

Parental divorce and trust

Tarja K. Viitanen[†]

University of Otago and IZA

PRELIMINARY - Please do not quote without permission

Keywords: Parental divorce, generalized trust, HILDA, random effects ordered probit

JEL Codes: J12, J13, Z13

Abstract:

This paper examines the effect of parental divorce during childhood on generalized trust later on in life using Australian HILDA panel data. The dependent variable is composed of answers to the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The main explanatory variables include the occurrence of parental divorce for the whole sample and the age at which parents divorced for the sub-sample. The analysis is conducted using random effects ordered probit and correlated random effects ordered probit models. The results indicate that the level of generalized trust is significantly affected by parental divorce for both men and women. However, there are no significant differences in the expressed level of generalized trust due to age at which parents divorced.

[†] I would like to thank Arnaud Chevalier and an anonymous referee for comments on earlier drafts of the paper. Contact details: Tarja Viitanen, Department of Economics, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Tel: +64 3 4795296. E-mail: tarja.viitanen@otago.ac.nz

1. Introduction

At individual level, parental divorce is associated with lower levels of trust in their parents and future intimate partners (Franklin et al., 1990; King, 2002). This paper examines whether parental divorce has wider societal impacts, specifically whether it can affect generalized trust. Social capital including trust is found to have a significant economic payoff (Knack and Keefer, 1997; La Porta et al., 1997; Berggren, 2006; Bjornskov 2006). Although the effect of divorce has been estimated for outcomes of economic interest, for example, education, marriage and divorce propensity, and family incomes (Lang & Zagorski, 2001; Corak, 2001; Gruber, 2004; Gonzalez and Viitanen, 2008), the effect has never been estimated for generalized trust.

This paper analyses the effect of parental divorce during childhood on generalized trust later on in life using Australian HILDA panel data. The analysis is conducted using random effects ordered probit models. The dependent variable is composed of answers to the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The main explanatory variables include the occurrence of parental divorce for the whole sample and the age at which parents divorced for the sub-sample.

The results show that both men and women with divorced parents are in general significantly less likely to express trust in other people for the whole sample. The Family Law Act of 1975, which came into force on 5 January 1976, introduced the no-fault divorce in Australia and superseded previous state and territory laws. Restricting the sample to those born in 1976 or later, that is, after easier divorce had been introduced shows large negative effects for women of the effect of parental divorce on generalized trust. The results for the sub-sample of men however become insignificant. Further analysis examining the effect of

the age of the child when parental divorce took place does not show any statistically significant effects of age at parental divorce on generalized trust.

2. Data and econometric method

This analysis is based on the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey, which is a nationally-representative Australian household-based panel survey that has been conducted since 2001.

The primary outcome measure used in this analysis is a 7-point Likert scale answer to question “To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please indicate, by crossing one box on each line, how strongly you agree or disagree with each. a) Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”, where the scale runs from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). This outcome measure is part of the Self-Completion Questionnaire, which is not part of the face-to-face interview. Furthermore, this variable is only available in waves 5, 6 and 8 of the survey.

Of the initial Hilda sample for waves 1-9 (160,084 observations), 52,066 individuals participated in waves 5, 6, and/or 8. The minimum age of the sample individual is restricted to 15 since this is the age when Self-Completion Questionnaire is required to be completed; this reduces the sample size to 40,839 observations. There are 6,889 missing values for trust data and a further 6,457 missing values for the parental divorce data¹. This reduces the sample size to 27,493. Further 6 observations are not used due to missing socio-economic status variable. There are missing values for number of siblings (665 observations) and the oldest child (590 observations) dummy, instead of dropping these observations a dummy for missing cells is included in all regressions and the variable is recoded accordingly. In the end

¹ Spearman rank-correlation coefficient between missing response for the generalized trust question and parental divorce is insignificant; the correlation coefficient between missing parental divorce variable and generalized trust is -0.08 and significant at 1% level. Although the parental divorce may not be missing at random, this is likely to lead to an underestimate of the true effect of parental divorce on generalized trust.

we have a sample size of 27,482 observations. Descriptive statistics for both, the male (N=12,869) and female (N=14,613) subsamples are provided in Table 1.

