Center for European, Governance and Economic Development Research | cege

cege Discussion Paper

No. 412

March 2021

Language and Xenophobia

Florian Rottner

GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN

ISSN: 1439-2305

Language and Xenophobia

By FLORIAN ROTTNER*

Draft: March 4, 2021

Previous research examining attitudes toward foreigners and immigration has focused primarily on economic, socioeconomic, and cultural variables to explain the different attitudes of individuals toward foreigners. With my research, I add language as another dimension to explain these differences. I use the difference in how languages distinguish between different politeness groups in their second person pronouns to explain how much trust individuals place in foreigners. Using data from the World Value Survey and the World Atlas of Language Structure I find that individuals who speak a language without politeness distinctions have a higher probability to respond that they trust foreigners.

What factors determine people's attitude towards foreigners. Why are some countries in the world considered immigration countries and others not. This is one of the most exciting questions of our time. In the United States, the 2016 presidential election was won by a candidate who aggressively campaigned for a wall on the border with Mexico to limit immigration. In the same year, one of the slogans of the Leave campaign during the vote on Brexit was "take back control of our borders" to stop immigration from Eastern Europe. On the other hand, during the refugee crisis in 2015, Germany voluntarily opened its borders to people from Syria, thus coining the term "welcome culture". Previous research has focused on non-economic factors, such as cultural values or political views, and economic factors, such as competition in the labour market, as explanations for the differences in people's attitudes towards foreigners. In my research I want to provide another approach to explain why people differ in their attitudes towards foreigners,

* University of Goettingen, Department of Economics, Platz der Goettinger Sieben 3, 37073 Goettingen, Germany; email: florian.rottner@uni-goettingen.de

namely their language. My research shows that the language someone speaks has an influence on their attitude towards foreigners.

About 6500 languages are spoken worldwide, which differ in many features. Germans for example divide people linguistically into two different groups. For family and close friends they use the personal ”you” as a pronoun. But there is also the polite ”Sie” for strangers or people of higher rank. In the German language, 2nd person pronouns are thus divided into two groups of politeness. English does not know such a distinction, ”you” is always used as a form of address completely independent of the social relationship between the speaker and the person addressed. Some languages even distinguish more than two groups of politeness. In Marathi, for example, there is a separate polite pronoun for priests. Other languages avoid pronouns completely as a sign of politeness towards the person addressed and use titles or kinship terms instead. My hypothesis is based on this distinction between languages that have a politeness distinction in their second person pronouns and those that have none. When strangers for one person linguistically belong to another group such as family and close friends, i.e. people you trust, this has an effect on their behaviour. Every time you address these people, the language reminds you by using a different pronoun that they are strangers who have not yet made it into the inner social circle. This leads to a more negative attitude towards foreigners than a speaker of a language that does not make a distinction between politeness and politeness. For these persons, foreigners are linguistically closer, since they are addressed in the same way as family members and close friends. This leads to a more friendly and welcoming attitude towards foreigners, as both groups are linguistically equal.

This linguistic effect should not only reflect cultural preferences of a society. It is an effect that exists in addition to culture and can theoretically go in a different direction than the effect of culture. This hypothesis is based on linguistic relativism (also Sapir-Whorf hypothesis) (Sapir 1921, Slobin 1996, Whorf 1964), which in its weak form states that linguistic categories and usage influence thought and decisions. The linguistic differentiation of people into at least two groups, one that is close to us and one to which we are more distant, thus influences our behaviour and leads to a more adverse attitude

towards foreigners.

To test my hypothesis I use a ordered probit model to empirically analyze an individuals attitude towards foreigners across languages, using data from the sixth wave of the World Value Survey (WVS), carried out from 2010 to 2014 (*World Values Survey: Round Six - Country-Pooled Datafile Version* 2014). I'm interested in question V107, which asks participants directly how much trust they place into people of other nationalities. They can choose their answer from 4 categories with descending trust level from *Trust completley* to *Do not trust at all*. This is an advantage over indirect measurements of personal preferences such as voting or lobbying, as these are also influenced by preferences in other policy areas. A second advantage of the WVS data for my analysis is that it contains information about the language the participants speak at home. This gives me some national variations of the language feature due to immigrants and their descendants still speaking their mother tongue or the mother tongue of their parents at home, and for countries where several languages are spoken in everyday life. The information on the politeness distinction in 2nd person pronouns of the different languages comes from the World Atlas of Language Structure (WALS) (Helmbrecht 2013). WALS divides languages into 4 different groups based on whether they have a politeness distinction and if so, how many politeness groups they have. I reduce this to two groups, because for my research question I am only interested in whether there is a distinction of politeness or not.

I find a negative effect of the politeness distinction on the degree to which respondents trust foreigners: The marginal effects show that people who speak a language with a politeness distinction are more likely to answer the question with "Not at all trust" or "Not very trust" than people whose language does not have a politeness distinction. In contrast, for the categories "Trust somewhat" and "Trust fully," the marginal effects are positive. The size of the effects ranges from just under 2 to just under 8 percent. These effects are robust to a variety of control variables. When the country fixed effects are omitted to account for the effect of Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Hofstede 2001), which have previously been found to affect attitudes toward foreigners (Leong and Ward 2006), the

results hold. Furthermore, I use two different subsamples to overcome the limitations of my original data set. The results of these additional regressions are consistent with previous results and support my original findings. In addition, I still repeat my regressions with a data set that uses *Global Preference Survey* (GPS) (Falk et al. 2018, Falk et al. 2016) preferences instead of Hofstede's cultural dimensions as controls for cultural idiosyncrasies. These regressions also confirm my results.

There is a growing literature on the effect of language structures on the behaviour of individuals. Chen (2013) and Roberts et al. (2015) have shown that people who speak a language without necessary distinction between present and future act more future-oriented. They save more, retire with more assets, smoke less, practice safer sex and are less obese. Similar savings behaviour is also found for corporations (Chen et al. 2017). Kim et al. (2017) find that in countries where langauges do not require speakers to grammatically mark future events managers are less likely to engage in earnings management as future consequences of it are perceived more imminent. Chi et al. (2020) demonstrate that languages with a more ambiguously encoding of future timing lead to higher R&D investments on the country- and firm-level. Galor et al. (2020) investigate the effect of language characteristics on educational attainment. The presence of a periphrastic future tense has an positive impact on educational attainment whereas the the presence of sex-based grammatical gender has a negative effect on female educational attainment. Hicks et al. (2015) and Santacreu-Vasut et al. (2013) also show that gender specific linguistic characteristics are associated with worse outcomes for women regarding the allocation of household tasks and the implementation of gender political quotas respectively.

There is an extensive literature which theoretical and empirically investigates factors, like age, political views, education, employment status, skill composition of the labour market and cultural values, influencing personal attitudes towards foreigners. Leong and Ward (2006) examine the influence of cultural characteristics of societies and their impact on attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism in Europe. They conclude that certain cultural traits are associated with lower support for policies that promote social coexistence and lead to more pessimistic attitudes toward multicultural-

ism. (Hjerm 1998) uses data from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) 1995 to examine the effect of national attachment on xenophobia in four European countries. His findings conclude that civic national identity and national pride lead to lower levels of xenophobia whereas on the other hand ethnic national identity and national pride lead to higher levels of xenophobia. Gang et al. (2013) show in their paper that the change in the attitude of European citizens towards foreigners between 1988 and 2008, which was found by Eurobarometer surveys, can be explained by racial prejudice, economic conditions and educational attainment. Racial prejudice and economic strain leads to more negative attitudes while on the other hand educational attainment act as a powerful antidote against anti-foreigner attitudes. Ostapczuk et al. (2009) test the hypothesis that the positive effect of a respondent's education on their attitudes towards foreigners is not because highly educated people are actually less xenophobic, but because they are simply more likely to give socially desirable answers. They do indeed find a strong bias in self-reported attitudes towards foreigners, but even after controlling for social desirability, an effect of education on attitudes towards foreigners can be found. In another paper , it is shown that the skill composition of natives relative to immigrants has an effect on attitudes toward immigrants (Mayda 2006). Skilled individuals are more in favour of immigration in countries where natives are more skilled than immigrants and opposed otherwise. Facchini et al. (2011) come to the same conclusion, that skilled natives are less likely to favour skilled migration due to the perceived competition threat on the labour market. This effect leads to lower number of policies aiming at to increase the intake of skilled immigrants despite the benefits this kind of immigration can have on the destination country. Scheve and Slaughter (2001) on the other hand show for the US, that less-skilled workers have a higher preference for policy which is limiting inflow of immigrants into the US. Individuals believe that the US economy is absorbing the influx of immigrants, at least in part, through changing wages. Facchini and Mayda (2012) find that interest groups play a statistically significant role in shaping migration policy for different sectors in the US. Sectors where trade unions are more important tend to have higher barriers to migration, while sectors with stronger business interest groups

have lower barriers. In a comparative study on the public views regarding the equality of rights foreigners deserve between Germany and Israel Raijman et al. (2003) identify the perceived level of threat as the main determinant of support for foreigners' rights.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section I describes the politeness distinction in second person pronouns and how it differs across languages. Section II explains my hypothesis on how your language might influence your attitude towards foreigners. Section III describes my underlying data. Section IV focuses on my model. The results of my regressions are presented in Section V and VI. In Section VII, I conclude my findings.

I. Politness Distinction

The language characteristic of interest for my research is the politeness distinctions in personal pronouns, and to be more precises in second person pronouns. Before I get into this characteristic of a language in more detail I would like to start with a small exmaple from my native language German. German has a binary politeness distinction. There are *du* (you.sg.familiar) and *ihr* (you.pl.familiar) as intimate or familiar pronoun to address someone and *Sie* (you.honorific) as a formal pronoun of address, which does not distinguish numbers. The formal pronoun is normally used between adults, who are not in a close social relationship like family or friends. Normally the usage of pronouns is symmetrical, so if you are addressed with the familiar *du* you will answer with it. One common exception is between adults and children. Adults usually address all children with *du*, but receive a *Sie* if they are not in a close social relationship with the child. This politeness distinction and its symmetrical use leads in Germany to the custom of offering someone the *du*, when the relationship has grown closer. In the most cases the offer is initiated by the older person or the one with the higher status, for example in an work environment.

The World Atlas of Language Structures (Helmbrecht 2013) distinguishes four different forms of politeness distinction in second person pronouns. The first one is very simple, there is no politeness distinction, so these languages have no personal pronouns

which express different degrees of respect or intimacy toward the addressee. One well known example is the English language, which only uses *you* as second person pronoun to address someone.

The next group are languages with a binary politeness distinction. Languages in this group have a clear contrast between a pronoun that is a polite form of address and a familiar pronoun. This binary distinction may well be expressed by several distinct pronouns as long as these pronouns do not indicate more than one politeness distinction. One example is Polish, which uses two different pronouns to indicate the same degree of respect in different dialects. *Wy* is used in rural areas and *Pan/Pani* is used in urban areas. The language Taba, which is spoken in Indonesia, has the pronoun *meu* (2.SG.HON), which is a free pronoun fulfilling all grammatical functions, and the pronoun *h=* (2.SG.HON), which is a obligatory clitic only in subject form. Clitics have the form of affixes, but play a syntactic role at the phrase level. A common example for a clitic is the contracted forms of the auxiliary verb in I'm. The binarity does not refer to the number of pronouns, but describes the fact that linguistically two groups are distinguished. A close group, which is addressed with the familiar pronoun, and a more distant group, which is addressed with the polite pronoun. Also the pragmatic rules when to use which pronoun can differ between languages with a binary politeness distinction. The mother-in-law will be addressed with the familiar *du* by the daughter-in-law in German, whereas she continues to be addresse with the polite *vous* in French.

The third group includes all languages that have two or more degrees of politeness within a pronominal paradigm. These systems are rare. One example is Marathi, which distinguishes between *tu*, used for familiy and intimate persons, *te* and *he* (2.SG.HON), used for people with higher social status, and *āpan* (2.SG.HON), used for priests and teacher in a very formal context.

