

Departamento de Economía
Facultad de Ciencias Sociales
Universidad de la República

Documentos de Trabajo

**Individual Attitudes Towards Others,
Misanthropy Analysis in a Cross-Country Perspective.**

Natalia Melgar, Máximo Rossi and Tom W. Smith

Documento No. 12/08
Julio, 2008

**INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS OTHERS,
MISANTHROPY ANALYSIS IN A CROSS-COUNTRY PERSPECTIVE**

Natalia Melgar, Máximo Rossi and Tom W. Smith

Abstract

In general, misanthropy has been analyzed taking into account residents of one country and just comparing results. Instead of doing that, we employ 2004 International Social Survey Program and analyze its determinants in a cross-country model taking into account both individual characteristics and country effects.

Our model shows, as expected, that misanthropy could be explained by some socio-demographic and economic individual characteristics. For instance, being a woman, having a university degree, being married lowers misanthropy while being young; having a low income, having no political preferences, being self-employed makes people more misanthropic. Moreover, in order to capture fix effects, we included (dummies) variables per country of residence and almost all of them result significant in determining misanthropy. This last result indicates that not only individual characteristics matters but also some factors regarding context also play a significant role. Finally, we show that there is a strong relationship among our misanthropy ranking of countries and two corruption perception rankings.

Key words: misanthropy, trust, cross-country research, individual attitudes.

JEL classification: Z13

RESUMEN

En general, la misantropía ha sido analizada tomando en cuenta a los residentes de un país y comparando los resultados para distintos países. Nosotros, utilizando la encuesta del año 2004 del *International Social Survey Program* analizamos los determinantes de dicha actitud en un enfoque que considera más de treinta países en forma simultánea, tomando en cuenta las características de los ciudadanos e incluyendo efectos fijos por país. Las mujeres, tener un título universitario y estar casado disminuye el grado de misantropía. En tanto ser joven, tener un bajo ingreso, no tener preferencias políticas y estar auto-empleado muestra a dichos ciudadanos con un mayor grado de misantropía.

Incluyendo efectos fijos a través de variables *dummies* por países encontramos que todas ellas son significativas en la determinación del grado de misantropía. Finalmente encontramos que existe una fuerte correlación entre el ordenamiento de los países por misantropía y dos ordenamientos con distintas medidas de percepción de corrupción.

Palabras claves: misantropía, confianza, análisis comparativo, actitudes individuales.

Clasificación JEL: Z13

INTRODUCTION

Misanthropy is defined as hatred, dislike, or distrust of humankind and it is also a disposition to dislike and/or distrust other people. Our research is motivated by the following facts. First, by definition misanthropy is a social phenomenon. Second, and as it will be explained later, its influence on individual behavior has been increasing and changing. Third, the increasing consciousness that a way is needed to cope with differences in pluralized societies.

Moreover, from sociology and economics, the analysis of misanthropy determinants is relevant because it is connected with the erosion of social capital¹, which is a function of individual level actions and attributes. Misanthropy is, undeniably, a negative externality that influences the decision-making process regarding whether to invest or not in social capital.

The contribution of this research to the existing literature on the field is three-fold. Firstly, we confirm a set of hypothesis about the impact on some individual characteristics on misanthropy for a more heterogeneous and bigger sample than previous analysis. Secondly, given that our database includes more than thirty countries, we are able to analyze country effects and analyzing both individual and contexts characteristics. Additionally, we construct our dependent variable from principal components methodology and taking into account two dimensions of misanthropy (trust in other people and fair treatment). Finally, we find evidence that there is a strong relationship among our misanthropy ranking of countries and two corruption perception rankings.

This paper is organized as follow. In Section I, we present some empirical evidence and our expected results. Section II describes our database and methodology. Section III deals with results and section IV discuss the relationship between corruption perception and misanthropy. Finally, in section V we conclude.

¹ Jacobs (1961) defines social capital as "neighborhood networks." According to Putnam (1995), social capital represents "features of social life—networks, norms, and trust—that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives."