Alesina and LaFerrara (2000) outline the possible hypotheses of the determinants of trust: 1) moral or cultural attitude, 2) trust based on past experience, 3) trusting people who are more similar to oneself, 4) trusting people with whom they have known longer and 5) legal institutions. The control variables in this analysis control for as many of the other determinants of trust as the data allows; Table 1 summarises these variables for the sample.

[Table 1 about here]

Approximately 10% of the sample has experienced parental divorce; 10% of the divorces occurred before the child turned 7 years of age and 50% occurred before they turned 16. A typical respondent is in their mid-40s with diploma/certificate level education for men and year 11 or below education level for women. About a third of the sample have their own children. Stability measures the number of years at the current address, which is 10 years on average for the sample.

Deciles 1-10 refer to the SEIFA 2001 index of relative socio-economic advantage/disadvantage, where 1 is the lowest and 10 is the highest decile. Out of the health conditions, the most common one is limited use of feet/legs with about 5% of the sample. Second most common ailment is nervous or emotional condition with 2.4% of men and 3.5% of women of the sample suffering from these health conditions. Indigenous refers to aboriginal or Torres Strait origin. 27% of the sample individuals have both parents with an immigrant background.

As discussed previously, the main dependent variable is a 7-point Likert scale answer to the question “To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements?”

Please indicate, by crossing one box on each line, how strongly you agree or disagree with each. a) Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”, where the scale runs from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). An OLS analysis treats Likert-scale variables as cardinal. However, it is likely that respondents do not treat an attitude level 4 as four times as trusting as those reporting response 1. Therefore the econometric method takes into account the ordinal nature of the dependent variable by using an ordinal response model.

The central idea of the ordered response model is that there is a latent continuous metric y^* underlying the ordinal responses observed by the researcher. The latent variable specification of the estimated random effects ordered probit model can be written as:

$$y_{it}^* = \beta x_{it} + \alpha_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where x_{it} is a set of observed variables that may be associated with the generalized trust indicator, α_i is an individual-specific, time-invariant random component capturing individual-specific heterogeneity and ε_{it} is assumed to be a random error term. The random error is assumed to be strictly exogenous, that is uncorrelated with x_{it} .

The observed generalized trust variable is assumed to be related to the latent generalized trust variable y^* in the following way:

$$y_{it} = j \quad \text{if} \quad \mu_{j-1} < y_{it}^* < \mu_j \quad , j = 1, \dots, J \quad (2)$$

where J is the number of response categories. An ordered probit model estimates an underlying score as a linear function of the control variables and a set of cutpoints or threshold parameters μ_j that are empirically estimated. Equation (2) states that if y_{it}^* is between μ_{j-1} and μ_j , the response to the question on generalized trust is equal to j ($y_{it} = j$). The ordered probit models are estimated using ordered probit available in Stata (Release 11, Stata Corporation) and random effects ordered probit estimator, which is a user-written

program introduced to Stata by Frechette (2001a, 2001b). The random effects ordered probit model is estimated using maximum likelihood estimation with the likelihood for each unit approximated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature (see Butler and Moffitt, 1982 for more details).

The assumption that the random error term is uncorrelated with x_{it} is restrictive and if it is not satisfied, the estimates may be inconsistent. Correlated random effects ordered probit estimation allows for the possibility that the observed regressors may be correlated with the individual effect (Mundlak, 1978, Chamberlain, 1984, Wooldridge, 2009). In practice the individual effect is parameterized allowing correlation between the individual effects and the means of the regressors:

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \bar{x}_i + u_i \quad (3)$$

where \bar{x}_i is the average of the observations on the exogenous variables over the sample period and u_i are independent of the x variables.