The last group "pronoun avoidance"' is rather different from the first three. Polite forms of address in these languages do not belong to the class of pronouns. Instead, status and kinship terms, titles and other complex nominal expressions are used. If there are second person pronouns they are usually used to address social equals or inferiors.

This strategy can be found in languages of East and Southeast Asia such as Japanese, Burmese or Thai.

Brown and Gilman (1960) explain the usage of familiar and polite pronouns by two parameters, which are not fully independent. The first one is power. In this case the polite pronouns are used to express a difference in social rank between the interlocutors. The asymmetrical use of *Sie* and *du* between adults and children in German for example reflects this difference in social power. The other parameter is solidarity. This reflects the social distance between the interlocutors. If your conversation partner is a stranger, your social distance to him is greater and polite pronouns are used. On the other hand, the social distance to your family members or friends is very small and the familiar pronoun is used. The use of solidarity pronouns is always symmetrical.

II. Hypothesis

Persons speaking a language with a politeness distinction divided people linguistically into at least two groups. One that is close to them and one that is further away (The solidarity parameter Brown and Gilman (1960) mention) . I argue that this linguistic separation influences the way people think and behave towards foreigners. One possible explanation for how friendly and hospitable a society and its members are towards foreigners is therefore the language they speak and whether or not there is a difference in politeness. For example, an English-speaking person addresses everyone with a *you*, whether it is a family member, a close friend or a complete stranger. This brings all these different people closer together linguistically and thus influences the person's behaviour. If a person is addressed in the same way as a family member, he or she is treated more like a family member, which leads to a friendlier and more welcoming attitude towards foreigners. A German-speaking person, on the other hand, makes a clear linguistic distinction between close persons and foreigners and is therefore reminded each time he or she is addressed whether he or she is a close or a more distant person. If they are reminded each time through their language, this distinction will also be reflected in their behaviour towards the foreign person.

This language effect should not only reflect the cultural differences between societies, but should also be a pure language effect on the behaviour of the individual. One explanation for such a language effect is the theory of linguistic relativity. In its weak form this theory states that linguistic categories and language use influence the thinking and decisions of individuals (Sapir 1921, Slobin 1996, Whorf 1964). Therefore, a possible distinction in second person pronouns for different groups of people can influence the behaviour of an individual towards these groups beyond his personal and cultural preferences. This effect is reflected in people who speak a language with a difference in politeness, in a different attitude and behaviour towards foreigners.

III. Data

For my analysis I use three main sources. The World Values Survey (WVS) Wave 6 (2010-2014) (*World Values Survey: Round Six - Country-Pooled Datafile Version* 2014) for information about attitude, socio-econmic status, world view ect, WALS (Helmbrecht 2013), which contains a multitude of grammatical and lexical characteristics of thousands of languages, among others politeness distinction in second person pronouns and Hofstede's cultrual dimensions (Hofstede 2001). The survey data and the language data is combined via question V247 "*What language do you normally speak at home?*" in the WVS. So, individuals get attributed the value for politeness distinction of the language that is used in their household. They also get the cultural dimension of the country they are currently living in, as it is not possible to track where they were born or raised. After combining my data I delete all observations with missing data in the politeness distinction variable and the cultural dimensions. Afterward I impute the data of all missing answers to survey questions using chained imputation with 35 iterations. I don't impute values for politeness distinction of missing languages and missing cultural dimensions as I'm not really convinced myself that one could retrieve plausible values for those by looking at answers individuals have given to survey questions about their lives or by looking at other languages or the culture of other nations. After the imputation I have 41,152 unique observations from 32 countries (See appendix Table 3).

A. Dependent Variable

As proxy for xenophobia and an individuals attitude towards foreigners I use questions from the World Values Survey (WVS) Wave 6 (2010-2014). In Question V107 participants are asked "*I'd like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. People of another nationality.*". Respondents are given four possible answers with decreasing trust levels: "*Trust completely*", "*Trust somewhat*", "*Do not trust at all*" and "*Do not trust very much*". You would expect that people with a more adverse attitude towards foreigners will show lower trust levels towards people with a different nationality. As you can see in Table 1, the majority of responses are in the two middle categories, with just over 35% each. Approximately 24% answered "trust completely" and only about 4% have no trust at all in people of another nationality.

Table 1—: Distribution of the answers regarding trust in foreigners

Trust completely	Trust somewhat	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Missing	Total
8,545	13,059	12,632	1,546	5,370	41,152

Note: Question V107 WVS Wave 6: I'd like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. People of another nationality.

B. Independent Variable

The information about the politeness distinction in second person pronouns in languages is taken from chapter 45A of the WALS (Dryer and Haspelmath 2013). The authors divide languages into 4 categories depending on how many different groups can be addressed based on politeness reasons. The 4 different groups are explained in more detail in chapter "Politeness Distinction" (Helmbrecht 2013). For my analysis I encoded these 4 categories into a binary variable taking the value 0 if a language as no politeness distinction in second person pronouns at all and 1 if a language has any kind of

distinction[1]. As I have no hypothesis why it should matter for an individuals attitude towards foreigners if her language differentiates only two politeness groups or more or expresses politeness by pronoun avoidance, "binary distinction", "two or more" and "pronoun avoidance" are combined in the value distinction. Slightly over 80% of the individuals in my sample speak a language with some sort of politeness distinction as shown in Table 2.

Table 2—: Distribution politeness distinction across individuals

No distinction	Distinction	Total
7,391	33,761	41,152

Note: Distribution of politeness distinction across all observed individuals. The politeness distinction variable always refers to the language that the respondents reported as the language they speak at home.

As you can see from Table 3 the variation of the politeness variable within the countries is rather low, most of the means are very close to 0 or 1. This is not surprising, since in most countries one language is dominant and spoken by the majority of the inhabitants. Furthermore, even in countries with many regional languages like India these languages are these languages are highly related because of close geographical proximity and therefore, share the same rules or very similar rules for politeness distinction in second person pronouns. The only notable exception is Singapore with a mean of 0.5. The reasons for that is that almost all respondents from Singapore reported either English or Mandarin as their language spoken at home. Mandarin features a politeness distinction whereas English on the other hand has none.

From WALS I also retrieve the family and the genus of each language. In general languages can not be assumed to be independent from each other, so I use their family and genus to control for possible correlations between languages, which are related.

[1] A list of all reported languages and their value for the politeness distinction variable can be found in the appendix Table 20

Table 3—: Distribution politeness distinction by country

Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.	Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Argentina	1	0	1021	Netherlands	0.995	0.067	1768
Australia	0.036	0.187	1434	New Zealand	0.013	0.113	776
Brazil	1	0	1486	Pakistan	0.961	0.194	847
Chile	1	0	1000	Peru	0.993	0.081	1210
China	1	0	2300	Philippines	1	0	512
Taiwan	1	0	1183	Poland	1	0	963
Colombia	0.995	0.068	1505	Romania	1	0	1498
Ecuador	0.981	0.137	1202	Russia	1	0	2343
Estonia	1	0	496	Singapore	0.520	0.500	1730
Germany	0.990	0.099	2027	Slovenia	1	0	9
Hong Kong	0.878	0.331	49	Sweden	0.989	0.106	1142
India	1	0	1871	Thailand	1	0	1152
Japan	1	0	2443	Trinidad	0.001	0.032	996
Malaysia	0.900	0.300	391	Turkey	1	0	1498
Mexico	0.974	0.159	1936	United States	0.072	0.259	2173
Morocco	0.006	0.076	1199	Uruguay	0.997	0.055	992

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Total	0.820	0.384	41152

Note: Distribution of the politeness distinction variable of the language individuals speak at home grouped by their country of living. Frequency is the total number of observations from one country.

C. Controls

I use Hofstede's cultural dimensions as a control for cultural characteristics and differences of the societies I look at. I'm especially interested in masculinity as it is a measurement for competitiveness within a society and power distance, a measurement of hierarchy and its acceptance in society, as these two have been identified to influence attitude towards foreigners before (Leong and Ward 2006). As a second source for cultural characteristics and differences of societies I use data from the GPS (Falk et al. 2018, Falk et al. 2016) for additional regressions. Data from GPS is not yet widely used in research about attitudes of individuals towards foreigners, but it gives me a second data set with a

different composition of countries. This gives me the opportunity to test my hypothesis for a wider range of countries and languages. Unfortunately, GPS does not contain direct correspondences to Hofstede's dimensions of masculinity and power distance. The five preferences reported by the GPS that I use for my research are *Patience*, *Risk Preference*, *Positive Reciprocity*, *Negative Reciprocity* and *Altruism*.

I use a question from the WVS to control for the effect of the general trust level of a person. Question V24 of the WVS asks *"Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?"* and gives two possible answers: 1. *"Most people can be trusted."* and 2. *"Need to be very careful."*. GPS also contains data on trust, but it is again aggregated on the country level. Therefore, I do not use it as it contains less information than the data from the WVS.

Furthermore, I use a wide range of information about the respondents, that is found in the WVS. Starting with information about the respondent's age (V241), gender (V240), religion (V144), education (V248), martial status (V57) and number of children (V58). A second big block of questions is about their financial and employment situation. Are they employed (V229)? Are they the chief wage earner in their family (V235)? In which income class would they sort themselves (V238) and in which income class they actually are based on their income (V239). For the self reported class they can choose between upper class, upper middle class, lower middle class, working class and lower class. Question V239 has 10 different ascending income groups and the respondent is asked to state in which of this 10 groups they fall with their income. I encode these 10 groups into 5 to match the possible answers from question V238. And finally are they in fear of losing their job or worried to not find one(V181). The scale of possible answers has 5 possible answers, "Very much", "A good deal", "Not much", "Not at all" and "Don't know/No answer". If you are unemployed or in fear of losing your job, strangers can be seen as competition in the job market. This might increase your reluctance towards them. This effect can be increased if you are the chief wage earner of your family or in lower income classes where the financial situation is tougher. I also control if the respondents (V246) or their parents (V243, V244) are immigrants themselves. Own experience with

immigration and being a foreigner in a new country might increase your own openness towards foreigners because you can put yourself in their situation. Another question that is somewhat linked to the ones before, is the question about the general happiness in life (V10). The respondents are asked to state if they are "Very happy", "Rather happy", "Not very happy" or "Not at all happy". It might be the case that unhappy persons are more unfriendly to others in general or that they blame their misfortune onto others. Foreigners are a common target for such blame. Therefore, the happiness might affect an individual's attitude towards foreigners. The last question I use is about the political views of the respondents. They have to sort themselves into a left-right scale concerning their political position (V95). The scale rages from 1 (left) to 10 (right). I code this ten scale into 5 different groups, "Left", "Center Left", "Center", "Center Right" and "Right". I would expect that people to the right of the political spectrum are more reserved towards foreigners.

IV. Model

I examine the effect of an individuals attitude towards foreigners using the following ordered probit model.

$$Pr(trust_j = i) = Pr(\kappa_{i-1} < \beta_1 + \beta_2 d_j + \beta_3 X_j + \beta_4 X_\ell + \beta_5 X_C + \varepsilon_j < \kappa_i)$$

The dependent variable $trust_j$ is an individuals answer to the question if they trust people of another nationality. It takes on one of four possible outcomes (1 = *"Do not trust at all"*, 2 = *"Do not trust very much"*, 3 = *"Trust somewhat"* and 4 = *"Trust completely"*). The main independent variable of interest is d_j. It takes on the value 1 if the language a person speaks at home has a politeness distinction, otherwise it is 0. X_j are characteristics of individual j, e.g. age, gender, religion, job status ect., and her answers to other questions of interest in the WVS, for example the political views or general happiness in life . X_ℓ are language specific characteristics, such as gender and family. X_C are either country fixed effects or Hofstede's cultural dimensions. I can only assign the masculinity and power distance values of their country of residence to the participants, as

the WVS unfortunately does not contain any information about the participants' country of birth. So these variables have no variation within a country. In order to still control for their effect, I have to drop the country fixed effects. This is done in further regressions. κ denotes the cut off points between the different categories of $trust$. Standard Errors are clustered at the language level (Regressions with standard errors clustered at the country level can be found in the appendix).