I. MISANTHROPY: INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE AND MASS PHENOMENON

Misanthropy is defined as hatred, dislike, or distrust of humankind and it is also a disposition to dislike and/or distrust other people.

Our research is motivated by the following facts. First, by definition misanthropy is a social phenomenon. Second, its influence on individual behavior has been increasing and changing. Smith (1997) shows that, in the case of American Society, misanthropy registered a positive tendency since 1970 and for example, regarding September 11th, as Rasinski, Berkold, Smith and Albertson (2002) hold, even when strong feelings of national pride persisted well beyond that date, so did positive perceptions of people in general.

A standard measure of misanthropy (which asks whether people are fair, helpful and trustworthy) underwent a substantial shift shortly after 9/11. According to the authors, this result indicates that, rather than thinking about the acts of the terrorists, people reflected upon the acts of those involved in the rescue and relief efforts in New York, acts of charity from those throughout the country, and acts of patriotism both within the country and abroad.

Additionally, Wilson (1991) states that social psychological factors such as (dis)trust and (in)tolerance have been changing through another process: urbanism that is a quality (of communities but also) of person's experiences which are determined by person's exposure to life and interactions with others. Third, the increasing awareness that it is needed to find a way to cope with differences in pluralized societies.

As mentioned, from sociology and economics, the analysis of misanthropy determinants is relevant because it is connected with the erosion of social capital, which is a function of individual level actions and attributes. According to Glaeser, Laibson, Scheinkman and Soutter (1999), networks are not merely the result of historical accident; they come about as individuals spend time and energy to connect with others. If scientists are going to understand social capital, then the starting point is the analysis of the decision-makers who actually invest or not in social connection:

an individual's social capital is that individual's social characteristics—including charisma, status and access to networks—that enable that person to extract private returns from interactions with others. The social capital of a set of individuals is the aggregate of those individuals' social capital that takes into account all externalities across the members of the set. Misanthropy is, undeniably, one negative externality that influences the decision making process.

According to Heitmeyer (2003) it is optimistic to consider the human being's social and cultural existence in various groups as conflict-free. There has been an underestimation of the social impact of structural and regulatory crises, as well as the changing of social relationships and networks (crises of cohesion) within the society. Cattacin, Gerber, Sardi, and Wegener (2006) argue that, in the long run, especially when misanthropic situations and attitudes come together, the negative aspects of modernization create a destructive impact on the individual and the human society.

Following Smith (1997), we test the following hypothesis and for doing so we construct the independent variables reported in table 1.

Insert Table 1: Description of independent variables.

H-01) Misanthropy could be higher among men than women.

Included variable: woman.

H-02) Misanthropy might be lower among older adults.

Included variables: age2, age3 and age4.

H-03) Misanthropy could decrease with socioeconomic status.

Included variables: edu2, edu3, edu4 and income.

H-04) Misanthropy could increase with disruptive family situations especially those involving divorce.

Included variables: married and divorced.

H-05) Misanthropy might be higher among cultural groups and minorities that have been discriminated against and isolated from the majority culture. However, for

the majority social contact with minorities should have minimal impact.

Included variable: minorities.²

H-06) Religions and religiosity is expected to reduce misanthropy.

Included variables: no_religion, roman_catholic and attendance.

H-07) Misanthropy is likely to be greater in large metropolitan areas.

Included variable: big_city.

H-08) Misanthropy is expected to increase as negative life events occur.

Included variable: unemployed.³

H-09) There are other individual characteristics that could be connected with misanthropy. For example: 1) job characteristics and/ or 2) political affiliation.

Included variables: private_sector, self_employed, worked_hours, no_pparty, left and right.

H-10) Misanthropy is influenced by other factor contexts.

