overestimate the likelihood of a bad experience with a stranger, depriving themselves of the opportunities of mutual exchange. Just as some bad experiences are not going to turn optimists into misanthropes, a few happy encounters with strangers will not change long-term pessimists into trusters. Change is possible, but it is likely to occur slowly.

Mistrusters look at people who are different from themselves (out-groups) with suspicion. A deep-seated pessimism makes people view outsiders as threats to what little they have.<sup>2</sup> Minorities and immigrants are seeking to take jobs away from the majority population; open markets take jobs away from native citizens. Protecting yourself and others like you against

these risks becomes paramount. When people see little hope for the future and believe that others control their fate, they naturally develop a sense of fatalism and mistrust. Perhaps one of the best descriptions came from Edward Banfield's (1958, 110) description of the social distrust in the Italian village of Montegrano in the 1950s, where poverty was rife and people had little hope for the future: "...any advantage that may be given to another is necessarily at the expense of one's own family. Therefore, one cannot afford the luxury of charity, which is giving others more than their due, or even justice, which is giving them their due." Banfield's discussion is controversial—not everyone agrees that Montegrano was marked by such mistrust. However, the picture that Banfield drew is a dramatic portrayal of the misanthrope, who sees risk and danger at every corner.

In contrast, generalized trusters look at people who are different from themselves as members of their moral community. Interacting with them broadens your vistas. So it is hardly surprising that moralistic trusters have warm feelings toward people who are different from themselves, including minorities and, immigrants (Uslaner, 2002, ch. 5).

We should thus expect that trusting people, who see their world as good and getting better, would see their neighborhoods as safer than would pessimists, who see danger clouds ahead everywhere they go.

#### 4: Does Trust Shape Attitudes Toward Risk?

The argument I have laid out suggests that trusters *underestimate* risk. Even when the world outside seems threatening, people who trust others are less likely to see danger than mistrusters. There are alternative perspectives: Hardin (1992, 165) argues that trust is merely "encapsulated experience." His perspective views *all* trust as strategic:



Suppose...that I started life with such a charmed existence that I am now too optimistic about trusting others, so that I often overdo it and get burned. Because I am trusting, I enter into many interactions and I collect data for updating my Bayesian estimates very quickly. My experience soon approaches the aggregate average and I reach an optimal level of trust that pays off well in most of my interactions, more than enough to make up for the occasions when I mistakenly overrate the trustworthiness of another.

Hardin's argument dovetails nicely with Paldam's. On either of their accounts, there should be no "added value" from trust in attitudes toward risk. If trust is simply the set of expectations about people based upon past experiences (Hardin) or the result of other social and economic factors (Paldam), then it is strategic trust with no "moral" content. It is an empty sieve that should have no independent predictive power once the factors shaping trust have been taken into account. If we include measures of one's personal experience and neighborhood crime rates, there would be no reason to believe that (moralistic or generalized) trust would have an independent effect on perceptions of neighborhood safety. If, however, trust stems from an optimistic world view and the belief that one controls her own fate, then we would expect that generalized trusters would feel safer at night—safer than they have any objective reason to believe.

Which of these perspectives is correct? This is not an easy set of claims to test. However, there is an ideal set of data that permits an examination of these three alternative arguments. The Pew Center for the People and the Press 1996 Civic Engagement Survey of metropolitan Philadelphia asked the standard survey question about how safe it is to walk in your neighborhood at night with responses ranging from very safe, somewhat safe, not too safe, to not

at all safe. It also included estimates of *neighborhood violent crime rates*, obtained from records from local police departments as well as a range of relevant attitudinal and demographic variables, including the standard generalized trust dichotomy. The survey sample included residents of the central city as well as the suburban counties of Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery.<sup>3</sup>

If trust matters independently of experience, *trusters should consistently overestimate the level of safety controlling for the actual level of violence in their neighborhoods*. Paldam's arguments that trust is "not primary" or simply an artifact of experiences (Hardin, 1992) would expect no difference between trusters and mistrusters in the level of safety, since information on the level of violence should "wash out" any effects of trust (which is endogenous to information). There is no *a priori* reason to presume that trusters and mistrusters would gain different levels of information, once other factors (such as where you live, etc.) are controlled.