V. Regression Results

The coefficient for the politeness distinction in a language is negative as expected, i.e. people speaking a language with a distinction are more likely to trust people with another nationality less. If you look at the marginal effects for the four possible answers in column IV to VII, individuals have a higher chance to answer "*do not trust at all*" or "*do not trust very much*" and a lower probability to answer with "*trust somewhat*" and "*trust completely*". The marginal effects are of considerable size, ranging from just under 2% to almost 8%. They are all statistically significant at the 1% level.

Individuals who trust people more in general also trust foreigners more, as one would expect. But the important point for my research is that the inclusion of the trust variable does not change the direction and significance of the effect of the language variable. This suggests that the language variable does not just capture a general effect on trust that translates into higher trust in foreigners. The language variable has an additional effect on a person's attitude toward foreigners, in addition to the effect it might have on a person's trust in other people.

Table 4—: Regression with all observations

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.442*** **	**-0.441*** **	**-0.293*** **	**0.079** **	**0.018** **	**-0.074*** **	**-0.024*** **
	(0.147)	(0.144)	(0.112)	(0.035)	(0.009)	(0.028)	(0.009)
Trust			0.435***	-0.117***	-0.027*	0.109***	0.035***
			(0.032)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.006)
Immigrant			0.131***	-0.035***	-0.008	0.033***	0.011***
			(0.034)	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.127***	-0.033***	-0.010*	0.032***	0.011***
			(0.030)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.004)
Both Immigrants			0.028	-0.008	-0.002	0.007	0.002
			(0.048)	(0.013)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.004)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III.

A person's own experience with immigration, either because they are immigrants themselves or indirectly through their parents' immigration history, has a positive effect on a person's trust towards foreigners. The experience of being a foreigner in a place where new neighbours may have little trust leads people to be more open to others themselves. For the effect, it seems to be unimportant whether one has had the experience oneself or whether one only knows it from the stories of one's parents.

WVS does not ask for the country of origin of the participants. Therefore, it is only possible to assign to individuals the value of the cultural dimension of their country of residence. This leads to the fact that the culture variable has no variation within a country.Therefore, it is only possible to measure the effect of the culture dimensions if the country fixed effects are omitted to allow for between countries variation. The results

of the regression without country fixed effects are shown in Table 5. The language variable still has a negative effect on the trust an individual has towards foreigners. Power Distance as a measure of hierarchy in a society lead to a higher level of xenophobia as previous research (Leong and Ward 2006) has also found. Masculinity has no statistically significant effect. The effects of the other variables remain unchanged when compared to column 3.

Table 5—: Regression with all observations and cultural dimensions

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.333*** **	**0.092*** **	**0.021**	**-0.085*** **	**-0.027*** **
	(0.115)	(0.034)	(0.014)	(0.031)	(0.009)
Trust	0.416***	-0.115***	-0.026*	0.107***	0.034***
	(0.037)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.009)	(0.006)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.003	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.012***	0.003***	0.001*	-0.003***	-0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Immigrant	0.122***	-0.034***	-0.008	0.031***	0.010***
	(0.039)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.003)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.121***	-0.032***	-0.009*	0.031***	0.011**
	(0.040)	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.004)
Both Immigrants	0.023	-0.006	-0.001	0.006	0.002
	(0.054)	(0.015)	(0.003)	(0.014)	(0.005)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

The vast majority of individuals in my data speak a language without politeness distinction (Table 3). The variation in this dimension is therefore very small. Moreover,

the variation in languages within the group of languages that do not have a politeness distinction is also small. As can be seen from Tables 3 and 6, these observations are predominantly from individuals who speak English and live in an English-speaking country. As an additional robustness check, I try to overcome these limitations by using different subsamples.

Table 6—: Distribution politeness distinction across languages

Full Dataset			Only Immigrants			Official language		
Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns	Freq.	Perc.	Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns	Freq.	Perc.	Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns	Freq.	Perc.
No distinction	**7391**	17.96%	No distinction	**1539**	31.05%	No distinction	**253**	14.99%
Distinction	33761	82.04%	Distinction	3418	68.95%	Distinction	1435	85.01%
Total	41152		Total	4957		Total	1688	

Languages with no politeness distinction

Language at home	Freq.	Perc.	Language at home	Freq.	Perc.	Language at home	Freq.	Percent
Albanian	5	0.07%	Albanian	5	0.32%	Albanian	5	1.98%
Arabic	1150	15.56%	Arabic	27	1.75%	Arabic	23	9.09%
Aymara	7	0.09%	Berber	1	0.06%	Aymara	7	2.77%
Berber	66	0.89%	English	1506	97.86%	Berber	66	26.09%
Brahui	33	0.45%				English	150	59.29%
English	6128	82.91%				Maori	2	0.79%
Maori	2	0.03%						
Total	**7391**		Total	**1539**		Total	**253**	

Note: Distribution of politeness distinction across all observed individuals. The politeness distinction variable always refers to the language that the respondents reported as the language they speak at home. The distribution is presented for the full data set and the two subsamples used for regressions, the results of which are presented in Table 4, Table 5, Table 7, Table 8, Table 9 and Table 10. The second part of the table shows the language distribution of those who, when asked what language they speak at home, reported a language that does not have a politeness distinction in its second person pronouns.

The first subsample contains only individuals who have experience with immigration, either directly or indirectly through their parents. First- or second-generation immigrants may still speak the language of their origin at home, leading to higher variation in the

variables of interest. Table 6 shows that the proportion of observations of individuals speaking a language without politeness distinction increases, but the proportion speaking English also increases. This effect is driven primarily by immigrants to typical immigration countries such as the United States, Australia, and New Zealand, all of which are English-speaking countries and English being a language with no politeness distinction.

Table 7—: Regression only individuals with immigration history

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.456****	**-0.489****	**-0.364****	**0.071****	**0.052****	**-0.081****	**-0.041****
	(0.187)	(0.191)	(0.150)	(0.035)	(0.020)	(0.037)	(0.017)
Trust			0.490***	-0.095***	-0.069***	0.109***	0.056***
			(0.040)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.008)
Immigrant			0.114**	-0.022***	-0.016*	0.025***	0.013**
			(0.048)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.006)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.149*	-0.028**	-0.021	0.033*	0.017
			(0.083)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.011)
Both Immigrants			0.017	-0.003	-0.002	0.004	0.002
			(0.055)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.006)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. For all regressions, only people who report being immigrants themselves or report at least one parent as an immigrant are included (Questions V243-245 in WVS). Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III.

Table 8—: Regression only individuals with immigration history and cultural dimensions

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.242****	**0.048****	**0.036****	**-0.056****	**-0.028****
	(0.103)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.026)	(0.011)
Trust	0.503***	-0.101***	-0.074***	0.116***	0.059***
	(0.037)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.008)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.010***	0.002***	0.001***	-0.002***	-0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Immigrant	0.094	-0.019	-0.014	0.022	0.011
	(0.067)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.008)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.034	-0.007	-0.005	0.008	0.004
	(0.109)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.024)	(0.014)
Both Immigrants	-0.070	0.014	0.010	-0.016	-0.008
	(0.073)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.009)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. For all regressions, only people who report being immigrants themselves or report at least one parent as an immigrant are included (Questions V243-245 in WVS). Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column I. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

The results of the regressions with this subsample are reported in Table 7 and Table 8. The politeness distinction variable continues to have a negative effect on the level of trust a person places in foreigners, both in the regressions with country fixed effects and in the regressions that omit them to test for the effect of cultural dimensions. The results for the other variables are also unchanged compared to the results for the full dataset reported in Table 4.

The second subsample looks only at people who speak a language that is not the of-

ficial language of the country in which they live. The official language of a country is taken from the CIA World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). This leads to a larger variation among languages that do not have a politeness distinction. However, the proportion of observations that do not have a politeness distinction remains the same compared to the full dataset.

Table 9—: Regression only individuals not speaking official language

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.644***	**-0.613***	**-0.565**	**0.129**	**0.049**	**-0.142**	**-0.037**
	(0.354)	(0.336)	(0.351)	(0.084)	(0.044)	(0.090)	(0.023)
Trust			0.547***	-0.125***	-0.048	0.137***	0.036***
			(0.092)	(0.011)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.009)
Immigrant			0.111	-0.025	-0.010	0.028	0.007
			(0.083)	(0.020)	(0.008)	(0.020)	(0.005)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.006	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.000
			(0.144)	(0.032)	(0.014)	(0.036)	(0.010)
Both Immigrants			-0.063	0.014	0.005	-0.016	-0.004
			(0.080)	(0.020)	(0.005)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Individuals who reported to speak at home the official language of the country they live in have been dropped all regressions. The official language of a country was taken from the CIA World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III.

In column 3 of Table 9, when all control variables are added, the coefficient of the politeness discrimination variable loses its statistical significance but the direction of the effect is still negative. The marginal effects also still have the expected direction. I would argue that the lack of significance is most likely due to the small sample size. Because

of this and because the effects are still in the same direction I would say that the results support my original results with the full data set. The results with the cultural dimensions instead of the country fixed effects are shown in Table 10. Here the language variable remains significant at the 10% level. The results overall fall in line with the previous results of the full dataset and the first subsample.

Table 10—: Regression only individuals not speaking official language and cultural dimensions

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.327***	**0.076**	**0.029**	**-0.083***	**-0.022***
	(0.186)	(0.048)	(0.022)	(0.046)	(0.013)
Trust	0.574***	-0.133***	-0.050	0.145***	0.038***
	(0.089)	(0.016)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.008)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.003	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.016***	0.004***	0.001	-0.004***	-0.001***
	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Immigrant	0.042	-0.010	-0.004	0.011	0.003
	(0.073)	(0.017)	(0.007)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	-0.009	0.002	0.001	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.133)	(0.031)	(0.012)	(0.033)	(0.009)
Both Immigrants	-0.053	0.012	0.004	-0.013	-0.004
	(0.076)	(0.019)	(0.005)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Individuals who reported to speak at home the official language of the country they live in have been dropped all regressions. The official language of a country was taken from the CIA World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column I. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

A. General Preference Survey

In further regressions, I use the preferences of the GPS instead of the cultural dimensions of Hofstede. Participants are again assigned the preferences of their country of residence, as I have no information about their country of birth. The procedure for imputation is the same as before, observations missing the politeness distinction or the preferences are deleted and then the missing answers to survey questions are imputed using 35 rounds of chained imputation. Missing values for the politeness distinction and the preferences are not imputed for the same reasons discussed in Chapter III.

Table 11—: Distribution politeness distinction across countries GPS

Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.	Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Algeria	0.017	0.128	1197	Morocco	0.006	0.076	1199
Argentina	1	0	1021	Netherlands	0.995	0.067	1768
Australia	0.036	0.187	1434	Nigeria	0.224	0.417	1646
Brazil	1	0	1486	Pakistan	0.961	0.194	847
Chile	1	0	1000	Peru	0.993	0.081	1210
China	1	0	2300	Philippines	1	0	512
Colombia	0.995	0.068	1505	Poland	1	0	963
Estonia	1	0	496	Romania	1	0	1498
Georgia	1	0	1200	Russia	1	0	2343
Germany	0.990	0.099	2027	Rwanda	0.622	0.492	37
Ghana	0.004	0.063	251	South Africa	0	0	1224
Haiti	0.955	0.213	22	Zimbabwe	0	0	65
India	1	0	1871	Sweden	0.989	0.106	1142
Iraq	0	0	955	Thailand	1	0	1152
Japan	1	0	2443	Turkey	1	0	1498
Kazakhstan	1	0	736	Ukraine	1	0	737
Jordan	0.001	0.029	1200	Egypt	0	0	1523
Mexico	0.974	0.159	1936	United States	0.072	0.259	2173

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Total	0.722	0.448	44617

Note: Distribution of the politeness distinction variable of the language individuals speak at home grouped by their country of living. Frequency is the total number of observations from one country. Data for the dataset with GPS preference measures instead of Hofstede cultural dimensions.