Different levels of: violence, inter-group hostility, standards of living etc. should tend to make differences among countries. Therefore, in order to capture those fix effects, we added dummies variables representing country of residence.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The source of individual-level data analyzed in this paper is the National Identity module of the International Social Survey Program that was carried out in 2003 and 2004 and covers more than 30,000 respondents from 36 countries at different stages of economic development.

² We include those who answer that his/ her ethnic group or family origin was Arabs, Blacks, Chinese and Turks and lives in a country where those groups are minorities. For example, Chinese living in New Zealand or Turks in Germany.

³ Specifically, pessimism may increase with experiences of: a) criminal victimization, b) violence, c) illness or family deaths and d) unemployment. We include a variable that indicates whether the person is unemployed; unfortunately we have no variables to measure others aspects.

We use answers to the following two questions to construct our dependent variable. These two questions represent measures of attitudes towards fairness and trust, respectively:

1. "How often do you think that people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, and how often would they try to be fair?": (1) try to be fair almost all of the time, (2) try to be fair most of the time, (3) try to take advantage most of the time, (4) try to take advantage almost all of the time and (8) can't choose.
2. "Generally speaking, would you say that people can be trusted or that you can not be too careful in dealing with people?": (1) people can almost always be trusted, (2) people can usually be trusted, (3) you usually can not be too careful in dealing with people, (4) you almost always can not be to careful in dealing with people and (8) can't choose.

Figure 1 shows the weighted frequency distribution of the answers to those questions in the whole sample.

Insert Figure 1: Distribution of answers.

In order to estimate the impact of the independent variables on misanthropy at individual level we adopt the following strategy.

With the purpose of incorporating the weights of each dimension we construct a new continuous variable from principal components analysis.⁴ When we did so, we found that the two dimensions have the same weight. This new variable ranges from -2.5 to 2.4, figure 2 shows the density and frequency functions.

Insert Figure 2: Density and frequency functions

⁴ When we construct this variable, the answers to the categories "don't know" or "can't choose" were consider as missing values.

The data set also contains a wealth of information on demographics, socio-economic status, and values, which we use to test ten hypotheses about the incidence of individual characteristics on the formation of this attitude.

With our dependent variable and a set of independent variables, we estimated a linear regression and regarding individual characteristics the estimated coefficients represent the elasticities.

III. RESULTS

As could be seen in table 2, almost all hypotheses are verified in the expected direction.

Insert Table 2: The model.

As mentioned, the estimated coefficients give direct information about the impact of each individual characteristic on misanthropy. In each case, if the variable is significant, the estimated coefficient reports the change in misanthropy (our dependant variable) with respect to its level.⁵

H-01: Women are less misanthropic than men. Traditionally men see the world in more competitive and conflictual terms, while women are more cooperative and nurturing. When we consider a woman instead of a man, the reduction in misanthropy is 4.8%. Although, these traditional gender roles and perspectives have been changing in recent decades, some influences remains and differences between genders are significant.

H-02: All variables associated with age are significant. However, it is worth noting that misanthropy decreases with age: the impact is negative and strictly decreasing. If the person belongs to the second group (between 31 and 50 years old) misanthropy decreases 3.8% and the reduction is 14% if the person belongs to the fourth group (71 years old or older). This may result from life course adjustments, as adults adapt to their surroundings and interact with other people whom they can trust or not. As Smith

⁵ This is true because we are estimating a linear model where: $Y = a + b * X$, consequently, b_i represents the marginal effect on Y when X_i changes.

(1997) argues, lower misanthropy among older adults might be a function of cohort. Older adults were raised during a period in which society and ones fellow citizens were more civil (e.g., less crime, less divorce, more people living outside of large metropolitan areas). Therefore, they should be less misanthropic than more recent generations socialized in more troubled situations and more impersonal environments.

H-03: Misanthropy decreases with socioeconomic status, the better-off people are materially and the higher their social standing, the more likely they will view the world and other people in a favorable light. Specifically, misanthropy should decline as income and education increase. As could be seen in table 2, both income and education (level 3 and 4) are significant and the coefficients are negatives. An infinitesimal increase in income, cause a reduction in misanthropy of 6.7%. Moreover, even when the two highest levels of education reduce misanthropy; the impact of level 4 is much higher than level 3 (-18.6% and 30%, respectively).