The models are estimated separately for men and women. This is to ensure that the variance of the residual is not constrained to be the same in the two groups as would be the case with pooled data².

3. Results of the impact of parental divorce on generalized trust

3.1 Effect of the incidence of parental divorce on generalized trust

This section examines the effect of parental divorce on generalized trust later in life. Table 2 presents the results of the effect of parental divorce on generalized trust for women using ordered probit, random effects ordered probit and correlated random effects ordered

² The results estimated using pooled data with intercept shifts and both intercept and slope shifts are available from the author upon request.

probit. The tables report the probit coefficients³. Estimates of the six threshold parameters (μ) are significant at the 1% level but are not reported due to space considerations. All of the regressions also include dummies for missing values for education, number of siblings and being oldest child variables; these are not significant in any of the models and hence are not reported in the tables of results. Year dummies to control for the time-dimension of the panel data were included in the model but were found not to affect the inferences and hence were not included in the final specifications.

The main independent variable looking at whether one's parents were divorced is negative and statistically significant across all specifications. This implies that women with divorced parents are in general less likely to express trust in other people.

[Table 2 about here]

Education level has a positive effect on the level of generalized trust with those with higher levels of education more likely to have a high level of generalized trust. Interestingly, the number of own siblings is negatively associated with one's level of trust, while being the oldest is positively related to the level of generalized trust. While the education and number of siblings effects become insignificant in the correlated random effects model, the variable oldest child remains significant across all specifications.

The effect of a long-term health condition is investigated by including dummy variables for 1) a nervous/emotional condition, 2) any disfigurement/deformity, 3) limited use of feet or legs, and 4) a mental illness. All of these are significant and negative in model (1), while disfigurement/deformity loses significance in the random effects ordered probit model.

³ Average marginal effects or marginal effects at the mean are not straightforward to calculate since the marginal effect depends on the realisation of the random effect and these are not calculated by the estimation procedure.

All of the health condition variables become insignificant in the correlated random effects specification, some of which may be due to larger standard errors.

The results for men are reported in Table 3. The main independent variable looking at whether one's parents were divorced is negative and significant across all the specifications implying that men with divorced parents are less likely to trust other people in general.

[Table 3 about here]

For men only the higher education variables are significantly different from zero, unlike for women for whom the results were significant and increasing with the level of education. Interestingly the random effects ordered probit indicates that having own children is associated with higher levels of one's generalized trust. Nervous or emotional health condition is the only one that is significantly associated with lower level of generalized trust across all specifications for men.

Important from a policy perspective is the finding that having immigrant parents (either one or both depending on specification) is marginally associated with lower levels of generalized trust. This could indicate some problems assimilating to the Australian society and might deserve more detailed research.

Likelihood ratio statistics were used to compare the random effects ordered probit model with the simple pooled ordered probit model. Specifically the null hypothesis of the test is $\alpha_i = 0$. When α_i is not zero the panel-level variance component is important and the random effects ordered probit is a significant improvement on the simple pooled ordered probit. Results for both men and women indicate that the α_i is important and hence further analysis is conducted using random effects ordered probit and correlated random effects ordered probit.

Further random effects ordered probit models are run for the following dependent variables that can be considered similar in nature to the generalized trust question used as a dependent variable thus far. These variables include 7-point Likert scale composed of slightly/moderately/strongly agreeing or disagreeing (with 4 being neutral) with the following statements: 1) “Most people you meet make agreements honestly”, 2) “Most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance” and 3) “Neighborhood: People in this neighborhood can be trusted”. The parental divorce dummy is not significant for either gender in any of these regressions. Hence the generalized trust question appears to capture the individual’s trust in general rather than any grievances one may feel due to previous bad experiences regarding specific past agreements.