GPS covers other countries than Hofstede with its cultural dimensions. This gives

me the opportunity to test my hypothesis for a different and wider group of countries, even though the GPS preferences do not map exactly the same cultural characteristics of societies as Hofstede. Compared to before, mainly countries from North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa are added. A complete list of countries and the distribution of the language variable within the countries can be seen in Table 11.

Table 12—: Distribution politeness distinction across languages GPS

Full Dataset			Only Immigrants			Official language		
Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns	Freq.	Perc.	Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns	Freq.	Perc.	Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns	Freq.	Perc.
No distinction	**12414**	27.82%	No distinction	**1505**	32.56%	No distinction	**411**	10.49%
Distinction	32203	72.18%	Distinction	3117	67.44%	Distinction	3506	89.51%
Total	44617		Total	4622		Total	3917	
Languages with no politeness distinction								
Language at home	Freq.	Perc.	Language at home	Freq.	Perc.	Language at home	Freq.	Percent
Albanian	5	0.04%	Albanian	5	0.33%	Albanian	5	1.22%
Arabic	5823	46.91%	Arabic	616	40.93%	Arabic	23	5.60%
Aymara	7	0.06%	Berber	16	1.06%	Aymara	7	1.70%
Berber	246	1.98%	English	808	53.69%	Berber	66	16.06%
Brahui	33	0.27%	Ewe	11	0.73%	Brahui	33	8.03%
English	4326	34.85%	Hausa	25	1.66%	English	81	19.71%
Ewe	167	1.35%	Igbo	3	0.20%	Ewe	167	40.63%
Hausa	615	4.95%	Swahili	3	0.20%	Hausa	28	6.81%
Igbo	338	2.72%	Zulu	18	1.20%	Zulu	1	0.24%
Swahili	12	0.10%						
Zulu	842	6.78%						
Total	**12414**		Total	**1505**		Total	**411**	

Note: Distribution of politeness distinction across all observed individuals. The politeness distinction variable always refers to the language that the respondents reported as the language they speak at home. The distribution is presented for the full data set and the two subsamples used for regressions, the results of which are presented in Table 13, Table 15 and Table 18. The second part of the table shows the language distribution of those who, when asked what language they speak at home, reported a language that does not have a politeness distinction in its second person pronouns. Data for the dataset with GPS preference measures instead of Hofstede cultural dimensions.

The proportion of languages without politeness distinction is slightly higher compared to the first data set. The group of languages without politeness distinction is no longer

dominated by English, but by Arabic and English. This is mainly due to the countries of North Africa that have been added. Furthermore, some African languages have been added (see Table 12)[2]. The same two subsamples are used as before.

The language variable again has a negative effect that is statistically significant. The marginal effects go in the same direction as before and their size is also comparable.

Table 13—: Regression with all observations (GPS)

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.459*** **	**-0.453*** **	**-0.307*** **	**0.087*** **	**0.014**	**-0.076*** **	**-0.025*** **
	(0.134)	(0.133)	(0.103)	(0.033)	(0.009)	(0.025)	(0.008)
Trust			0.409***	-0.117***	-0.018	0.102***	0.033***
			(0.029)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Immigrant			0.125***	-0.036***	-0.006	0.031***	0.010***
			(0.027)	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.109***	-0.030***	-0.006	0.027***	0.010***
			(0.029)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.003)
Both Immigrants			0.037	-0.011	-0.002	0.009	0.003
			(0.034)	(0.010)	(0.002)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	44617	44617	44617	44617	44617	44617	44617

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. GPS preference measures are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

Individuals who speak a language with politeness distinction are more likely to answer ”Do not trust at all” and ”Do not trust very much” and less likely to answer ”Trust somewhat” and ”Trust completely”. Furthermore, people who generally have a higher level of trust towards other people or people who have their own migration history are

[2]A list of all reported languages and their value for the politeness distinction variable can be found in the appendix Table 21

more likely to trust foreigners.

To control for the cultural difference of societies and individuals, I must again omit the country fixed effects to allow for variation between countries.

Table 14—: Regression with all observations and cultural preferences

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.349*** **	**0.101*** **	**0.016**	**-0.088*** **	**-0.029*** **
	(0.102)	(0.031)	(0.012)	(0.027)	(0.008)
Trust	0.415***	-0.120***	-0.019	0.105***	0.035***
	(0.030)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.005)
Preferences					
Risk Preference	0.361***	-0.105***	-0.017	0.091***	0.030***
	(0.123)	(0.033)	(0.015)	(0.032)	(0.011)
Altruism	-0.646***	0.187***	0.030	-0.164***	-0.054***
	(0.228)	(0.069)	(0.022)	(0.055)	(0.020)
Patience	0.592***	-0.172***	-0.028	0.150***	0.050***
	(0.133)	(0.031)	(0.023)	(0.032)	(0.014)
Pos. Reciprocity	0.681***	-0.198***	-0.032	0.172***	0.057***
	(0.159)	(0.047)	(0.023)	(0.039)	(0.016)
Neg. Reciprocity	-0.619***	0.180***	0.029	-0.157***	-0.052***
	(0.187)	(0.051)	(0.024)	(0.047)	(0.018)
Immigrant	0.128***	-0.037***	-0.006	0.032***	0.011***
	(0.033)	(0.012)	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.140***	-0.039***	-0.009*	0.035***	0.013***
	(0.038)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.004)
Both Immigrants	0.077**	-0.022*	-0.004	0.019**	0.007*
	(0.039)	(0.012)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	44617	44617	44617	44617	44617

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. GPS preference measures are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

The language variable still has a negative effect and the margin effects also keep their direction. Of the preferences, Risk Preference, Patience and Positive Reciprocity have a

positive effect and Altruism and Negative Reciprocity have a negative effect.The other variables have the same effect as before.

For the first sub-sample, I again look only at those individuals who stated that they were immigrants themselves or whose parents were immigrants. The effect of the language variable remains unchanged both in the regression with country fixed effects and in the regression with cultural preferences. The effect of the other variables do not change, but in the regression with the cultural preferences the control variables for the immigration history of individuals lose their statistical significance.

Table 15—: Regression only individuals with immigration history (GPS)

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.510*** **	**-0.520*** **	**-0.390*** **	**0.080*** **	**0.049** **	**-0.087*** **	**-0.042*** **
	(0.162)	(0.165)	(0.125)	(0.029)	(0.019)	(0.029)	(0.015)
Trust			0.472***	-0.097***	-0.059***	0.106***	0.051***
			(0.031)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.011)	(0.007)
Immigrant			0.087**	-0.018*	-0.011**	0.020**	0.009**
			(0.041)	(0.010)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.004)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.118**	-0.024**	-0.015*	0.026**	0.013**
			(0.054)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.006)
Both Immigrants			0.018	-0.004	-0.002	0.004	0.002
			(0.066)	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.015)	(0.007)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	4622	4622	4622	4622	4622	4622	4622

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. For all regressions, only people who report being immigrants themselves or report at least one parent as an immigrant are included (Questions V243-245 in WVS). Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. GPS preference measures are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

Table 16—: Regression only individuals with immigration history and cultural preferences

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.346*** **	**0.073*** **	**0.045*** **	**-0.080*** **	**-0.038*** **
	(0.098)	(0.024)	(0.016)	(0.025)	(0.011)
Trust	0.482***	-0.101***	-0.063***	0.111***	0.053***
	(0.030)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.008)
Preferences					
Risk Preference	0.274*	-0.057*	-0.036*	0.063*	0.030*
	(0.141)	(0.030)	(0.021)	(0.032)	(0.017)
Altruism	-0.786**	0.165**	0.103**	-0.181***	-0.087**
	(0.323)	(0.075)	(0.043)	(0.070)	(0.041)
Patience	0.467***	-0.098***	-0.061**	0.107***	0.051**
	(0.165)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.034)	(0.020)
Pos. Reciprocity	0.998***	-0.209***	-0.130***	0.229***	0.110***
	(0.242)	(0.058)	(0.041)	(0.050)	(0.035)
Neg. Reciprocity	-0.906***	0.190***	0.118***	-0.208***	-0.100***
	(0.204)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.028)
Immigrant	0.055	-0.011	-0.007	0.013	0.006
	(0.043)	(0.010)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.005)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.076	-0.016	-0.010	0.017	0.009
	(0.047)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.005)
Both Immigrants	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.059)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.006)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	4622	4622	4622	4622	4622

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. For all regressions, only people who report being immigrants themselves or report at least one parent as an immigrant are included (Questions V243-245 in WVS). Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. GPS preference measures are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

The second subsample contains only observations that indicate as the language they speak at home a language that is different from the official language of their country of residence. The coefficient of the language variable loses its statistical significance, but the sign of the coefficient is still negative. In the regression with cultural preferences, the coefficient additionally becomes very small. The lack of statistical significance could be due to the small sample size, just as in Table 9. The cultural preferences except for risk preference and patience also lose their significance. In addition, the direction of the effect of Risk Preference and Altruism changes.

Table 17—: Regression only individuals not speaking official language (GPS)

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.597***	**-0.554***	**-0.507**	**0.135**	**0.034**	**-0.126**	**-0.044**
	(0.324)	(0.315)	(0.324)	(0.091)	(0.036)	(0.079)	(0.029)
Trust			0.418***	-0.111***	-0.029	0.104***	0.036***
			(0.056)	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Immigrant			0.141**	-0.038***	-0.010	0.035**	0.012**
			(0.055)	(0.014)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.005)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			-0.029	0.008	0.002	-0.007	-0.002
			(0.102)	(0.028)	(0.006)	(0.025)	(0.009)
Both Immigrants			-0.056	0.015	0.004	-0.014	-0.005
			(0.040)	(0.012)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	3917	3917	3917	3917	3917	3917	3917

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Individuals who reported to speak at home the official language of the country they live in have been dropped all regressions. The official language of a country was taken from the CIA factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. The coefficients and marginal effects of the control variables can be found in the appendix. GPS preference measures are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

Table 18—: Regression only individuals not speaking official language and cultural preferences

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.022**	**0.006**	**0.001**	**-0.005**	**-0.002**
	(0.205)	(0.055)	(0.017)	(0.051)	(0.018)
Trust	0.435***	-0.116***	-0.030	0.108***	0.038***
	(0.054)	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Preferences					
Risk Preference	-1.220**	0.326**	0.084	-0.304**	-0.106**
	(0.476)	(0.138)	(0.072)	(0.119)	(0.042)
Altruism	0.319	-0.085	-0.022	0.080	0.028
	(0.263)	(0.068)	(0.029)	(0.067)	(0.024)
Patience	0.565***	-0.151***	-0.039	0.141***	0.049***
	(0.147)	(0.046)	(0.031)	(0.036)	(0.014)
Pos. Reciprocity	0.205	-0.055	-0.014	0.051	0.018
	(0.255)	(0.070)	(0.019)	(0.063)	(0.022)
Neg. Reciprocity	-0.205	0.055	0.014	-0.051	-0.018
	(0.328)	(0.086)	(0.029)	(0.083)	(0.029)
Immigrant	0.097	-0.026	-0.007	0.024	0.008
	(0.069)	(0.017)	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.006)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	-0.008	0.002	0.000	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.093)	(0.025)	(0.006)	(0.023)	(0.008)
Both Immigrants	-0.032	0.009	0.002	-0.008	-0.003
	(0.038)	(0.011)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	3917	3917	3917	3917	3917

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Individuals who reported to speak at home the official language of the country they live in have been dropped all regressions. The official language of a country was taken from the CIA factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. GPS preference measures are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

The loss of effect size in Table 18 could also be due to the change in composition in the observations reporting a language without politeness distinction. Due to the subsample, this group is now dominated by languages native to Africa. It could be that there are particular factors in African countries or among people from Africa that lead to less trust in foreigners. By omitting the country fixed effects in Table 18, the effects of these factors are absorbed by the language variable and counteract the true effect of language.

B. General Trust and Language

One possible idea for the channel through which language influences people's attitudes toward foreigners could be the general trust that a person has in other people. My previous regressions have shown that general trust has a significant positive effect on the level of trust that a person has towards foreigners. To test for this channel, I regress the language variable on the general trust variable from the WVS for the 6 different datasets from my previous regressions. The results of these regressions are shown in Table 19. I find no significant effect of the language variable on the trust that participants place in people in my data. Therefore, the effect of the language variable on attitudes toward foreigners is independent of a person's general trust and is an genuine effect on the attitude toward foreigners.