H-04: Regarding marital status, we find that while married and divorced are significant variables; those variables show opposite signs and similar absolutes values (-6.5% and 6.3%, respectively). While it is possible to see divorce as just another miscellaneous negative life event, Smith (1997) holds that divorce will have a distinct and especially strong impact on shaping judgments about human nature since it concerns broken commitments involving very close, interpersonal relationships.

H-05: Misanthropy is higher among cultural groups and minorities that have been discriminated against and isolated from the majority culture. Specifically, as our model shows, negative assessments are higher among those who belong to a minority group; the dummy that represents those ethnic groups is significant (at 1%), especially high and its sign are positive (15.5%).

H-06: We found that there are no significant differences among people who identify with some religious group and those who do not (atheist and agnostics), we found that religiosity matters in the expected direction. Misanthropy reduces 3.7% if the person attends religious services once a month or more frequently. However, as there is no information available, we could not identify if there are a significant difference among those with fundamentalist beliefs, which may emphasize the sinful nature of humans and a stern and authoritarian God, and others.

H-07: Even when it is expected that place of residence matters, (we hypothesized that misanthropy was likely to be greater in large metropolitan areas because in those areas people are strangers and the environment is perceived as more threatening and impersonal) we found that this does not occur. Living in a big city is not relevant in forming this attitude towards other people.

H-08: When the person is unemployed, misanthropy increases (13.2%). This individual characteristic is significant and regarding economic characteristics, its positive coefficient is the highest. In general, negative experiences, especially those caused by other people, should lead to unfavorable evaluations of people.

H-09: Regarding job characteristics, all the variables included increases misanthropy. Working for a private enterprise and to be self-employed make misanthropy higher, as expected the last variable has a higher effect (6.5% and 10.4%, respectively). Moreover, misanthropy increases 8%, if the person works more than thirty hours per week. Secondly, we found that political affiliation has a very important role in determining misanthropy. While identifying with the right makes no difference, those who identify with the left wing are less misanthropic (7.4%). In addition, having no political preferences increase misanthropy (12.1%).

H-10: Misanthropy is influenced by other factor such us country and contexts characteristics. Different levels of: violence, inter-group hostility, standards of living etc. should tend to make differences among countries. As could be seen in table 2, we found significant differences among countries. The omitted dummy variable is United States; this means that the results are estimated with respect to that country.

According to our model, ten countries are more misanthropic than United States and fifteen are less misanthropic. On the other hand, there are no significant differences among United States, France, Great Britain, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Portugal, South Africa, South Korea, Spain and Taiwan; those dummies variables are no significant. Table 2 also shows the ranking of countries and the significant country variables are reported in figure 3. As could be seen, country effects vary from 73.4% in the case of Chile to -63.3% in the case of Cyprus.

Insert Figure 3 – Marginal effects per country of residence.

All Latin American countries included in our sample belong to the first group (Chile, Brazil, Mexico and Uruguay). The same is true in the case of almost all Ex-socialist countries of Eastern Europe (Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and Bulgaria) and Russia. Even when some of those countries are part to the European Union, they are the newest members so the result indicates that other factors have a bigger negative effect (past of corruption, economic instability, lower gross domestic product, lower human development index etc.).

Taking into account the group of countries, which register a negative sign (fifteen countries), we found that Anglo-settlement colonies (Australia, Canada and New Zealand) fall in this group as do the majority of countries that have showed good economical performance such as others European countries (Ireland, Czech Republic, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Austria and Switzerland).

In the case of Asia, we found greater heterogeneity. While living in Philippines increases misanthropy, the opposite is true in the case of Japan. Once again, differential economic performance could be one cause of this result. As mentioned, Taiwan and Israel are no significant.