3.2 Robustness of results to changes in divorce laws

The Matrimonial Causes Act of 1959 introduced the first uniform divorce laws across the Australian states and territories, however, state and territory laws continued to apply to cases where spouses were seeking orders relating to their children or their property (Family Court of Australia, 2009). The Family Law Act of 1975 introduced the no-fault divorce in Australia, which came into force on 5 January 1976. This law superseded state and territory laws regarding "guardianship, custody, access and maintenance of children of a marriage" (Family Court of Australia, 2009). Since there is no information on the state of residence during childhood in the HILDA data, the analysis is restricted to individuals who lived all their childhood after easier divorce had been introduced i.e. those born in 1976 or later. This restricts the sample to individuals who are a maximum of 29 years old in 2005, 30 years old in 2006 or 32 in 2008. The results for this sub-sample are reported in Table 4.

Table 4 reports random effects ordered probit models for women and men in columns 1 and 3 respectively, and correlated random effects ordered probits in columns 2 and 4. The

effect of parental divorce on generalized trust is highly significant and negative for this sub-sample of women, about twice in magnitude compared to the full sample results reported in Table 2. The results for the sub-sample of men are negative but fail to be significant.

[Table 4 about here]

Education has similar effects compared to the full sample with the more highly educated, reporting higher generalized trust. For women only, being the oldest child increases trust while a nervous or emotional condition decreases it for both men and women; however, these results disappear in the correlated random effects specification. What remains significant in both specifications is a negative effect of limited use of feet or legs for men. Interestingly for this younger sub-sample of men, being of indigenous origin has a marginally significant negative effect on the level of generalized trust.

3.3 Effect of age at parental divorce

This section examines whether the age at which parents divorced affects ones level of generalized trust. The analysis is restricted to individuals whose parents have divorced; this reduces the sample size to 1,521 women and 1,360 men for the full sample (Table 5). The sub-sample of individuals born after the introduction of no-fault divorce across the states of Australia contains too few individuals and the models are not estimable.

Table 5 reports random effects ordered probit (columns 1 and 3) and correlated random effects ordered probit (columns 2 and 4) results separately for men and women. The estimates are only reported for the main variables of interest that is dummies for whether parental divorce happened when the child was 0-4 years old, 5-12 years old, 13-17 years old, or 18 or older. Alternative specifications including linear, quadratic and cubic terms of age at parental divorce were never significant for either men or women.

The results reported in Table 5 indicate that there are no significant effects of age at parental divorce on generalized trust. The coefficient estimate for women is large and negative for those women who experienced parental divorce between ages 0 to 4, however, this result is statistically not different from zero.

[Table 5 about here]

4. Conclusions

This paper analyses the effect of parental divorce during childhood on generalized trust later on in life using Australian HILDA panel data. The analysis is conducted using ordered probit, random effects ordered probit and correlated random effects probit. The dependent variable is a 7-point Likert scale answer agreeing or disagreeing with the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The main explanatory variable is the occurrence of parental divorce. The effect is estimated for the whole sample and for the sample of 15-29 year olds who lived in an era of easier divorce. Further analysis is conducted examining the effect at which parents divorced for the level of generalized trust.

The results indicate that the level of generalized trust is significantly affected by parental divorce with both men and women who have experienced parental divorce expressing significantly lower levels of generalized trust for the main sample. The results remain strong for women but lose statistical significance for men for the sub-sample of individuals born after easier no-fault divorce was introduced across Australia.

Throughout the different specifications, there is a marginally significant negative effect of having one or both parents being immigrants. This is an interesting effect in itself and deserves further research.

Further analysis examining the effect of the age of the child when parental divorce took place does not show any statistically significant effects of age at parental divorce on generalized trust.

