Annual online survey in its 22nd year

Fieldwork conducted: Nov 1 – Nov 24, 2021

28 countries 36,000+ respondents 1,150+ respondents/country

GLOBAL AVERAGES vary based on the number of countries surveyed each year:

GLOBAL 27 does not include Nigeria*
GLOBAL 22 does not include Colombia, Kenya, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, S. Africa and Thailand
GLOBAL 24 Not asked in China, Russia, Thailand

the sensitive nature of the question prevented this data from being collected in these markets

Other global averages detailed in technical appendix

*To prevent skewing the global results, Nigeria is not included in any global averages because the online population is not representative of the true population.
22 YEARS OF TRUST

'R01
Rising Influence of NGOs

'R02
Fall of the Celebrity CEO

'R03
Earned Media More Credible Than Advertising

'R04
U.S. Companies in Europe Suffer Trust Discount

'R05
Trust Shifts from “Authorities” to Peers

'R06
A “Person Like Me” Emerges as Credible Spokesperson

'R07
Business More Trusted Than Government and Media

'R08
Young People Have More Trust in Business

'R09
Trust in Business Plummets

'R10
Performance and Transparency Essential to Trust

'R11
Business Must Partner With Government to Regain Trust

'R12
Fall of Government

'R13
Crisis of Leadership

'R14
Business to Lead the Debate for Change

'R15
Trust is Essential to Innovation

'R16
Growing Inequality of Trust

'R17
Trust in Crisis

'R18
The Battle for Truth

'R19
Trust at Work

'R20
Trust: Competence and Ethics

'R21
Business Most Trusted

'R22
The Cycle of Distrust
TRUST DOWN UNDER
The Trust Index is the average percent trust in NGOs, business, government and media. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, 27-mkt avg.

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. The Trust Index has declined 10 pts since 2017.
CONTINUED TRUST INEQUALITY IN AUSTRALIA
Trust Index in Australia


Distrust Neutral Trust

Record high
High income (Top 25%)
22pts

Trust gap, high vs. low income
18pts

Low (Bottom 25%)
50
44

Countries with the greatest income-based trust inequality

Thailand 36pts
Saudi Arabia 27pts
UK 25pts
Ireland 23pts
Germany 21pts
The Netherlands 21pts

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. The Trust Index is the average percent trust in NGOs, business, government and media. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, Australia, by income.
TRUST DECLINES FOR ALL INSTITUTIONS; NO INSTITUTION TRUSTED IN AUSTRALIA

Percent trust, in Australia

The Trust Index is the average percent trust in NGOs, business, government and media. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, Australia

TRUST INDEX

Change, 2021 to 2022

-6 pts

Business

58

-5

NGOs

58

-4

Government

52

-9

Media

43

-8

Distrust
Neutral
Trust
Change, 2021 to 2022

(1-49)
(50-59)
(60-100)
AUSTRALIA’S TRUST BUBBLE HAS BURST
Per cent trust, in Australia

Business

NGOs

Government

Media


Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, Australia.
MILLENNIALS MOST TRUSTING GENERATION; GEN Z LEAST TRUSTING

Per cent trust

Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change, 2021 to 2022

Distrust Neutral Trust

2021 Edelman Trust Barometer. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, Australia, by generation.
TRUST IN MOST INDUSTRY SECTORS DECLINE

Per cent trust, in Australia

Social media distrusted and falls further

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer, TRU_IND. Please indicate how much you trust businesses in each of the following industries to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. Industries shown to half of the sample. General population, Australia.
MY EMPLOYER REMAINS A BASTION OF TRUST

Per cent trust

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, by market. "Your employer" only shown to those who are an employee of an organization (Q43/1). *Nigeria is not included in the global average.
A CYCLE OF DISTRUST
GOVERNMENT AND MEDIA SEEN AS DIVISIVE

Per cent who say, in Australia

These institutions are…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Unifying Force</th>
<th>Dividing Force</th>
<th>Gap, difference between unifying force vs. dividing force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-29 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-22 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "a dividing force in society" and "a unifying force in society" refer to the perceptions of whether these institutions are seen as unifying or dividing forces in society. The gap indicates the difference in perceptions, with positive numbers indicating a unifying perspective and negative numbers indicating a dividing perspective.