IV. CORRUPTION PERCEPTION AND MISANTHROPY, ARE THEY RELATED?

Given our previous results, we analyzed whether there is a relationship among this ranking of countries and corruption perception rankings. As could be seen in table 3, the rankings seem to be related. In order to prove this, we employed the Spearman's rank correlation test, which displays the correlation coefficients for selected variables. The null hypothesis established that the variables are independent.

In particular, we tested whether our misanthropy ranking of countries is correlated with two corruption perception rankings. We selected Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index (2004) and a previous ranking that was obtained in a previous research (Melgar, Rossi and Smith, 2008).

Insert Table 3: Corruption and misanthropy rankings.

As expected we find that misanthropy ranking is correlated with both corruption perception rankings. In the first case, the correlation coefficient is 68,44 and in the second case, it raises to 80,61. In both cases the null hypothesis was rejected at 1%. Even when those coefficients are high, the correlation is not perfect because those variables are not determined by the same set of independent variables.

Figure 4 shows the dispersion between the misanthropy ranking and our previous corruption perception ranking.

Insert Figure 4: Corruption perception ranking and misanthropy ranking.

This results sheds light on the relationship between those variables, social trust is strongly connected with political trust. Person's trust in other people and trust in civil servants seem to be positively related.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We found that women are less misanthropic than men and older people also tend to be less misanthropic than young people. Moreover, misanthropy decreases when income and/ or the level of education increases. Additionally, although we found that there are no significant differences among religious groups and atheists, our model shows that religiosity decreases misanthropy.

The incidence of belonging to minorities groups is also significant; we found that if the person belongs to an ethnic group that is a minority in his/ her country, misanthropy increases.

Marital status also influences on misanthropy. While being married decreases it, being divorced has the opposite effect. Something similar was found in the case of political affiliation, if the individual identifies with the left, he/ she seems to be less misanthropic than do people who not and having no political preferences increase

misanthropy.

It was found that unemployed people are likely to be more misanthropic than those who have a job or are retired. In addition those who have a job vary on misanthropy depending on its characteristics. Working for a private enterprise, being self-employed and working more than 30 hours per week make misanthropy higher.

As expected, misanthropy is influenced by context factor. We capture those effects by including (dummies) variables per country of residence. We included thirty-six countries and the results were computed with respect to United States. It was found that there is a significant difference in twenty-five cases. According to our model, ten countries show a positive impact (people are more misanthropic than United States inhabitants) and fifteen register a negative people (people are less misanthropic than United States residents). As showed, country effects vary from 73.4% in the case of Chile to -63.3% in the case of Cyprus.

Moreover, the ranking of countries shows that among others characteristics, economic performance could be an important determinant of misanthropy. All Latin American countries are found at the top of the ranking and the same is true in the case of almost all Ex-socialist countries of Eastern Europe and Russia. Australia, Canada and New Zealand (Anglo-settlement colonies), register a negative sign as do European countries. This group of countries has in common good indicators of economic performance. In the case of Asia, we found greater heterogeneity.

Finally, we find evidence that misanthropy is strongly and positively correlated with corruption perception.

Summing up, we found substantial heterogeneity in the determinants of misanthropy. In particular, not only there are socio-demographic and cultural variables that play a relevant role in shaping this attitude but also we show that economic and context characteristics such as personal income, employment status and country of residence matters. This heterogeneity makes difficult to revert this attitude, which has been increasing. Additionally, misanthropy ranking of countries is correlated with two corruption perception rankings.