References

- Alesina, A. and La Ferrara, E. (2000) "The determinants of trust", NBER Working Paper No. 7621.
- Alesina, A. and La Ferrara, E. (2002) "Who trusts others?", *Journal of Public Economics*, 85(2): 207-234.
- Berggren, N. and Jordahl, H. (2006) "Free to Trust: Economic Freedom and Social Capital", *Kyklos*, 59(2): 141-169.
- Bjornskov, C. (2006) "Determinants of generalized trust: a cross-country comparison", *Public Choice*, 130: 1-21.
- Bjornskov, C. (2006) "The multiple facets of social capital", *European Journal of Political Economy*, 22(1): 22-40.
- Butler, J.S. and Moffitt, R. (1982) "A computationally efficient quadrature procedure for the one-factor multinomial probit model", *Econometrica*, 50: 761-764.
- Chamberlain, G. (1984) *Panel data*. Chapter 22, pp. 1247-1318. North Holland, Amsterdam. in handbook of Econometrics, Vol. 1, edited by Griliches, Z. And Intriligator, M.
- Corak, M. (2001) "Death and divorce: the long-term consequences of parental loss on adolescents", *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(3): 682-715.
- Dolan, P., Peasgood, T. and White, M. (2008) "Do we really know what makes us happy? A review of the economic literature on the factors associated with subjective well-being", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29: 94-122.
- Family Court of Australia (2009) http://www.familycourt.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/FCOA/home/about/For_Students/FCOA_Student_AFL, accessed November 24 2009.
- Franklin, K. M., Janoff-Bulman, R. and Roberts, J. E. (1990) "Long-term impact of parental divorce on optimism and trust: changes in general assumptions or narrow beliefs", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(4): 743-755.
- Frechette, G. (2001a) "Sg158: random-effects ordered probit", *Stata Technical Bulletin*, 59: 23-27 Reprints 10, 261-266.
- Frechette, G. (2001b) "Sg158.1: update to random-effects ordered probit", *Stata Technical Bulletin* 61: 12 Reprints 10, 266-267.
- Gonzalez, L. and Viitanen, T.K. (2008) "The Long Term Effects of Legalizing Divorce on Children", IZA Discussion Paper No. 3789.

Gruber, J. (2004) “Is Making Divorce Easier Bad for Children? The Long-Run Implications of Unilateral Divorce”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 22(4): 799-833.

Lang, K. and Zagorsky, J.L. (2001) “Does growing up with a parent absent really hurt?”, *Journal of Human Resources*, 36(2): 253-273.

La Porta R., Lopez de Silanes, F. Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (1997) “Trust in large organizations”, *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 87(2): 333-338.

King, V. (2002) “Parental Divorce and Interpersonal Trust in Adult Offspring”, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(3): 642-656

Knack, S. and Keefer, P. (1997) “Does social capital have an economic payoff?”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112: 1251-1273.

Mundlak, Y. (1978) “On the pooling of time-series and cross-section data”, *Econometrica*, 46(1): 69-85.

Rowthorn, R. (1999) “Marriage and trust: some lessons from economics”, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 23: 661-691.

Wooldridge, J. (2009) “Correlated random effects models with unbalanced panels”, Manuscript (version July 2009), Michigan State University.