I estimated an ordered probit model of perceptions of safety in one's neighborhood with the "victimization" for rapes (which had the highest correlation with safety) as the key independent variable. Also included are whether you have ever been a victim of crime, how much you trust your city government, whether you live in the center city or a suburb, gender, how much you like both your neighborhood and Philadelphia, how much television news you watch, and whether your parent was a victim of a crime. These control variables should "equalize" information levels to the extent possible.<sup>4</sup> Trust in government and satisfaction with your neighborhood should lead to greater perceptions of safety, assuming that people who have faith in their institutions believe that they are better protected. Central city respondents should feel less safe because crime rates are higher and because criminals—especially violent criminals—will

find the wider streets of suburbia less easily to navigate. People who watch local television news are less likely to feel safe—since local news in the United States and elsewhere is dominated by crime stories (reflected in the saying, “if it bleeds, it leads”—crime is often the first story reported). People who have been victims of a crime or whose parents were victims should also be less likely to see their neighborhoods as safe—and women might feel more vulnerable than men.

I focus on graphs rather than a table for the full ordered probit (details are available upon request). Figure 1 shows that perceptions of safety vary strongly with the actual level of violence. The plot shows the predicted probabilities from the ordered probit for perceived safety according to the level of violence *controlling for all other predictors, including trust*. People who see their neighborhoods as “somewhat safe” are not as strongly affected by the actual level of violence, but even here we see a downward slope as the violence index increases. As the vulnerability of one’s neighborhood to rape increases, people are more likely to say that they feel somewhat safe or not too safe, but the rate of increase is modest. There is a sharp drop in the probability (from about .35 to under .10) of seeing your neighborhood as very safe as the rape vulnerability index rises from its minimum to its maximum.

In Figure 2, I show the probability of saying that your neighborhood is very safe is *far higher among trusters* than among mistrusters. The four curves represent probabilities of saying that it is safe to walk at night by level of rape vulnerability and trust. Living in a very safe neighborhood with the lowest incidences of rape lead to the greatest perceptions of safety. But even in the safest neighborhoods (measure4d objectively), there is a substantial gap between respondents who believe that “most people can be trusted” and those who say “you can’t be too

careful in dealing with people.” Trusters in safe neighborhoods have a probability of .49 of saying that their neighborhoods are safe at night. However, mistrusters in the same neighborhoods have a mean probability of .24 of saying that they feel safe at night. There is clearly “added value” from being a trusting person. At rising levels of danger, it matters less whether you are a truster or a mistruster. We find few trusting people in the most violent neighborhoods (with a vulnerability index of 1477)—and at such high levels we find very few trusters saying that the neighborhood is very safe (about eight percent). We also see about the same share of trusters holding that their neighborhoods are not at all safe. However, in very safe neighborhoods, neither trusters nor mistrusters feel particularly vulnerable. The rate of increase in seeing neighborhoods as much sharper for mistrusters than for people who believe that most people can be trusted (compare the blue curve with the red curve). In the most dangerous neighborhoods, we only find mistrusters—and we also see a sharp drop in perceptions that the neighborhood is very safe (to about 4 percent) and a rise in the share of seeing their areas as not at all safe (to about 20 percent). Three of the curves seem to converge, but this reflects the virtual absence of trusters in the most violent neighborhoods.<sup>5</sup>

Perceptions of safety are not simply a reflection of how trusting people are. As the American military expression goes, “Where you stand depends upon where you sit.” The level of violence plays a big role in perceptions of safety, but so does (even more so) where you live. First I focus on perceptions of whether your neighborhood is very safe (see Figure 3). People living in the central cities have a far lower likelihood of saying that their neighborhood is safe, *regardless of the actual level of violence or their trust/mistrust. Yet, within each area of residence, trusters are substantially more likely to see their neighborhoods as very safe.* At

most levels of violence, suburban trusters are about 20 percent more likely to see their neighborhoods as very safe compared to suburban mistrusters. There is a smaller advantage for trusters in the central city (starting out around 10 percent but ultimately converging at high levels of violence). We cannot make comparisons for very high levels of violence because such high rates only occur in the central city.

Suburban mistrusters are generally more likely to see their neighborhoods as very safe than central city trusters for most levels of rape incidence. So where you live matters a lot. There is far less violence in the suburbs than in the city—and people see their safe neighborhoods as less risky. However, in the safest neighborhoods in *both the suburbs and the city*, trusting respondents see their neighborhoods as safer than do mistrusters.