REFERENCES

- Cattacin, S., Gerber, B., Sardi, M., and Wegener, R. (2006). *Monitoring rightwing attitudes, xenophobia and misanthropy in Switzerland: an explorative study*. University of Geneva, Department of sociology, sociological research: report 1.
- Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D. I., Scheinkman, J. A. and Soutter, C. L. (1999). *What is Social Capital? The Determinants of Trust and Trustworthiness*. NBER, working paper 7216.
- Heitmeyer, W. (ed.) (2003). *Deutsche Zustände: Folge 1*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage.
- Melgar, N., Rossi, M. and Smith, Tom W. (2008). *Perception of Corruption*. Department of Economics; Uruguay, working paper 05-08.
- Putnam, R. (1995). *The Case of the Missing Social Capital*. Mimeo.
- Rasinski, K. A., Berktold, J., Smith, T. W. and Albertson, B. L. (2002). *America Recovers: A Follow-up to a national Study of Public response to the September 11th Terrorist Attack*. Chicago, IL., National Opinion Research Center.
- Smith, T. W. (1997). *Factors Relating to Misanthropy in Contemporary American Society*. *Social Science Research* 26 (2): 179-196.
- Wilson, T. C. (1991). *Urbanism, migration and tolerance: a reassessment*. *American Sociological Review*, 56: 117-123)

ANNEX

1. Figures

Figure 1 - Distribution of answers.





Figure 2 – Density and frequency functions.

2.1 Density functions



2.2 Frequency functions




Figure 3 - Marginal effects per country of residence.





Figure 4 – Corruption perception ranking and misanthropy ranking.



2. Tables.

Table 1 - Description of independent variables.

Hypothesis	Variable	Categories	Mean
H-01	Woman	1 if respondent is a woman	0.533
H-02	Age18-30	1 if respondent's age is between 18 and 30 years old	0.195
	Age31-50	1 if respondent's age is between 31 and 50 years old	0.405
	Age51-70	1 if respondent's age is between 51 and 70 years old	0.304
	Age+71	1 if respondent's age is 71 years old or older	0.097
H-03	Edu1	1 if respondent's years of education are less than 6	0.065
	Edu2	1 if respondent's years of education are between 6 and 12	0.578
	Edu3	1 if respondent's years of education are between 13 and 17	0.293
	Edu4	1 if respondent's years of education are between 18 and 22	0.064
	Income	Log of earnings	8.542
H-04	Married	1 if respondent is married or living as married	0.601
	Divorced	1 if respondent is divorced or legally separated	0.087
H-05	Minorities	1 if respondent belongs to an ethnic group that is a minority in his/ her country	0.053
H-06	No_religion	1 if respondent is atheist or agnostic	0.195
	Roman_catholic	1 if religious group is Roman Catholic	0.359
	Attendance	1 if respondent attends religious services, at least, once a month	0.307
H-07	Big city	1 if respondent lives in a big city	0.321
H-08	Unemployed	1 if respondent is unemployed	0.075
H-09	Private_sector	1 if respondent works for a private enterprise	0.419
	Self-employed	1 if respondent is self-employed	0.125
	Worked_hours	1 if respondent works more than 30 hours a week	0.900
	Center	1 if party affiliation is center	0.162
	Left	1 if party affiliation is left	0.204
	Right	1 if party affiliation is right	0.179
	No_pparty	1 if respondent does not identify with a political party	0.145
H-10	Country dummies	1 if respondent lives in that country	-----

Table 2 - The model.