Table 1: Summary statistics

	Males	Females
Parents divorced	0.106 (0.307)	0.108 (0.311)
Personal		
Age	44.946 (17.840)	44.340 (18.767)
Education: yr 11 and below	0.302 (0.459)	0.388 (0.487)
Education: yr 12	0.137 (0.344)	0.157 (0.364)
Education: diploma or certificate	0.370 (0.483)	0.239 (0.426)
Education: bachelor or honours	0.128 (0.334)	0.133 (0.339)
Education: postgraduate	0.092 (0.289)	0.083 (0.276)
Own children 0-14	0.311 (0.463)	0.341 (0.474)
Stability	10.697 (12.024)	10.376 (12.081)
Decile 1	0.090 (0.287)	0.093 (0.290)
Decile 2	0.101 (0.302)	0.109 (0.312)
Decile 3	0.105 (0.307)	0.107 (0.310)
Decile 4	0.094 (0.291)	0.097 (0.295)
Decile 5	0.103 (0.304)	0.097 (0.296)
Decile 6	0.091 (0.288)	0.086 (0.281)
Decile 7	0.098 (0.298)	0.101 (0.301)
Decile 8	0.103 (0.304)	0.103 (0.304)
Decile 9	0.109 (0.312)	0.104 (0.305)
Decile 10	0.112 (0.315)	0.103 (0.304)
Health Conditions		
A nervous or emotional condition	0.024 (0.152)	0.035 (0.184)
Limited use of feet/legs	0.048 (0.214)	0.052 (0.221)
Mental illness	0.009 (0.095)	0.012 (0.111)
Any disfigurement/deformity	0.006 (0.077)	0.005 (0.068)
Stigma		
Indigenous	0.002 (0.040)	0.003 (0.052)
Immigrant mother	0.323 (0.468)	0.325 (0.468)
Immigrant father	0.356 (0.479)	0.355 (0.478)
Both parents immigrants	0.274 (0.446)	0.272 (0.445)
Region		
Sydney	0.160 (0.367)	0.170 (0.376)
Balance of NSW	0.138 (0.345)	0.136 (0.343)
Melbourne	0.183 (0.387)	0.173 (0.378)
Balance of Victoria	0.075 (0.263)	0.071 (0.257)
Brisbane	0.088 (0.283)	0.094 (0.292)
Balance of QLD	0.113 (0.317)	0.114 (0.317)
Adelaide	0.060 (0.238)	0.063 (0.243)
Balance of SA	0.032 (0.177)	0.030 (0.170)
Perth	0.070 (0.255)	0.068 (0.252)
Balance of WA	0.029 (0.168)	0.024 (0.153)
Tasmania	0.031 (0.173)	0.032 (0.175)
Northern Territory	0.006 (0.078)	0.007 (0.082)

ACT	0.020 (0.139)	0.019 (0.137)
Number of observations	12,869	14,613

Note: Standard deviation in parentheses.

Table 2: The effect of parental divorce on generalized trust for women

	(1) Ordered probit	(2) Random effects ordered probit	(3) Correlated random effects ordered probit
Divorced parents	-0.068 (0.035) **	-0.091 (0.045) **	-0.082 (0.048) *
Age	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.005 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)
Age squared	0.000 (0.000) ***	0.000 (0.000) ***	0.000 (0.000) ***
Education: yr 12	0.071 (0.034) **	0.093 (0.041) **	0.124 (0.100)
Education: diploma or certificate	0.029 (0.029)	0.064 (0.036) *	0.516 (0.119) ***
Education: bachelor or honours	0.189 (0.036) ***	0.261 (0.045) ***	0.504 (0.164) ***
Education: postgraduate	0.230 (0.029) ***	0.423 (0.053) ***	0.776 (0.216) ***
Kids 0-14	-0.013 (0.024)	-0.015 (0.029)	-0.071 (0.055)
Stability	0.001 (0.001)	0.002 (0.001) *	0.002 (0.001)
Number of siblings	-0.012 (0.006) **	-0.018 (0.007) **	-0.017 (0.007) **
Oldest child	0.052 (0.024) **	0.062 (0.0309) **	0.059 (0.031) *
Indigenous	0.244 (0.260)	0.319 (0.281)	0.304 (0.281)
Parents non-Oz	-0.063 (0.071)	-0.100 (0.087)	-0.098 (0.087)
Mom non-Oz	-0.107 (0.054) **	-0.118 (0.066) *	-0.123 (0.066) *
Dad non-Oz	-0.016 (0.042)	-0.018 (0.053)	-0.013 (0.053)
A nervous or emotional condition	-0.301 (0.061) ***	-0.239 (0.065) ***	0.057 (0.083)
Limited use of feet/legs	-0.190 (0.050) ***	-0.188 (0.054) ***	-0.048 (0.070)
Mental illness	-0.365 (0.104) ***	-0.455 (0.111) ***	-0.305 (0.146) **
Any disfigurement or deformity	-0.399 (0.151) ***	-0.242 (0.168)	0.096 (0.200)
Mundlak correction	no	no	yes
Region	yes	yes	yes
Socio-economic status	yes	yes	yes
Observations	14,613	14,613	14,613