Finally, I turn to perceptions that your neighborhood is not at all safe (see Figure 4). Here we see similar results to perceptions of “very safe” areas. Trusters in the seclusion of the suburbs seem largely unaffected by the actual level of violent crimes. As the violence index moves from 1 to 356, the probability that a suburban truster views her neighborhood as unsafe barely budges from its initial position at zero. After that value on the rape vulnerability index, we find almost no trusters. But suburban mistrusters increase their perception of unsafe neighborhoods from about zero to 10 percent. Central city trusters also are loathe to say that their neighborhood is not at all safe. Not until the violence index goes above 600 do we see a take-off in the probability curve. Again, we see that trust matters: At the index value of 356, central city trusters are less likely to say that their neighborhood is not at all safe (about 4 percent) than are suburban mistrusters (about 10 percent). Central city mistrusters *always see their neighborhoods as less safe than central city trusters and their perceptions of insecurity*

*rise exponentially as the crime rate goes up.*

---

Figures 1, 2, 3, 4 about here

People's perceptions of the safety of their neighborhoods do depend upon the actual level of violence (though the simple correlation is just  $-.292$ ). But trust matters as well. Trust is not simply a sieve for information and context, as Hardin would have it, or for the economic status of the area, as Paldam would argue. Nor are trusters ever on alert for miscreants. They consistently downplay the level of insecurity. Across every comparison—through actual level of violence and where one lives—trusters believe that their neighborhoods are safer than mistrusters do, *net of any other experiences such as being a victim of crime, having a parent who was a victim, how often you watch local television news and how much you like your neighborhood or the city.* Trusters may not deny contrary evidence, but they discount it.

The Pew measure of safety is not an aberration. Trusters are far less likely to lock their doors. And they are less less likely to feel that they must protect themselves from criminals with a gun (Uslaner, 2002, 199, 263). Next to living in an urban area, trust has the biggest effect of any variable on whether people think they should lock their doors. Even being attacked or robbed three times in the last five years doesn't matter as much as being a truster. In a variety of circumstances, trusters feel more secure against threats.

5: Reprise


Optimists underestimate risk. Are they irrational? Hardly, optimism (and trust) pays. Trusters find it easier to work with others in their community and nation. This cooperative spirit leads to higher levels of economic growth and better functioning legal systems. Trust ultimately

pays better than mistrust. We know from game theory that being nice is better than being mean (Axelrod, 1984). So it should hardly be surprising that depreciating risk is a winning strategy. When you fear encounters with strangers, you lose the opportunity to expand your markets. Trust opens up opportunities: It expands the base of people we interact with. Trust makes us more likely to embrace new technologies. Trust makes us more likely to take risks in daily life and in business. The trusting person seeks cooperation rather than confrontation, so closing the deal is easier when trust is widespread. To be sure, trusters might be more likely to be taken in by rogues. Yet, over the long haul, they will do better than mistrusters *because they are less likely to be consumed by the fear of failure and they are more likely to search for common ground*. And, critically, contrary to Paldam's argument (and that of Hardin), trust does produce added value, even controlling for both objective and subjective perceptions of the environment of crime.

Trust as an alternative to risk makes sense for two reasons: Risk seems threatening and trust has many benefits. Two good reasons are quite sufficient. The famed novelist E.M. Forster (1965, 70) gave "Two Cheers for Democracy" almost four decades ago and his argument can readily be extended to trust (since both provide many benefits to society but neither is a panacea):

...one because it admits variety and two because it permits criticism. Two cheers are quite enough: there is no occasion to give three. Only Love the Beloved Republic deserves that.