Table 19—: Regression without english speaker

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Politeness Distinction	**-0.351**	**-0.368**	**0.185**	**-0.535***	**-0.508**	**-0.347**
	(0.305)	(0.364)	(0.399)	(0.314)	(0.358)	(0.370)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41146	4938	1650	44614	4587	3861

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I to III are the samples with Hofstede's cultural dimensions and IV to VI with the preferences from GPS.

VI. Conclusion

Overall, my results show that language is an important new factor to explain the different attitudes of people towards foreigners. The fact whether a language has a politeness distinction in its 2nd person pronouns has a significant influence on how much trust speakers of that language place in foreigners. People who speak a language with a politeness distinction are more likely to indicate that they do not trust foreigners at all or not very much. On the other hand, they have a lower probability of responding that they trust foreigners completely or at least somewhat. This effect is robust to a variety of control variables and persists even when country fixed effects are omitted to control for cultural differences across societies. Unfortunately, the variation within my language variable and especially the number of different languages that do not have politeness distinction is limited due to constraints in my data. To address this problem, I look at two different subsamples of my data that include, first, only first and second wave immigrants and, second, only people who do not speak the official language of their country of residence. The subsample results also show a negative effect of the variable on attitudes towards foreigners and support the results with the full data set. In addition, I use a second source for cultural peculiarities of societies, namely GPS. This gives me the opportunity to test my hypothesis for additional countries and languages. These results also support my initial findings. For future research on people's attitudes towards foreigners, therefore, the language of the people under investigation should always be included in addition to the economic and non-economic factors that have played a central role in the research so far.

VII. Appendix

A. Summary Statistics

Table 20—: List of Languages

Full Dataset			Only Immigrants			Official language		
Country	Politeness Distinction	Freq.	Country	Politeness Distinction	Freq.	Country	Politeness Distinction	Freq.
Albanian	No	5	Albanian	No	5	Albanian	No	5
Arabic	No	1150	Arabic	No	27	Arabic	No	23
Armenian	Yes	1	Armenian	Yes	1	Armenian	Yes	1
Aymara	No	7	Berber	No	1	Aymara	No	7
Berber	No	66	Dutch	Yes	341	Berber	No	66
Brahui	No	33	English	No	1506	English	No	150
Dutch	Yes	1747	Finnish	Yes	2	Finnish	Yes	3
English	No	6128	French	Yes	14	French	Yes	31
Finnish	Yes	3	German	Yes	279	German	Yes	18
French	Yes	31	Greek	Yes	5	Greek	Yes	5
German	Yes	1948	Hindi	Yes	111	Hungarian	Yes	131
Greek	Yes	5	Hungarian	Yes	7	Indonesian	Yes	1
Hindi	Yes	973	Indonesian	Yes	1	Italian	Yes	8
Hungarian	Yes	131	Italian	Yes	7	Japanese	Yes	4
Indonesian	Yes	1	Japanese	Yes	3	Kashmiri	Yes	2
Italian	Yes	8	Kannada	Yes	1	Korean	Yes	2
Japanese	Yes	2447	Kashmiri	Yes	2	Mandarin	Yes	356
Kannada	Yes	144	Korean	Yes	2	Maori	No	2
Kashmiri	Yes	2	Malayalam	Yes	1	Nepali	Yes	6
Korean	Yes	2	Mandarin	Yes	470	Panjabi	Yes	2
Malayalam	Yes	192	Marathi	Yes	1	Persian	Yes	1
Mandarin	Yes	4659	Nepali	Yes	2	Polish	Yes	10
Maori	No	2	Panjabi	Yes	119	Portuguese	Yes	1
Marathi	Yes	250	Pashto	Yes	86	Quechua	Yes	44
Nepali	Yes	6	Persian	Yes	1	Russian	Yes	526
Panjabi	Yes	744	Polish	Yes	51	Sinhala	Yes	2
Pashto	Yes	233	Portuguese	Yes	83	Spanish	Yes	163
Persian	Yes	1	Quechua	Yes	3	Tagalog	Yes	6
Polish	Yes	970	Romanian	Yes	19	Tamil	Yes	63
Portuguese	Yes	1487	Russian	Yes	483	Turkish	Yes	39
Quechua	Yes	44	Sinhala	Yes	2	Vietnamese	Yes	10
Romanian	Yes	1375	Spanish	Yes	835			
Russian	Yes	2869	Swedish	Yes	202			
Sinhala	Yes	2	Tagalog	Yes	9			
Spanish	Yes	8871	Tamil	Yes	38			
Swedish	Yes	1114	Thai	Yes	25			
Tagalog	Yes	518	Turkish	Yes	199			
Tamil	Yes	160	Urdu	Yes	4			
Thai	Yes	1150	Vietnamese	Yes	9			
Turkish	Yes	1537						
Urdu	Yes	126						
Vietnamese	Yes	10						

Note: Number of participants who reported speaking a language at home. The politeness distinction column indicates whether the language has a politeness distinction or not.

Table 21—: List of Languages

Full Dataset			Only Immigrants			Official language		
Country	Politeness Distinction	Freq.	Country	Politeness Distinction	Freq.	Country	Politeness Distinction	Freq.
Albanian	No	5	Albanian	No	5	Albanian	No	5
Arabic	No	5823	Arabic	No	616	Arabic	No	23
Armenian	Yes	13	Armenian	Yes	3	Armenian	Yes	13
Aymara	No	7	Berber	No	16	Aymara	No	7
Berber	No	246	Dutch	Yes	341	Berber	No	66
Brahui	No	33	English	No	808	Brahui	No	33
Dutch	Yes	1747	Ewe	No	11	English	No	81
English	No	4326	Finnish	Yes	2	Ewe	No	167
Ewe	No	167	French	Yes	38	Finnish	Yes	3
Finnish	Yes	3	Georgian	Yes	47	French	Yes	46
French	Yes	73	German	Yes	278	German	Yes	9
Georgian	Yes	1180	Greek	Yes	5	Greek	Yes	5
German	Yes	1939	Hausa	No	25	Hausa	No	28
Greek	Yes	5	Hindi	Yes	111	Hungarian	Yes	126
Hausa	No	615	Hungarian	Yes	4	Indonesian	Yes	1
Hindi	Yes	973	Igbo	No	3	Italian	Yes	7
Hungarian	Yes	126	Indonesian	Yes	1	Japanese	Yes	3
Igbo	No	338	Italian	Yes	7	Kannada	Yes	144
Indonesian	Yes	1	Japanese	Yes	2	Kashmiri	Yes	2
Italian	Yes	7	Kannada	Yes	1	Korean	Yes	2
Japanese	Yes	2446	Kashmiri	Yes	2	Malayalam	Yes	192
Kannada	Yes	144	Korean	Yes	2	Mandarin	Yes	15
Kashmiri	Yes	2	Malayalam	Yes	1	Marathi	Yes	250
Korean	Yes	2	Mandarin	Yes	15	Nepali	Yes	6
Malayalam	Yes	192	Marathi	Yes	1	Panjabi	Yes	744
Mandarin	Yes	2315	Nepali	Yes	2	Pashto	Yes	233
Marathi	Yes	250	Panjabi	Yes	119	Persian	Yes	1
Nepali	Yes	6	Pashto	Yes	86	Polish	Yes	10
Panjabi	Yes	744	Persian	Yes	1	Portuguese	Yes	1
Pashto	Yes	233	Polish	Yes	51	Quechua	Yes	44
Persian	Yes	1	Portuguese	Yes	83	Romanian	Yes	12
Polish	Yes	970	Quechua	Yes	3	Russian	Yes	1256
Portuguese	Yes	1487	Romanian	Yes	21	Sinhala	Yes	2
Quechua	Yes	44	Russian	Yes	846	Spanish	Yes	179
Romanian	Yes	1387	Sinhala	Yes	2	Tagalog	Yes	6
Russian	Yes	4333	Spanish	Yes	582	Tamil	Yes	17
Sinhala	Yes	2	Swahili	No	3	Turkish	Yes	41
Spanish	Yes	6735	Swedish	Yes	202	Urdu	Yes	126
Swahili	No	12	Tagalog	Yes	9	Vietnamese	Yes	10
Swedish	Yes	1114	Thai	Yes	25	Zulu	No	1
Tagalog	Yes	518	Turkish	Yes	199			
Tamil	Yes	17	Urdu	Yes	4			
Thai	Yes	1150	Vietnamese	Yes	9			
Turkish	Yes	1539	Yoruba	Yes	12			
Urdu	Yes	126	Zulu	No	18			
Vietnamese	Yes	10						
Yoruba	Yes	369						
Zulu	No	842						

Note: Number of participants who reported speaking a language at home. The politeness distinction column indicates whether the language has a politeness distinction or not. Data for the dataset with GPS preference measures instead of Hofstede cultural dimensions.

B. Regressions with SE clustered at country level

Table 22—: Regression with all observations and SE clustered at country level

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.442****	**-0.441****	**-0.293***	**0.079***	**0.018**	**-0.074***	**-0.024***
	(0.205)	(0.198)	(0.160)	(0.042)	(0.014)	(0.041)	(0.013)
Trust			0.435***	-0.117***	-0.027**	0.109***	0.035***
			(0.031)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.005)
Immigrant			0.131***	-0.035***	-0.008**	0.033***	0.011***
			(0.043)	(0.013)	(0.004)	(0.011)	(0.003)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.127***	-0.033***	-0.010**	0.032***	0.011***
			(0.028)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.003)
Both Immigrants			0.028	-0.008	-0.002	0.007	0.002
			(0.047)	(0.012)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.004)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	×	×	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. The coefficients and marginal effects of the control variables can be found in the appendix. Standard errors are clustered at the country level.

Table 23—: Regression with all observations, cultural dimensions and SE clustered at country level

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.333****	**0.092****	**0.021**	**-0.085****	**-0.027*****
	(0.130)	(0.036)	(0.013)	(0.035)	(0.010)
Trust	0.416***	-0.115***	-0.026**	0.107***	0.034***
	(0.033)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.005)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.003	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.012***	0.003***	0.001*	-0.003***	-0.001***
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Immigrant	0.122***	-0.034**	-0.008**	0.031**	0.010***
	(0.047)	(0.014)	(0.004)	(0.012)	(0.004)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.121***	-0.032***	-0.009**	0.031***	0.011***
	(0.033)	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.003)
Both Immigrants	0.023	-0.006	-0.001	0.006	0.002
	(0.050)	(0.014)	(0.003)	(0.013)	(0.004)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Personal Characteristics	√	√	√	√	√
Employment Status	√	√	√	√	√
Financial Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Family Situation	√	√	√	√	√
Political Views	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. The coefficients and marginal effects of the control variables can be found in the appendix. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies. Standard errors are clustered at the country level.