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. [INS]_PER_DIM. In thinking about why you do or do not trust [institution], please specify where you think they fall on the scale between the two opposing descriptions. 11-point scale; top 5 box, positive; bottom 5 box, negative. Questions asked of half of the sample. General population, Australia.
GOVERNMENT NOT SEEN AS ABLE TO SOLVE SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

Per cent who say each is a strength of institutions, in Australia

Take a leadership role

Coordinate cross-institutional efforts to solve societal problems

Get results

Successfully execute plans and strategies that yield results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority do not see as strength</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a leadership role</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get results</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. CMP_AR_E_Ins. Thinking about [institution] as they are today, please indicate whether you consider each of the following dimensions to be one of their areas of strength or weakness. 5-point scale; top 2 box, strength. Question asked of half of the sample. General population, Australia.
PERSISTENT SOCIETAL FEARS IN AUSTRALIA

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer, POP_EMO. Some people say they worry about many things while others say they have few concerns. We are interested in what you worry about. Specifically, how much do you worry about each of the following? 9-point scale; top 4 box, worry. Non-job loss attributes shown to half of the sample. General population, Australia. Job loss asked of those who are an employee of an organization (Q43/1). Job loss is a net of attributes 1-3, 5, and 22-24.
DECLINING ECONOMIC OPTIMISM IN AUSTRALIA

Per cent who believe they and their families will be better off in five years’ time

My family and I will be better off in five years’ time

51% 9 countries at all-time lows

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. CNG_FUT. Thinking about the economic prospects for yourself and your family, how do you think you and your family will be doing in five years’ time? 5-point scale; top 2 box, better off. General population, 27-mkt avg. *Nigeria is not included in the global average
NEWS SOURCES FAIL TO FIX THEIR TRUST PROBLEM

Per cent trust, in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source</th>
<th>Least-trusting countries for each source</th>
<th>Change 2012 to 2022</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional media</td>
<td>U.S. 45, Japan 47, S. Korea, U.S. 43</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search engines</td>
<td>Russia 35, Japan 39, U.S. 28</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned media</td>
<td>S. Korea 24, Russia 28, U.S. 28</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>France 19, Germany 20, Canada 21</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. COM_MCL. When looking for general news and information, how much would you trust each type of source for general news and information? 9-point scale; top 4 box: trust. Question asked of half of the sample. General population, Australia.

*From 2012-2015, “Online Search Engines” were included as a media type. In 2016, this was changed to “Search Engines.”
FAKE NEWS CONCERNS AT ALL-TIME HIGHS

Per cent who agree

I worry about **false information or fake news** being used as a weapon

Global 27

76%

+4 pts

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. ATT_MED_AGR. Below is a list of statements. For each one, please rate how much you agree or disagree with that statement using a nine-point scale where one means “strongly disagree” and nine means “strongly agree”. 9-point scale; top 4 box. agree. Question asked of half the sample. General population, 27-mkt avg. *Nigeria is not included in the global average.
CYCLE OF DISTRUST THREATENS SOCIETAL STABILITY

Government and media feed cycle of division and disinformation for votes and clicks.

NGOs and business pressured to take on societal problems beyond their abilities.
DISTRUST BECOMES THE DEFAULT
CONVINCED WE’RE BEING LIED TO BY SOCIETAL LEADERS

Per cent who worry, in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Worry Percentage</th>
<th>Change 2021 to 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journalists and reporters</td>
<td>65% (+1 pt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business leaders</td>
<td>61% (-1 pt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My country's government leaders</td>
<td>61% (+3 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are purposely trying to mislead people by saying things they know are false or gross exaggerations
Which are you more likely to believe?

55% My tendency is to distrust until I see evidence that something is trustworthy

61% My tendency is to trust until I see evidence that something is untrustworthy

People in this country lack the ability to have constructive and civil debates about issues they disagree on
Per cent trust, in Australia

TRUST BECOMES PERSONAL

Double-digit decline for journalists

Scientists and employers most trusted

Journalists 43 43 38 -12
CEOs 43 43 -5
Government leaders 43 43 -9
Citizens of my country 59 +8
My CEO 61 +7
People in my local community 64 +4
National health authorities 68 +0
Scientists 71 +6
My coworkers 73 +n/a

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. TRU_PEP. Below is a list of groups of people. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that group of people to do what is right using a 9-point scale where one means that you “do not trust them at all” and nine means that you “trust them a great deal”. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. Some attributes asked of half the sample. General population, Australia. “My coworkers” and “my CEO” only shown to those who are an employee of an organization (Q43/1).
SOCIETAL LEADERSHIP NOW A CORE BUSINESS FUNCTION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buy or advocate for brands based on beliefs</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose a place to work based on beliefs</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest based on beliefs and values</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of institutional investors subject ESG to</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the same scrutiny as operational and financial considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global 7**

Source: 2021 Edelman Trust Barometer Special Report: Institutional Investors

---

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. Belief-driven consumer, employee, and investor segments. General population, Australia. Employee data is filtered to be among employees of an organization (Q43/1). Investor data is only among those who sell stocks, bonds, or mutual funds as a standalone or employer-sponsored investment (INVESTOR/1). See Technical Appendix for a full explanation of how belief-driven consumers, employees, and investors were measured.
CEOS EXPECTED TO BE THE FACE OF CHANGE