	<i>MISANTHROPY</i>	
WOMAN	-0.048***	[0.012]
AGE31-50	-0.038**	[0.018]
AGE51-70	-0.048**	[0.020]
AGE+71	-0.140***	[0.026]
EDU2	-0.038	[0.032]
EDU3	-0.186***	[0.034]
EDU4	-0.300***	[0.039]
INCOME	-0.067***	[0.008]
MARRIED	-0.065***	[0.015]
DIVORCED	0.063***	[0.024]
LEFT	-0.074***	[0.017]
RIGHT	-0.010	[0.018]
NO_PPARTY	0.121***	[0.022]
UNEMPLOYED	0.132***	[0.034]
PRIVATE_SECTOR	0.065***	[0.013]
WORKED_HOURS	0.080***	[0.018]
SELF_EMPLOYED	0.104***	[0.020]
NO_RELIGION	-0.007	[0.016]
ATTENDANCE	-0.037**	[0.016]
BIG_CITY	-0.007	[0.013]
MINORITIES	0.155***	[0.041]
CHILE	0.734***	[0.048]
BRAZIL	0.545***	[0.051]
POLAND	0.417***	[0.049]
SLOVENIA	0.403***	[0.058]
SLOVAK	0.328***	[0.059]
MEXICO	0.211***	[0.052]
URUGUAY	0.191***	[0.055]
BULGARIA	0.176***	[0.052]
PHILIPPINES	0.156***	[0.048]
RUSSIA	0.147***	[0.040]
AUSTRALIA	-0.079**	[0.036]
IRELAND	-0.124**	[0.055]
CZECH REPUBLIC	-0.134***	[0.045]
NEW ZEALAND	-0.136***	[0.038]
CANADA	-0.177***	[0.051]
JAPAN	-0.182***	[0.045]
SWEDEN	-0.233***	[0.038]
NORWAY	-0.253***	[0.045]
FINLAND	-0.277***	[0.042]
DENMARK	-0.363***	[0.044]
GERMANY	-0.444***	[0.040]
NETHERLANDS	-0.466***	[0.038]
AUSTRIA	-0.577***	[0.049]
SWITZERLAND	-0.626***	[0.039]
CYPRUS	-0.633***	[0.045]

FRANCE	-0.029	[0.046]
GREAT BRITAIN	-0.083	[0.054]
HUNGARY	-0.028	[0.047]
ISRAEL	0.042	[0.054]
LATVIA	-0.054	[0.053]
PORTUGAL	0.001	[0.050]
SOUTH AFRICA	-0.034	[0.062]
SOUTH KOREA	0.049	[0.044]
SPAIN	-0.008	[0.044]
TAIWAN	-0.026	[0.042]
Constant	0.659***	[0.076]
Observations	30762	
R-squared	0.15	

Robust standard errors in brackets

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

United States is the omitted variable

Table 3: Corruption and misanthropy rankings.

Country	Corruption perception (1)	Transparency International (2)	Misanthropy
Brazil	0,344	3,9	0,545
Mexico	0,222	3,6	0,211
Bulgaria	0,183	4,1	0,176
Poland	0,175	3,5	0,417
Russia	0,146	2,8	0,147
France	0,140	7,1	0,000
Slovak	0,135	4,0	0,328
Philippines	0,125	2,6	0,156
Slovenia	0,053	6,0	0,403
Czech Republic	0,053	4,2	-0,134
Great Britain	0,045	8,6	0,000
Hungary	0,040	4,8	0,000
Chile	0,038	7,4	0,734
Uruguay	0,037	6,2	0,191
Israel	0,037	6,4	0,000
Japan	0,025	6,9	-0,182
Latvia	0,014	4,0	0,000
Portugal	0,000	6,3	0,000
South Korea	-0,013	4,5	0,000
Spain	-0,030	7,1	0,000
Taiwan	-0,030	5,6	0,000
Ireland	-0,031	7,5	-0,124
Germany	-0,031	8,2	-0,444
Canada	-0,033	8,5	-0,177
Sweden	-0,042	9,2	-0,233
Austria	-0,044	8,4	-0,577
Australia	-0,049	8,8	-0,079
Switzerland	-0,052	9,1	-0,626
Norway	-0,053	8,9	-0,253
Netherlands	-0,054	8,7	-0,466
Cyprus	-0,055	5,4	-0,633
United States	-0,055	7,5	0,000
New Zealand	-0,056	9,6	-0,136
Finland	-0,059	9,7	-0,277
Denmark	-0,059	9,5	-0,363

(1) This ranking was obtained in a previous research, Melgar et al. (2008), each coefficient indicates the changed in the probability of perceiving the highest level of corruption if the person lives in that country with respect to living in the United States.

(2) Corruption Perception Index 2004, the higher the coefficient, the lower the level of corruption perception.