C. Full Regression Tables

Table 24—: Regression Full Dataset

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.442*** **	**-0.441*** **	**-0.293*** **	**0.079** **	**0.018** **	**-0.074*** **	**-0.024*** **
	(0.147)	(0.144)	(0.112)	(0.035)	(0.009)	(0.028)	(0.009)
Male		0.046	0.022	-0.006	-0.001	0.005	0.002
		(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Age		0.001*	0.005***	-0.001***	-0.000	0.001***	0.000***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Religion							
Christianity		0.113***	0.116***	-0.032***	-0.006	0.029***	0.009***
		(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Islam		0.186**	0.252***	-0.066***	-0.018	0.062***	0.022***
		(0.084)	(0.073)	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.018)	(0.007)
Judaism		0.241*	0.115	-0.031	-0.006	0.029	0.009
		(0.134)	(0.138)	(0.034)	(0.013)	(0.034)	(0.012)
Buddhist		0.023	0.049	-0.014	-0.002	0.012	0.004
		(0.032)	(0.040)	(0.011)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Hindu		-0.011	0.028	-0.008	-0.001	0.007	0.002
		(0.056)	(0.055)	(0.015)	(0.003)	(0.014)	(0.004)
Trust			0.435***	-0.117***	-0.027*	0.109***	0.035***
			(0.032)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.006)
General Happiness							
Very Happy			0.196***	-0.055**	-0.009	0.049***	0.014***
			(0.073)	(0.022)	(0.008)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Rather Happy			0.155**	-0.044*	-0.007	0.039**	0.011**
			(0.074)	(0.023)	(0.005)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Not Very Happy			0.058	-0.017	-0.002	0.015	0.004
			(0.070)	(0.021)	(0.003)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Education							
Below Upper Secondary			-0.364***	0.097***	0.026**	-0.094***	-0.029***
			(0.034)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Upper Secondary			-0.203***	0.052***	0.019***	-0.052***	-0.018***
			(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Employment Status			-0.041	0.011	0.003	-0.010	-0.003
			(0.032)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.003)
Chief Wage Earner			0.005	-0.001	-0.000	0.001	0.000
			(0.013)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.001)
Fear losing Job							
Very Much			-0.106***	0.029**	0.007	-0.027**	-0.008***
			(0.040)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.011)	(0.003)
A great Deal			-0.026	0.007	0.002	-0.006	-0.002
			(0.025)	(0.007)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.002)
Not Much			-0.025	0.007	0.002	-0.006	-0.002
			(0.027)	(0.007)	(0.002)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Income Class							
Lower class			-0.083*	0.023*	0.005	-0.021*	-0.007*
			(0.047)	(0.013)	(0.004)	(0.011)	(0.004)
Working class			-0.038	0.010	0.003	-0.010	-0.003
			(0.051)	(0.014)	(0.003)	(0.013)	(0.004)
Lower middle class			-0.030	0.008	0.002	-0.008	-0.003
			(0.041)	(0.011)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Upper middle class			-0.023	0.006	0.002	-0.006	-0.002
			(0.037)	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Income Class SR							
Lower class			-0.097	0.027	0.005	-0.025	-0.007
			(0.082)	(0.025)	(0.003)	(0.021)	(0.006)
Working class			-0.005	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
			(0.079)	(0.022)	(0.005)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Lower middle class			0.042	-0.011	-0.003	0.011	0.003
			(0.081)	(0.021)	(0.006)	(0.021)	(0.007)
Upper middle class			0.049	-0.013	-0.003	0.012	0.004
			(0.077)	(0.020)	(0.006)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Immigrant			0.131***	-0.035***	-0.008	0.033***	0.011***
			(0.034)	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.127***	-0.033***	-0.010*	0.032***	0.011***
			(0.030)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.004)
Both Immigrants			0.028	-0.008	-0.002	0.007	0.002
			(0.048)	(0.013)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.004)
Martial Status							
Married			-0.015	0.004	0.001	-0.004	-0.001
			(0.019)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.002)
Living together			-0.096***	0.026***	0.005	-0.024***	-0.007***
			(0.017)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Divorced			0.006	-0.002	-0.000	0.002	0.001
			(0.039)	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Seperated			-0.092***	0.025***	0.005	-0.023***	-0.007**
			(0.035)	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.003)
Widowed			-0.048	0.013	0.003	-0.012	-0.004
			(0.044)	(0.011)	(0.004)	(0.011)	(0.004)
No. of Children			-0.018***	0.005***	0.001*	-0.005***	-0.001***
			(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Political Views							
Left			0.086	-0.022*	-0.007	0.022	0.007
			(0.055)	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.005)
Center Left			0.039*	-0.010*	-0.003	0.010*	0.003*
			(0.022)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.002)
Center Right			-0.068***	0.019***	0.004	-0.017***	-0.005***
			(0.022)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.002)
Right			-0.119***	0.033***	0.006	-0.030***	-0.009***
			(0.029)	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.002)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III.

Table 25—: Regression Full Dataset and cultural dimensions

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.333*** **	**0.092*** **	**0.021**	**-0.085*** **	**-0.027*** **
	(0.115)	(0.034)	(0.014)	(0.031)	(0.009)
Male	0.016	-0.004	-0.001	0.004	0.001
	(0.021)	(0.006)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.002)
Age	0.004***	-0.001***	-0.000	0.001***	0.000***
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Religion					
Christianity	0.126*	-0.036*	-0.007	0.032*	0.010*
	(0.073)	(0.018)	(0.008)	(0.019)	(0.006)
Islam	0.172	-0.048	-0.010	0.044	0.014
	(0.121)	(0.031)	(0.012)	(0.031)	(0.011)
Judaism	0.181	-0.050*	-0.011	0.046	0.015
	(0.125)	(0.029)	(0.015)	(0.031)	(0.012)
Buddhist	0.144*	-0.040**	-0.008	0.037*	0.011*
	(0.075)	(0.020)	(0.008)	(0.019)	(0.007)
Hindu	0.169***	-0.047***	-0.010*	0.043***	0.014***
	(0.057)	(0.016)	(0.006)	(0.015)	(0.005)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.003	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.012***	0.003***	0.001*	-0.003***	-0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Trust	0.416***	-0.115***	-0.026*	0.107***	0.034***
	(0.037)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.009)	(0.006)
General Happiness					
Very Happy	0.169**	-0.048**	-0.009	0.044**	0.013**
	(0.068)	(0.020)	(0.007)	(0.017)	(0.005)
Rather Happy	0.138*	-0.040*	-0.006	0.036*	0.010**
	(0.071)	(0.022)	(0.005)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Not Very Happy	0.022	-0.006	-0.001	0.006	0.001
	(0.067)	(0.020)	(0.002)	(0.017)	(0.004)
Education					
Below Upper Secondary	-0.340***	0.093***	0.024*	-0.090***	-0.028***
	(0.029)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Upper Secondary	-0.185***	0.048***	0.017**	-0.048***	-0.017***
	(0.017)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Employment Status	-0.030	0.008	0.002	-0.008	-0.002
	(0.032)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.003)
Chief Wage Earner	0.019	-0.005	-0.001	0.005	0.002
	(0.018)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.001)
Fear losing Job					
Very Much	-0.180***	0.050***	0.012**	-0.047***	-0.015***
	(0.051)	(0.017)	(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.004)
A great Deal	-0.070**	0.019*	0.006**	-0.018**	-0.006**
	(0.033)	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Not Much	-0.047*	0.012	0.004	-0.012	-0.004*
	(0.029)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.003)
Income Class					
Lower class	-0.067	0.019	0.004	-0.017	-0.005
	(0.046)	(0.014)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.004)
Working class	-0.004	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.055)	(0.015)	(0.003)	(0.014)	(0.004)
Lower middle class	0.022	-0.006	-0.001	0.006	0.002
	(0.051)	(0.014)	(0.004)	(0.013)	(0.004)
Upper middle class	0.044	-0.012	-0.003	0.011	0.004
	(0.040)	(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Income Class SR					
Lower class	-0.107	0.031	0.005	-0.028	-0.008
	(0.073)	(0.023)	(0.003)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Working class	-0.006	0.002	0.000	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.070)	(0.020)	(0.004)	(0.018)	(0.006)
Lower middle class	0.055	-0.015	-0.004	0.014	0.005
	(0.067)	(0.018)	(0.005)	(0.017)	(0.006)
Upper middle class	0.036	-0.010	-0.002	0.009	0.003
	(0.075)	(0.020)	(0.006)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Immigrant	0.122***	-0.034***	-0.008	0.031***	0.010***
	(0.039)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.003)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.121***	-0.032***	-0.009*	0.031***	0.011**
	(0.040)	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.004)
Both Immigrants	0.023	-0.006	-0.001	0.006	0.002
	(0.054)	(0.015)	(0.003)	(0.014)	(0.005)
Martial Status					
Married	-0.027	0.007	0.002	-0.007	-0.002
	(0.029)	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.003)
Living together	-0.124***	0.035***	0.007	-0.032***	-0.010***
	(0.018)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.001)
Divorced	0.012	-0.003	-0.001	0.003	0.001
	(0.046)	(0.013)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.004)
Seperated	-0.079**	0.022**	0.005	-0.020**	-0.006**
	(0.036)	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Widowed	-0.056	0.016	0.004	-0.014	-0.005
	(0.053)	(0.013)	(0.005)	(0.014)	(0.004)
No. of Children	-0.017**	0.005*	0.001*	-0.004**	-0.001**
	(0.008)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Political Views					
Left	0.099**	-0.026**	-0.008	0.025**	0.009*
	(0.050)	(0.011)	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.005)
Center Left	0.059***	-0.016***	-0.004*	0.015***	0.005***
	(0.019)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.002)
Center Right	-0.076***	0.021***	0.004	-0.020***	-0.006***
	(0.024)	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Right	-0.121***	0.034***	0.006	-0.031***	-0.009***
	(0.028)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.002)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	41152	41152	41152	41152	41152

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

Table 26—: Regression only individuals with immigration history

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.456****	**-0.489****	**-0.364****	**0.071****	**0.052****	**-0.081****	**-0.041****
	(0.187)	(0.191)	(0.150)	(0.035)	(0.020)	(0.037)	(0.017)
Male		-0.062	-0.077	0.015*	0.011	-0.017	-0.009
		(0.047)	(0.050)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.006)
Age		0.004***	0.006***	-0.001***	-0.001***	0.001***	0.001***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Religion							
Christianity		0.084**	0.110***	-0.022**	-0.014**	0.025***	0.012**
		(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.005)
Islam		0.380***	0.496***	-0.084***	-0.074***	0.091***	0.068***
		(0.104)	(0.103)	(0.014)	(0.024)	(0.012)	(0.023)
Judaism		0.222***	0.130	-0.026	-0.017	0.029	0.014
		(0.078)	(0.096)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.012)
Buddhist		0.150***	0.215***	-0.041***	-0.029***	0.046***	0.025***
		(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.006)
Hindu		-0.004	0.060	-0.012	-0.008	0.014	0.006
		(0.085)	(0.093)	(0.019)	(0.011)	(0.021)	(0.010)
Trust			0.490***	-0.095***	-0.069***	0.109***	0.056***
			(0.040)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.008)
General Happiness							
Very Happy			0.495***	-0.111***	-0.055***	0.122***	0.044***
			(0.143)	(0.042)	(0.018)	(0.039)	(0.012)
Rather Happy			0.409***	-0.095**	-0.042***	0.103**	0.034***
			(0.151)	(0.044)	(0.014)	(0.040)	(0.011)
Not Very Happy			0.357**	-0.085**	-0.035**	0.091**	0.029***
			(0.140)	(0.040)	(0.015)	(0.037)	(0.010)
Education							
Below Upper Secondary			-0.375***	0.072***	0.056***	-0.087***	-0.041***
			(0.041)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.007)
Upper Secondary			-0.193***	0.034***	0.031***	-0.041***	-0.024***
			(0.038)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.005)
Employment Status			-0.046	0.009	0.007	-0.010	-0.005
			(0.112)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.024)	(0.013)
Chief Wage Earner			0.017	-0.003	-0.002	0.004	0.002
			(0.036)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Fear losing Job							
Very Much			-0.104**	0.020**	0.015**	-0.023*	-0.012**
			(0.049)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.005)
A great Deal			-0.057	0.011	0.008	-0.012	-0.007
			(0.041)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.005)
Not Much			-0.069	0.013	0.010	-0.015	-0.008
			(0.057)	(0.012)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.006)
Income Class							
Lower class			-0.043	0.008	0.006	-0.009	-0.005
			(0.107)	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.013)
Working class			-0.050	0.009	0.007	-0.011	-0.006
			(0.079)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.010)
Lower middle class			-0.036	0.007	0.005	-0.008	-0.004
			(0.077)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.009)
Upper middle class			-0.106	0.020	0.015	-0.023	-0.012
			(0.073)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.009)
Income Class SR							
Lower class			-0.097	0.021	0.012	-0.024	-0.009
			(0.146)	(0.032)	(0.019)	(0.036)	(0.014)
Working class			0.095	-0.019	-0.013	0.022	0.010
			(0.111)	(0.023)	(0.015)	(0.025)	(0.012)
Lower middle class			0.088	-0.018	-0.012	0.020	0.009
			(0.092)	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.010)
Upper middle class			0.089	-0.018	-0.012	0.021	0.010
			(0.085)	(0.018)	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.009)
Immigrant			0.114**	-0.022***	-0.016*	0.025***	0.013**
			(0.048)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.006)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.149*	-0.028**	-0.021	0.033*	0.017
			(0.083)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.011)
Both Immigrants			0.017	-0.003	-0.002	0.004	0.002
			(0.055)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.006)
Martial Status							
Married			0.014	-0.003	-0.002	0.003	0.002
			(0.052)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.006)
Living together			-0.120*	0.024*	0.016	-0.028*	-0.013
			(0.068)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.008)
Divorced			-0.060	0.012	0.008	-0.013	-0.007
			(0.097)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.011)
Seperated			0.007	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.001
			(0.078)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.009)
Widowed			-0.145*	0.030*	0.019	-0.034*	-0.015
			(0.088)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.019)	(0.010)
No. of Children			-0.023**	0.004**	0.003**	-0.005**	-0.003**
			(0.009)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Political Views							
Left			0.105	-0.019	-0.016	0.022	0.013
			(0.074)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.010)
Center Left			0.026	-0.005	-0.004	0.006	0.003
			(0.046)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.006)
Center Right			-0.182***	0.037**	0.024***	-0.043***	-0.019***
			(0.056)	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.006)
Right			-0.102**	0.020**	0.014*	-0.023**	-0.011**
			(0.048)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.005)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. For all regressions, only people who report being immigrants themselves or report at least one parent as an immigrant are included (Questions V243-245 in WVS). Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III.