Figure 1: Predicted Probabilities: feel safe walking in neighborhood by Rape Incidence



All covariates set at at estimation sample mean



Figure 2: Predicted Probabilities: feel safe walking in neighborhood by Rape Incidence and Trust




Figure 3: Predicted Probabilities: feel very safe by Rape Incidence, Residence, & Trust





Figure 4: Predicted probabilities: Neighborhood not safe by Rape Incidence, Residence, and Trust



## REFERENCES

- Axelrod, R. (1984) *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Banfield, E. (1958) *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Berggren, N. and Bjørnskov, C., 2011. Is the Importance of Religion in Daily Life Related to Social Trust? Cross-country and Cross-state Comparisons. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 80:459-480.
- Diener, E, Suh, E. & Oishi, S. (1997) Recent Findings on Subjective Well-Being. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 24 ( ):25-41.
- Forster, E.M. (1965) wo Cheers for Democracy. In E.M. Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy* (pp. 67-76). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Glaeser, E., Laibson, D., Scheinkman, J. and Soutter, C. (2000) Measuring trust. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3): 811-846.
- Hardin, R. (1992) The Street-Level Epistemology of Trust. *Analyse & Kritik*, 14(S):152-176.
- Lane, R.E. (1959) *Political Life*. New York: Free Press.
- Lewis, J. D. & Weigert, A.. 1985. Trust as a Social Reality. *Social Forces*, 63(4): 967-985.
- Mansbridge, J. (1999) Altruistic Trust. In Mark Warren (Ed.), *Democracy and Trust* (pp. 2090-309). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Misztal, B. A. (1996) *Trust in Modern Societies*. Cambridge, UK. Polity Press.
- Muller, D., Torgler, B. & Uslaner, E.M.. (2012) "Inherited Growth and Trust—A Comment," CREMA Working Paper 2012-04 at <http://www.crema-research.ch/papers/2012-04.pdf>.
- Orbell, J. & Dawes, R.M. (1991) A Cognitive Miser' Theory of Cooperators Advantage. *American Political Science Review*, 85(2):513-28.

- Paldam, M. (2009) The Macro Perspective on Generalized Trust. In G.T. Svendsen and G.L.H. Svendsen (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Capital* (pp. 354-375). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2010) "Generalized Trust: The Macro Perspective." In 331-57 in L. Sacconi & Antoni, G.D. (Eds.), *Social Capital, Corporate Social Responsibility and Performance* (pp. 331-357). London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Rosenberg, M. (1956) Misanthropy and Political Ideology. *American Sociological Review*, 21(6):690-695.
- Sitkin, S.B. & Roth, N.L.. 1993. Explaining the Limited Effectiveness of Legalistic Remedies for Trust/Distrust. *Organization Science*, 4(3): 367-392.
- Uslaner, E. M. (2002) *The Moral Foundations of Trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

## NOTES

- \* The research assistance of Mitchell Brown is greatly appreciated. I am also grateful to the Russell Sage Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation for a grant under the Russell Sage program on The Social Dimensions of Inequality (see [http://www.russellsage.org/programs/proj\\_reviews/social-inequality.htm](http://www.russellsage.org/programs/proj_reviews/social-inequality.htm)) and to the General Research Board of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland—College Park. Some of the data reported here come from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), which is not responsible for any interpretations. Other data come from the Pew Center for The People and The Press and I am grateful to Andrew Kohut for making them available to me. Most of the arguments here come from Uslaner (2002). I am grateful for the comments of David Levin.
1. This finding comes from the Pew Research Center for The People and The Press's 1996 Trust and Citizen Engagement survey in metropolitan Philadelphia. Ninety-seven percent of moralistic trusters said that other people trust them, compared to a still very high eighty-six percent of mistrusters ( $\tau\text{-}b = .174$ ,  $\gamma = .627$ ). This result may reflect either reality—perhaps we are more likely to trust people who trust us—or it may also be part of the general syndrome of overinterpretation.
  2. Most of this section comes from Uslaner (2002), ch. 7. The data bases and the specific statistical analyses (all multivariate) are discussed in that chapter.
  3. For details on the survey, see:  
<http://www.people-press.org/1997/04/18/trust-and-citizen-engagement-in-metropolitan-p>

hiladelphia-a-case-study/ and for more details and the full questionnaire, see <http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/110.pdf>. There is no publicly available description of the rape (or other violence measures) for neighborhoods. The measures run from 1 to over 2000, with the exact interpretation unstated. The source of the data was described to me by Andrew Kohut, then Director of the Pew Center for The People and The Press in a private conversation.

4. I also did estimates including education, but it was not significant. There is no clear theoretical linkage between education and perceptions of safety so there is no reason to include it in the models.
5. Do more trusting neighborhoods lead to less violence or does less violence lead to greater trust? Likely the direction of causality goes both ways, but this is not the place to examine this question (cf. Uslaner, 2002, chs. 5, 8).