The dependent variable is a 7-point Likert scale composed of slightly/moderately/strongly agreeing or disagreeing (with 4 being neutral) with the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The coefficient estimates for the socio-economic status and region are not reported but are available on request.

Standard errors are in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered for ordered probit model (1). Coefficient significance levels are denoted by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table 3: The effect of parental divorce on generalized trust for men

	(1) Ordered probit	(2) Random effects ordered probit	(3) Correlated random effects ordered probit
Divorced parents	-0.083 (0.039) **	-0.102 (0.048) **	-0.097 (0.048) **
		-0.013 (0.004) ***	-0.013 (0.004) ***
Age	-0.009 (0.004) **	0.000 (0.000) ***	
Age squared	0.000 (0.000) ***	0.042 (0.047)	0.000 (0.000) ***
Education: yr 12	0.021 (0.038)	-0.027 (0.038)	0.220 (0.104) **
Education: diploma or certificate	0.031 (0.031)	0.026 (0.052) ***	0.303 (0.138) **
Education: bachelor or honours	0.189 (0.042) ***	0.268 (0.061) ***	0.664 (0.197) ***
Education: postgraduate	0.188 (0.048) ***	-0.009 (0.030)	0.855 (0.267) ***
Kids 0-14	-0.007 (0.025)	0.005 (0.001) ***	-0.081 (0.055)
Stability	0.005 (0.001) ***	0.009 (0.008)	0.005 (0.001) ***
Number of siblings	0.009 (0.007)	0.048 (0.033)	0.009 (0.008)
Oldest child	0.034 (0.025)	-0.316 (0.279)	0.046 (0.033)
Indigenous	-0.225 (0.257)	-0.053 (0.092)	-0.299 (0.280)
Parents non-Oz	-0.025 (0.070)	-0.129 (0.070) *	-0.054 (0.092)
Mom non-Oz	-0.102 (0.052) *	-0.035 (0.055)	-0.126 (0.070) *
Dad non-Oz	-0.034 (0.043)	-0.510 (0.084) ***	-0.034 (0.055)
A nervous or emotional condition	-0.452 (0.075) ***	-0.129 (0.059) **	-0.378 (0.111) ***
Limited use of feet/legs	-0.130 (0.057) **	-0.007 (0.129)	0.036 (0.077)
Mental illness	-0.042 (0.131)	-0.045 (0.158)	0.223 (0.165)
Any disfigurement or deformity	-0.044 (0.125)		0.054 (0.199)
Mundlak correction	no	no	yes
Region	yes	yes	yes
Socio-economic status	yes	yes	yes
Observations	12,869	12,869	12,869

The dependent variable is a 7-point Likert scale composed of slightly/moderately/strongly agreeing or disagreeing (with 4 being neutral) with the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The coefficient estimates for the socio-economic status and region are not reported but are available on request.

Standard errors are in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered for ordered probit model (1). Coefficient significance levels are denoted by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table 4: The effect of parental divorce on generalized trust for a subsample born in 1976 or later