Table 27—: Regression only individuals with immigration history and cultural dimensions

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.242****	**0.048****	**0.036****	**-0.056****	**-0.028****
	(0.103)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.026)	(0.011)
Male	-0.066	0.013*	0.010	-0.015	-0.008
	(0.045)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.006)
Age	0.006***	-0.001***	-0.001***	0.001***	0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Religion					
Christianity	0.118**	-0.025**	-0.016**	0.028**	0.013**
	(0.047)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.006)
Islam	0.291*	-0.056**	-0.043	0.062**	0.036
	(0.151)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.024)
Judaism	0.186*	-0.037**	-0.026	0.042**	0.022
	(0.099)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.014)
Buddhist	0.210***	-0.042***	-0.030***	0.047***	0.025***
	(0.041)	(0.011)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.007)
Hindu	0.254	-0.050	-0.037	0.056	0.031
	(0.189)	(0.039)	(0.027)	(0.040)	(0.025)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.010***	0.002***	0.001***	-0.002***	-0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Trust	0.503***	-0.101***	-0.074***	0.116***	0.059***
	(0.037)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.008)
General Happiness					
Very Happy	0.463***	-0.107***	-0.053***	0.118***	0.043***
	(0.109)	(0.032)	(0.019)	(0.030)	(0.011)
Rather Happy	0.391***	-0.093***	-0.042***	0.101***	0.034***
	(0.115)	(0.034)	(0.014)	(0.032)	(0.010)
Not Very Happy	0.312***	-0.077**	-0.031**	0.082***	0.026***
	(0.111)	(0.031)	(0.014)	(0.030)	(0.009)
Education					
Below Upper Secondary	-0.348***	0.070***	0.053***	-0.083***	-0.040***
	(0.062)	(0.009)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.008)
Upper Secondary	-0.172***	0.032***	0.029***	-0.038***	-0.022***
	(0.037)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.005)
Employment Status	-0.060	0.012	0.009	-0.014	-0.007
	(0.106)	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.013)
Chief Wage Earner	0.031	-0.006	-0.005	0.007	0.004
	(0.035)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Fear losing Job					
Very Much	-0.161***	0.033**	0.024***	-0.038**	-0.019***
	(0.053)	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.015)	(0.005)
A great Deal	-0.063*	0.012*	0.010*	-0.014*	-0.008*
	(0.036)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Not Much	-0.067	0.013	0.010	-0.015	-0.008
	(0.055)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.006)
Income Class					
Lower class	-0.011	0.002	0.002	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.095)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.011)
Working class	0.049	-0.010	-0.007	0.012	0.005
	(0.079)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.009)
Lower middle class	0.076	-0.016	-0.011	0.018	0.009
	(0.079)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.009)
Upper middle class	0.031	-0.007	-0.004	0.008	0.003
	(0.080)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.009)
Income Class SR					
Lower class	-0.020	0.004	0.003	-0.005	-0.002
	(0.129)	(0.029)	(0.016)	(0.033)	(0.013)
Working class	0.154*	-0.032	-0.021*	0.037	0.017*
	(0.093)	(0.021)	(0.012)	(0.023)	(0.010)
Lower middle class	0.147*	-0.031	-0.021*	0.035*	0.016*
	(0.084)	(0.020)	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.009)
Upper middle class	0.094	-0.020	-0.013	0.023	0.010
	(0.080)	(0.018)	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.008)
Immigrant	0.094	-0.019	-0.014	0.022	0.011
	(0.067)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.008)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	0.034	-0.007	-0.005	0.008	0.004
	(0.109)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.024)	(0.014)
Both Immigrants	-0.070	0.014	0.010	-0.016	-0.008
	(0.073)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.009)
Martial Status					
Married	-0.001	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.057)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.007)
Living together	-0.102	0.021	0.014	-0.024	-0.011
	(0.069)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.016)	(0.008)
Divorced	-0.062	0.013	0.009	-0.014	-0.007
	(0.092)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.010)
Seperated	-0.018	0.004	0.003	-0.004	-0.002
	(0.090)	(0.018)	(0.013)	(0.021)	(0.011)
Widowed	-0.133	0.028	0.019	-0.032	-0.015
	(0.088)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.011)
No. of Children	-0.027***	0.005**	0.004***	-0.006**	-0.003***
	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.001)
Political Views					
Left	0.106	-0.019*	-0.017	0.023	0.014
	(0.070)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.010)
Center Left	0.040	-0.008	-0.006	0.009	0.005
	(0.042)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.005)
Center Right	-0.184***	0.039***	0.026***	-0.045***	-0.020***
	(0.053)	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.006)
Right	-0.147***	0.030**	0.021***	-0.035**	-0.016***
	(0.052)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.006)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	4957	4957	4957	4957	4957

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. For all regressions, only people who report being immigrants themselves or report at least one parent as an immigrant are included (Questions V243-245 in WVS). Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column I. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

Table 28—: Regression only individuals not speaking official language

	I	II	III	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.644***	**-0.613***	**-0.565**	**0.129**	**0.049**	**-0.142**	**-0.037**
	(0.354)	(0.336)	(0.351)	(0.084)	(0.044)	(0.090)	(0.023)
Male		-0.072	-0.087	0.020	0.008	-0.022	-0.006
		(0.077)	(0.070)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Age		0.003**	0.006**	-0.001**	-0.001	0.002**	0.000**
		(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Religion							
Christianity		0.127	0.168**	-0.040**	-0.012	0.042*	0.010*
		(0.095)	(0.085)	(0.017)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.005)
Islam		0.472	0.512*	-0.109**	-0.055	0.124*	0.040
		(0.315)	(0.307)	(0.050)	(0.055)	(0.069)	(0.032)
Judaism		0.576	0.297	-0.067	-0.027	0.074	0.020
		(0.449)	(0.395)	(0.086)	(0.043)	(0.096)	(0.032)
Buddhist		0.018	0.043	-0.011	-0.002	0.011	0.002
		(0.139)	(0.151)	(0.036)	(0.011)	(0.039)	(0.008)
Hindu		-0.019	0.032	-0.008	-0.002	0.008	0.002
		(0.213)	(0.245)	(0.060)	(0.015)	(0.062)	(0.013)
Trust			0.547***	-0.125***	-0.048	0.137***	0.036***
			(0.092)	(0.011)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.009)
General Happiness							
Very Happy			0.327	-0.084	-0.014	0.082	0.016
			(0.316)	(0.080)	(0.022)	(0.083)	(0.013)
Rather Happy			0.339	-0.087	-0.015	0.085	0.017
			(0.308)	(0.078)	(0.020)	(0.081)	(0.012)
Not Very Happy			0.431	-0.107	-0.024	0.108	0.023*
			(0.311)	(0.076)	(0.026)	(0.082)	(0.014)
Education							
Below Upper Secondary			-0.250**	0.057**	0.024	-0.064**	-0.017**
			(0.115)	(0.028)	(0.016)	(0.029)	(0.008)
Upper Secondary			-0.168**	0.037**	0.017	-0.043**	-0.012**
			(0.068)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.006)
Employment Status			0.082	-0.019	-0.007	0.021	0.005
			(0.108)	(0.025)	(0.010)	(0.027)	(0.007)
Chief Wage Earner			0.016	-0.004	-0.001	0.004	0.001
			(0.060)	(0.014)	(0.005)	(0.015)	(0.004)
Fear losing Job							
Very Much			-0.079	0.018	0.007	-0.020	-0.005
			(0.095)	(0.022)	(0.009)	(0.024)	(0.006)
A great Deal			0.007	-0.002	-0.001	0.002	0.000
			(0.109)	(0.024)	(0.011)	(0.027)	(0.007)
Not Much			0.035	-0.008	-0.003	0.009	0.002
			(0.100)	(0.022)	(0.011)	(0.025)	(0.007)
Income Class							
Lower class			0.197	-0.046	-0.016	0.050	0.012
			(0.189)	(0.042)	(0.023)	(0.049)	(0.012)
Working class			0.101	-0.024	-0.007	0.026	0.006
			(0.154)	(0.038)	(0.011)	(0.039)	(0.009)
Lower middle class			0.192	-0.045	-0.015	0.048	0.012
			(0.145)	(0.036)	(0.013)	(0.036)	(0.008)
Upper middle class			0.022	-0.006	-0.001	0.006	0.001
			(0.123)	(0.031)	(0.008)	(0.031)	(0.007)
Income Class SR							
Lower class			-0.807***	0.185***	0.068	-0.200***	-0.054*
			(0.289)	(0.060)	(0.068)	(0.070)	(0.029)
Working class			-0.428*	0.086**	0.054	-0.103*	-0.036
			(0.250)	(0.036)	(0.052)	(0.056)	(0.028)
Lower middle class			-0.357	0.069*	0.048	-0.085	-0.032
			(0.260)	(0.041)	(0.050)	(0.058)	(0.029)
Upper middle class			-0.239	0.044	0.034	-0.055	-0.023
			(0.260)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.058)	(0.028)
Immigrant			0.111	-0.025	-0.010	0.028	0.007
			(0.083)	(0.020)	(0.008)	(0.020)	(0.005)
Immigration Status Parents							
One Immigrant			0.006	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.000
			(0.144)	(0.032)	(0.014)	(0.036)	(0.010)
Both Immigrants			-0.063	0.014	0.005	-0.016	-0.004
			(0.080)	(0.020)	(0.005)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Martial Status							
Married			-0.040	0.009	0.004	-0.010	-0.003
			(0.082)	(0.018)	(0.008)	(0.021)	(0.006)
Living together			0.044	-0.010	-0.004	0.011	0.003
			(0.099)	(0.021)	(0.011)	(0.025)	(0.007)
Divorced			-0.030	0.007	0.003	-0.008	-0.002
			(0.182)	(0.041)	(0.017)	(0.046)	(0.012)
Seperated			0.031	-0.007	-0.003	0.008	0.002
			(0.290)	(0.064)	(0.030)	(0.072)	(0.021)
Widowed			-0.024	0.006	0.002	-0.006	-0.002
			(0.141)	(0.033)	(0.012)	(0.035)	(0.009)
No. of Children			-0.033	0.008	0.003	-0.008	-0.002
			(0.021)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.001)
Political Views							
Left			0.110	-0.025	-0.011	0.028	0.007
			(0.143)	(0.030)	(0.017)	(0.036)	(0.011)
Center Left			0.110	-0.025	-0.011	0.028	0.008
			(0.079)	(0.018)	(0.010)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Center Right			0.028	-0.006	-0.003	0.007	0.002
			(0.092)	(0.021)	(0.009)	(0.023)	(0.006)
Right			-0.027	0.007	0.002	-0.007	-0.002
			(0.109)	(0.026)	(0.009)	(0.028)	(0.007)
Country Fixed Effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Individuals who reported to speak at home the official language of the country they live in have been dropped all regressions. The official language of a country was taken from the CIA World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). Column I to III report coefficients for ordered probit regressions with different sets of control variables. Column IV to VII report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column III.