Per cent who say

CEOs should be personally visible when discussing public policy with external stakeholders or work their company has done to benefit society

Among employees

When considering a job, I expect the CEO to speak publicly about controversial social and political issues that I care about

80% (net)

60%

Change, 2019 to 2022

+12 pts

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. CEO_VIS. How visible do you think a CEO should personally be in these different types of business situations? 9-point scale; top 4 box, visible. Question asked of half of the sample. Data shown is a net of attributes 2 and 10. EMP_IMP. When considering an organization as a potential place of employment, how important is each of the following to you in deciding whether or not you would accept a job offer there? 3-point scale; top 2 box, important. Question asked of those who are an employee of an organization (Q43/1). General population, Australia.
WANT MORE, NOT LESS, BUSINESS ENGAGEMENT ON SOCIETAL ISSUES

Per cent who say, in Australia

On addressing each **societal issue**, business is…

![Bar chart showing the percentage of people who think business is not doing enough or overstepping for various societal issues.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Not Doing Enough</th>
<th>Overstepping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce reskilling</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic inequality</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy information</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to healthcare</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic injustice</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gap, not doing enough vs. overstepping**

- Workforce reskilling: 35 points
- Climate change: 34 points
- Economic inequality: 33 points
- Trustworthy information: 29 points
- Access to healthcare: 24 points
- Systemic injustice: 24 points

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. BUS_BND. Think about business as an institution, and its current level of engagement in addressing societal needs and issues. When it comes to each of the following areas, please indicate if you think business is going too far and overstepping what it should be doing, is doing just the right amount in regard to this activity, or is not going far enough in its actions and should be doing more. 3-point scale; code 3, “not doing enough”; code 1, “overstepping”. General population, Australia.
CEOS EXPECTED TO INFORM POLICY, NOT POLITICS

Per cent who expect CEOs to inform and shape conversations and policy debates about each issue, in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Strong/mandatory</th>
<th>Some expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/economy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage inequality</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and automation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice and discrimination</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global warming and climate change</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and its impact on jobs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving education and healthcare systems</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to increase the COVID vaccination rate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who the next leader of the country should be</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BREAKING THE CYCLE OF DISTRUST
NGOS AND BUSINESS MUST ACT AS STABILIZING FORCES (Competence score, net ethical score)

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. The ethical scores are averages of nets based on [INS]_PER_DIM/1-4. Question asked of half of the sample. The competence score is a net based on TRU_3D_[INS]/1. Depending on the question it was either asked of the full of half the sample. General population, Australia. For full details regarding how this data was calculated and plotted, please see the Technical Appendix.
GOOD INFORMATION CAN HELP CLOSE THE SOCIETAL DIVIDE

Trust Index

Well-informed regularly do the following:

Follow news regularly
- Consult 3+ news sources daily
- Read business and/or public policy news

Seek quality information
- Consult news sources with which they disagree
- Check information against multiple sources

When low-income respondents are well-informed, they are more trusting than high-income respondents who are not well-informed.

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. The Trust Index is the average percent trust in NGOs, business, government and media. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, 22-mkt avg., by income. Media Consumption scale. General population, 22-mkt avg., by income. For full details on how the Well-Informed Scale was built, please refer to the Technical Appendix.
# MY EMPLOYER MEDIA MOST BELIEVABLE

Per cent who believe information from each source automatically, or after seeing it twice or less, in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications from…</th>
<th>My employer</th>
<th>National government</th>
<th>Media reports, named source</th>
<th>Major corporations</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
<th>Media reports, anonymous source</th>
<th>My social media feed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Nr. of times they need to see the information repeated before believing it:**
  - Once or twice
  - If I see it here, I will automatically assume it is true

- **I will never believe it is true if this is the only place I see it**
  - My employer: 11
  - National government: 15
  - Media reports, named source: 17
  - Major corporations: 22
  - Advertising: 28
  - Media reports, anonymous source: 28
  - My social media feed: 41

---

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. HEAR_TIME1. When you see a new piece of information or a news story in each of the following information sources, how many times do you need to see it or hear it repeated in that same type of information source before you believe it is really true? Question asked of half of the sample. “Once or twice” is a sum of codes 2 and 3. General population, Australia. “Employer communications” only shown to those who are an employee of an organization (Q43/1).
**INFORMATION QUALITY NOW MOST POWERFUL TRUST BUILDER ACROSS INSTITUTIONS**