	WOMEN		MEN	
	(1) Random effects ordered probit	(2) Correlated random effects ordered probit	(3) Random effects ordered probit	(4) Correlated random effects ordered probit
Divorced parents	-0.225 *** (0.088)	-0.233 *** (0.089)	-0.043 (0.087)	-0.050 (0.087)
Age	-0.221 *** (0.061)	-0.201 *** (0.063)	-0.290 *** (0.060)	-0.285 *** (0.060)
Age squared	0.005 *** (0.001)	0.005 *** (0.001)	0.006 *** (0.001)	0.006 *** (0.001)
Education: yr 12	0.130 * (0.076)	0.215 * (0.113)	0.155 ** (0.074)	0.344 *** (0.113)
Education: diploma or certificate	0.025 (0.088)	0.750 *** (0.173)	0.041 (0.087)	0.210 (0.172)
Education: bachelor or honours	0.352 *** (0.100)	0.671 *** (0.197)	0.461 *** (0.106)	0.825 *** (0.235)
Education: postgraduate	0.433 *** (0.141)	0.849 *** (0.281)	0.264 (0.176)	0.854 *** (0.420)
Kids 0-14	-0.037 (0.056)	-0.072 (0.090)	0.016 (0.057)	-0.034 (0.090)
Stability	0.005 (0.004)	0.005 (0.004)	0.003 (0.004)	0.002 (0.004)
Number of siblings	0.001 (0.019)	-0.000 (0.020)	0.001 (0.021)	-0.000 (0.022)
Oldest child	0.128 ** (0.060)	0.122 ** (0.062)	-0.022 (0.059)	-0.026 (0.059)
Indigenous	0.385 (0.311)	0.368 (0.314)	-0.472 (0.303)	-0.485 (0.304)
Parents non-Oz	-0.215 (0.148)	-0.227 (0.151)	-0.065 (0.147)	-0.047 (0.148)
Mom non-Oz	-0.057 (0.105)	-0.064 (0.107)	-0.185 * (0.106)	-0.192 * (0.106)
Dad non-Oz	0.014 (0.092)	0.025 (0.093)	0.029 (0.089)	0.028 (0.089)
A nervous or emotional condition	-0.475 *** (0.173)	0.168 (0.226)	-0.761 *** (0.286)	-0.600 (0.469)
Limited use of feet/legs	-0.214 (0.275)	-0.122 (0.357)	-0.667 *** (0.255)	-0.671 ** (0.332)
Mental illness	-0.027 (0.224)	0.067 (0.300)	0.479 (0.366)	0.139 (0.480)
Any disfigurement or deformity	-0.513 (0.488)	0.782 (0.680)	-0.323 (1.158)	0.394 (1.284)
Mundlak correction	no	yes	no	yes
Region	yes	yes	yes	yes
Socio-economic status	yes	yes	yes	yes

Observations	3,485	3,485	3,210	3,210
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

The dependent variable is a 7-point Likert scale composed of slightly/moderately/strongly agreeing or disagreeing (with 4 being neutral) with the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The coefficient estimates for the socio-economic status and region are not reported but are available on request. Standard errors are in parentheses. Coefficient significance levels are denoted by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table 5: The effect of age at parental divorce on generalized trust

	WOMEN		MEN	
	(1) Random effects ordered probit	(2) Correlated random effects ordered probit	(3) Random effects ordered probit	(4) Correlated random effects ordered probit
Age 0-4 years	-0.266 (0.183)	-0.250 (0.184)	0.159 (0.205)	0.174 (0.206)
Age 5-12 years	0.091 (0.139)	0.132 (0.141)	0.103 (0.139)	0.126 (0.140)
Age 13-17 years	0.005 (0.096)	0.014 (0.097)	0.151 (0.104)	0.152 (0.104)
Mundlak correction	no	yes	no	yes
Individual controls	yes	yes	yes	yes
Region	yes	yes	yes	yes
Socio-economic status	yes	yes	yes	yes
Observations	1,562	1,562	1,360	1,360

The dependent variable is a 7-point Likert scale composed of slightly/moderately/strongly agreeing or disagreeing (with 4 being neutral) with the statement: “Generally speaking, most people can be trusted”. The coefficient estimates for the individual controls are not reported but are available on request.

Standard errors are in parentheses. Coefficient significance levels are denoted by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).