Table 29—: Regression only individuals not speaking official language and cultural dimensions

	I	Do not trust at all	Do not trust very much	Trust somewhat	Trust completely
Politeness Distinction	**-0.327***	**0.076**	**0.029**	**-0.083***	**-0.022***
	(0.186)	(0.048)	(0.022)	(0.046)	(0.013)
Male	-0.098	0.023*	0.009	-0.025	-0.007
	(0.068)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Age	0.008***	-0.002***	-0.001	0.002***	0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Religion					
Christianity	0.163*	-0.040**	-0.012	0.042*	0.010*
	(0.089)	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.024)	(0.005)
Islam	0.473*	-0.103**	-0.050	0.116*	0.037
	(0.272)	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.062)	(0.027)
Judaism	0.355	-0.080	-0.034	0.089	0.026
	(0.270)	(0.059)	(0.032)	(0.064)	(0.025)
Buddhist	0.052	-0.013	-0.003	0.013	0.003
	(0.204)	(0.050)	(0.014)	(0.053)	(0.012)
Hindu	0.062	-0.016	-0.004	0.016	0.003
	(0.214)	(0.052)	(0.016)	(0.055)	(0.012)
Culture					
Masculinity	-0.003	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Power Distance	-0.016***	0.004***	0.001	-0.004***	-0.001***
	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Trust	0.574***	-0.133***	-0.050	0.145***	0.038***
	(0.089)	(0.016)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.008)
General Happiness					
Very Happy	0.354	-0.094	-0.013	0.090	0.017
	(0.299)	(0.077)	(0.021)	(0.080)	(0.012)
Rather Happy	0.385	-0.101	-0.016	0.098	0.019*
	(0.288)	(0.075)	(0.020)	(0.077)	(0.011)
Not Very Happy	0.472	-0.121	-0.024	0.120	0.025**
	(0.294)	(0.074)	(0.026)	(0.079)	(0.013)
Education					
Below Upper Secondary	-0.278**	0.064**	0.026	-0.072**	-0.018**
	(0.115)	(0.030)	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.009)
Upper Secondary	-0.172**	0.038**	0.018	-0.044**	-0.012*
	(0.076)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.006)
Employment Status	0.034	-0.008	-0.003	0.009	0.002
	(0.112)	(0.026)	(0.010)	(0.028)	(0.008)
Chief Wage Earner	0.025	-0.006	-0.002	0.006	0.002
	(0.062)	(0.015)	(0.005)	(0.016)	(0.004)
Fear losing Job					
Very Much	-0.102	0.024	0.009	-0.026	-0.007
	(0.086)	(0.021)	(0.009)	(0.022)	(0.006)
A great Deal	0.019	-0.004	-0.002	0.005	0.001
	(0.106)	(0.023)	(0.011)	(0.027)	(0.008)
Not Much	0.065	-0.014	-0.007	0.016	0.005
	(0.101)	(0.022)	(0.011)	(0.025)	(0.008)
Income Class					
Lower class	0.219	-0.054	-0.015	0.056	0.013
	(0.193)	(0.045)	(0.024)	(0.051)	(0.012)
Working class	0.155	-0.039	-0.010	0.040	0.009
	(0.154)	(0.040)	(0.011)	(0.039)	(0.008)
Lower middle class	0.260*	-0.063	-0.019	0.066*	0.016*
	(0.146)	(0.039)	(0.015)	(0.036)	(0.008)
Upper middle class	0.110	-0.028	-0.006	0.028	0.006
	(0.131)	(0.035)	(0.009)	(0.033)	(0.007)
Income Class SR					
Lower class	-0.852***	0.194***	0.078	-0.211***	-0.061**
	(0.262)	(0.055)	(0.067)	(0.061)	(0.029)
Working class	-0.474**	0.093***	0.063	-0.114**	-0.043
	(0.232)	(0.032)	(0.051)	(0.049)	(0.029)
Lower middle class	-0.424*	0.082**	0.059	-0.101**	-0.040
	(0.235)	(0.035)	(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.029)
Upper middle class	-0.314	0.058	0.047	-0.073	-0.032
	(0.241)	(0.040)	(0.045)	(0.052)	(0.029)
Immigrant	0.042	-0.010	-0.004	0.011	0.003
	(0.073)	(0.017)	(0.007)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Immigration Status Parents					
One Immigrant	-0.009	0.002	0.001	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.133)	(0.031)	(0.012)	(0.033)	(0.009)
Both Immigrants	-0.053	0.012	0.004	-0.013	-0.004
	(0.076)	(0.019)	(0.005)	(0.019)	(0.005)
Martial Status					
Married	-0.102	0.023	0.009	-0.026	-0.007
	(0.083)	(0.018)	(0.010)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Living together	-0.027	0.006	0.003	-0.007	-0.002
	(0.097)	(0.022)	(0.010)	(0.024)	(0.007)
Divorced	-0.039	0.009	0.004	-0.010	-0.003
	(0.193)	(0.043)	(0.020)	(0.049)	(0.014)
Seperated	-0.091	0.021	0.008	-0.023	-0.006
	(0.283)	(0.068)	(0.022)	(0.071)	(0.019)
Widowed	-0.084	0.019	0.008	-0.021	-0.006
	(0.151)	(0.037)	(0.012)	(0.037)	(0.010)
No. of Children	-0.016	0.004	0.001	-0.004	-0.001
	(0.016)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.001)
Political Views					
Left	0.088	-0.020	-0.008	0.022	0.006
	(0.126)	(0.027)	(0.015)	(0.032)	(0.009)
Center Left	0.113	-0.026	-0.011	0.029	0.008
	(0.077)	(0.017)	(0.010)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Center Right	0.012	-0.003	-0.001	0.003	0.001
	(0.091)	(0.021)	(0.008)	(0.023)	(0.006)
Right	-0.051	0.012	0.004	-0.013	-0.003
	(0.108)	(0.027)	(0.009)	(0.028)	(0.006)
Country Fixed Effects	×	×	×	×	×
Language Family	√	√	√	√	√
Language Genus	√	√	√	√	√
Observations	1688	1688	1688	1688	1688

Note: *** Significant at the 1% level. ** Significant at the 5% level. * Significant at the 10% level. Individuals who reported to speak at home the official language of the country they live in have been dropped all regressions. The official language of a country was taken from the CIA World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency 2020). Column I reports coefficients for ordered probit regressions. Column II to V report the marginal effects for each of the four different possible answers given for question V107 of the WVS. The same set of control variables is used as in column I. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used to control for for cultural characteristics and differences of societies.

REFERENCES

Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960), The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity, *in* T. A. Sebeok, ed., 'Style in Language', MIT Press, chapter 12, pp. 253–276.

Central Intelligence Agency (2020), 'The World Factbook 2020'.
URL: *https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-world-factbook/index.html*

Chen, M. K. (2013), 'The effect of language on economic behavior: Evidence from savings rates, health behaviors, and retirement assets', *American Economic Review* **103**(2), 690–731.

Chen, S., Cronqvist, H., Ni, S. and Zhang, F. (2017), 'Languages and corporate savings behavior', *Journal of Corporate Finance* **46**, 320–341.
URL: *https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0929119917302304*

Chi, J. D., Su, X., Tang, Y. and Xu, B. (2020), 'Is language an economic institution? Evidence from R&D investment', *Journal of Corporate Finance* **62**, 101578.
URL: *https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0929119920300225*

Dryer, M. and Haspelmath, M., eds (2013), *The World Atlas of Language Structure Online*, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
URL: *http://wals.info*

Facchini, G. and Mayda, A. M. (2012), 'Individual Attitudes Towards Skilled Migration: An Empirical Analysis Across Countries', *The World Economy* **35**(2), 183–196.
URL: *http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-9701.2011.01427.x*

Facchini, G., Mayda, A. M. and Mishra, P. (2011), 'Do interest groups affect US immigration policy?', *Journal of International Economics* **85**(1), 114–128.
URL: *https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0022199611000560*

Falk, A., Becker, A., Dohmen, T., Enke, B., Huffman, D. and Sunde, U. (2018), 'Global Evidence on Economic Preferences*', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **133**(4), 1645–1692.
URL: *https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/133/4/1645/5025666*

Falk, A., Becker, A., Dohmen, T., Huffman, D. and Sunde, U. (2016), The preference survey module: A validated instrument for measuring risk, time, and social preferences.
URL: *http://ftp.iza.org/dp9674.pdf*

Galor, O., Özak, Ö. and Sarid, A. (2020), 'Linguistic Traits and Human Capital Formation', *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **110**, 309–313.
URL: *https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/pandp.20201069*

Gang, I. N., Rivera-Batiz, F. L. and Yun, M.-S. (2013), 'Economic Strain, Education and Attitudes towards Foreigners in the European Union', *Review of International Economics* **21**(2), 177–190.
URL: *http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/roie.12029*

Helmbrecht, J. (2013), Politeness Distinction in Pronouns, *in* M. Dryer and M. Haspelmath, eds, 'The World Altlas of Language Structures Online', Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
URL: *http://wals.info/chapter/45*

Hicks, D. L., Santacreu-Vasut, E. and Shoham, A. (2015), 'Does mother tongue make for women's work? Linguistics, household labor, and gender identity', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **110**, 19–44.
URL: *https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167268114002996*

Hjerm, M. (1998), 'National Identities, National Pride and Xenophobia: A Comparison of Four Western Countries', *Acta Sociologica* **41**(4), 335–347.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, 2nd edn, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Kim, J., Kim, Y. and Zhou, J. (2017), 'Languages and earnings management', *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **63**(2-3), 288–306.
URL: *https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0165410117300186*

Leong, C. H. and Ward, C. (2006), 'Cultural values and attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism: The case of the Eurobarometer survey on racism and xenophobia', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* **30**(6), 799–810.

Mayda, A. M. (2006), 'Who Is Against Immigration? A Cross-Country Investigation of Individual Attitudes toward Immigrants', *Review of Economics and Statistics* **88**(3), 510–530.

URL: *http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/10.1162/rest.88.3.510 http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/10.1162/003465301750160108*

Ostapczuk, M., Musch, J. and Moshagen, M. (2009), 'A randomized-response investigation of the education effect in attitudes towards foreigners', *European Journal of Social Psychology* **39**(6), 920–931.

URL: *http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ejsp.588*

Raijman, R., Semyonov, M. and Schmidt, P. (2003), 'Do Foreigners Deserve Rights? Determinants of Public Views Towards Foreigners in Germany and Israel', *European Sociological Review* **19**(4), 379–392.

URL: *https://academic.oup.com/esr/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/esr/19.4.379*

Roberts, S. G., Winters, J. and Chen, K. (2015), 'Future Tense and Economic Decisions: Controlling for Cultural Evolution', *PLOS ONE* **10**(7).

URL: *https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132145*

Santacreu-Vasut, E., Shoham, A. and Gay, V. (2013), 'Do female/male distinctions in language matter? Evidence from gender political quotas', *Applied Economics Letters* **20**(5), 495–498.

URL: *http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13504851.2012.714062*

Sapir, E. (1921), *Language*, Harcourt Brace, New York.

Scheve, K. F. and Slaughter, M. J. (2001), 'Labor market competition and individual preferences over immigration policy', *Review of Economics and Statistics* **83**(1), 133–145.

Slobin, D. I. (1996), From "Thought and Language" to "Thinking for Speaking", *in* J. J. Gumperz and S. C. Levinson, eds, 'Rethinking Linguistic Relativity', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 70–96.

Whorf, B. L. (1964), *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

World Values Survey: Round Six - Country-Pooled Datafile Version (2014).