Potential trust gain associated with doing each well (top 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>% pt gain</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>% pt gain</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>% pt gain</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>% pt gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information quality</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Information quality</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Information quality</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Information quality</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold others accountable</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Exert power effectively</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Take a leadership role</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Communication and transparency</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and transparency</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Work with other institutions and organizations</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Exert power effectively</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Exert power effectively</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exert power effectively</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Take a leadership role</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Long-term thinking and planning</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Change management</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get results</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Change management</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Hold others accountable</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Hold others accountable</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2022 Edelman Trust Barometer. Regression analysis. CMP_ARE_[INS]. Thinking about [institution] as they are today, please indicate whether you consider each of the following dimensions to be one of their areas of strength or weakness. 5-point scale; top 2 box, strength. Question asked of half of the sample. TRU_INS. Below is a list of institutions. For each one, please indicate how much you trust that institution to do what is right. 9-point scale; top 4 box, trust. General population, 24-mkt avg. For a full explanation of how this data was calculated, please see the Technical Appendix. Data not collected in China, Thailand and Russia for CMP_ARE_[INS].
RESTORING TRUST IS KEY TO SOCIETAL STABILITY

Business societal role is here to stay
People want more business leadership, not less.

Demonstrate tangible progress
Restore belief in society’s ability to build a better future: show the system works.

Leadership must focus on long-term thinking
Solutions over divisiveness; long-term thinking over short-term gain.

Every institution must provide trustworthy information
Clear, consistent, fact-based information is critical to breaking the cycle of distrust.
Some questions were asked of only half of the sample. Please refer to the footnotes on each slide for details.

For the general population, there were additional quotas on ethnicity in the UK and U.S., and on nationality in the UAE and Saudi Arabia.

For the informed public, there were additional quotas on nationality in the UAE and Saudi Arabia.

All data collected in China is from the mainland. Regions of Greater China were not surveyed.

In some cases, all the informed public sample was collected within the general population; some countries required an oversample to reach the desired target.

NOTE: Because some of the content we ask is deemed politically sensitive there are several countries where we take special precautions in order to avoid putting our respondents, or ourselves, in a position to break any local laws. We work closely with our sample partner and its legal team to identify which questions, and in what countries, we should refrain from asking. The three countries where we removed questions and/or answer options were China, Russia, and Thailand.

1. Some questions were asked of only half of the sample. Please refer to the footnotes on each slide for details.
2. For the general population, there were additional quotas on ethnicity in the UK and U.S., and on nationality in the UAE and Saudi Arabia.
3. For the informed public, there were additional quotas on nationality in the UAE and Saudi Arabia.
4. All data collected in China is from the mainland. Regions of Greater China were not surveyed.
5. In some cases, all the informed public sample was collected within the general population; some countries required an oversample to reach the desired target.

### 2022 EDELMAN TRUST BAROMETER: SAMPLES

#### SAMPLE SIZE, QUOTAS AND MARGIN OF ERROR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Informed Public</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample Size¹</td>
<td>Quotas Set On²</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td>Sample Size⁵</td>
<td>Quotas Set On³</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>Age, Gender, Region</td>
<td>+/- 0.6% total sample +/- 0.8% half sample</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Age, Education, Gender</td>
<td>+/- 1.3% total sample +/- 1.8% half sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China⁴ and U.S.</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>Age, Gender, Region</td>
<td>+/- 2.9% total sample +/- 4.1% half sample</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Age, Education, Gender</td>
<td>+/- 4.4% total sample +/- 6.2% half sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>Age, Gender, Region</td>
<td>+/- 2.9% total sample +/- 4.1% half sample</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Age, Education, Gender</td>
<td>+/- 9.8% total sample +/- 13.9% half sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other countries</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>Age, Gender, Region</td>
<td>+/- 2.9% total sample +/- 4.1% half sample</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Age, Education, Gender</td>
<td>+/- 6.9% total sample +/- 9.8% half sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Because some of the content we ask is deemed politically sensitive there are several countries where we take special precautions in order to avoid putting our respondents, or ourselves, in a position to break any local laws. We work closely with our sample partner and its legal team to identify which questions, and in what countries, we should refrain from asking. The three countries where we removed questions and/or answer options were China, Russia, and Thailand.

1. Some questions were asked of only half of the sample. Please refer to the footnotes on each slide for details.
2. For the general population, there were additional quotas on ethnicity in the UK and U.S., and on nationality in the UAE and Saudi Arabia.
3. For the informed public, there were additional quotas on nationality in the UAE and Saudi Arabia.
4. All data collected in China is from the mainland. Regions of Greater China were not surveyed.
5. In some cases, all the informed public sample was collected within the general population; some countries required an oversample to reach the desired target.