



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Political trust: Pillar or peril for democracy

Empirical tests of the consequences of political trust on individuals' attitudes and behaviors

Ouattara, E.M.S.

Publication date

2025

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Ouattara, E. M. S. (2025). *Political trust: Pillar or peril for democracy: Empirical tests of the consequences of political trust on individuals' attitudes and behaviors*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Appendix Chapter 4. The Elusive Effect of Political Trust on Participation

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A1. Dependent Variable and Experiment

Variable	Vignette Number		
	1, N = 3,259¹	2, N = 3,259¹	3, N = 3,259¹
Intended Participation			
Mean (SD)	2.47 (0.90)	2.50 (0.94)	2.52 (0.95)
Range	1.00, 4.00	1.00, 4.00	1.00, 4.00
(Missing)	383	371	376
Material Cost			
Sacrifice Uncertain	1,632 / 3,259 (50%)	1,624 / 3,259 (50%)	1,659 / 3,259 (51%)
Sacrifice Certain	1,627 / 3,259 (50%)	1,635 / 3,259 (50%)	1,600 / 3,259 (49%)
Activity Type			
Public Meeting	1,105 / 3,259 (34%)	1,095 / 3,259 (34%)	1,125 / 3,259 (35%)
Petition	1,077 / 3,259 (33%)	1,055 / 3,259 (32%)	1,059 / 3,259 (32%)
Peaceful demo	1,077 / 3,259 (33%)	1,109 / 3,259 (34%)	1,075 / 3,259 (33%)
Success Chance			
Little Chance	810 / 3,259 (25%)	1,078 / 3,259 (33%)	1,073 / 3,259 (33%)
Uncertain Chance	812 / 3,259 (25%)	1,072 / 3,259 (33%)	1,150 / 3,259 (35%)
Good Chance	824 / 3,259 (25%)	1,109 / 3,259 (34%)	1,036 / 3,259 (32%)
Blank	813 / 3,259 (25%)	0 / 3,259 (0%)	0 / 3,259 (0%)
attention check			
Not Passed	851 / 3,259 (26%)	851 / 3,259 (26%)	851 / 3,259 (26%)
Passed	2,408 / 3,259 (74%)	2,408 / 3,259 (74%)	2,408 / 3,259 (74%)

¹ Attention check only asked after 1st vignette

APPENDICES

Table A2. Respondent Descriptives and Attention Check

Variable	N	Overall, N = 3,259 ¹	Attention Check	
			Not Passed, N = 851 ¹	Passed, N = 2,408 ¹
Country	3,259			
NL		1,614 / 3,259 (50%)	328 / 851 (39%)	1,286 / 2,408 (53%)
UK		1,645 / 3,259 (50%)	523 / 851 (61%)	1,122 / 2,408 (47%)
Gender	3,259			
1.Male		1,596 / 3,259 (49%)	406 / 851 (48%)	1,190 / 2,408 (49%)
2.Female		1,663 / 3,259 (51%)	445 / 851 (52%)	1,218 / 2,408 (51%)
Age	3,259			
Mean (SD)		55.07 (15.47)	54.90 (15.80)	55.14 (15.36)
Range		18.00, 93.00	18.00, 89.00	18.00, 93.00
Political Trust	3,241			
Mean (SD)		2.87 (1.06)	2.82 (1.04)	2.89 (1.07)
Range		1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00
(Missing)		18	14	4
Political Interest	3,175			
Mean (SD)		2.71 (0.85)	2.45 (0.90)	2.81 (0.81)
Range		1.00, 4.00	1.00, 4.00	1.00, 4.00
(Missing)		84	38	46
Internal Efficacy (Understand)	3,197			
Mean (SD)		3.68 (0.83)	3.43 (0.89)	3.76 (0.79)
Range		1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00
(Missing)		62	42	20

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A2. Respondent Descriptives and Attention Check

Variable	N	Overall, N = 3,259 ⁷	Not Passed, N = 851 ⁷	Attention Check	
				Passed, N = 2,408 ⁷	
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)	3,201				
Mean (SD)		2.61 (1.13)	2.55 (1.15)	2.64 (1.12)	
Range		1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	
(Missing)		58	33	25	
External Efficacy (Legal Options)	3,086				
Mean (SD)		3.11 (0.94)	3.12 (0.94)	3.11 (0.94)	
Range		1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	
(Missing)		173	95	78	
External Efficacy (System Options)	3,053				
Mean (SD)		2.72 (1.04)	2.60 (0.98)	2.76 (1.06)	
Range		1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	1.00, 5.00	
(Missing)		206	96	110	
Education	3,199				
1.Primary School		145 / 3,199 (4.5%)	49 / 828 (5.9%)	96 / 2,371 (4.0%)	
2.High School/Tertiary/Tech. College		1,799 / 3,199 (56%)	508 / 828 (61%)	1,291 / 2,371 (54%)	
3.University/Higher Education		880 / 3,199 (28%)	205 / 828 (25%)	675 / 2,371 (28%)	
4.Postgraduate Education		375 / 3,199 (12%)	66 / 828 (8.0%)	309 / 2,371 (13%)	
(Missing)		60	23	37	
Occupation	3,258				

APPENDICES

Table A2. Respondent Descriptives and Attention Check

Variable	N	Overall, N = 3,259 ¹	Attention Check	
			Not Passed, N = 851 ¹	Passed, N = 2,408 ¹
1. Own business/Self-employed/Freelance		170 / 3,258 (5.2%)	39 / 851 (4.6%)	131 / 2,407 (5.4%)
2. Salaried Employee		1,574 / 3,258 (48%)	402 / 851 (47%)	1,172 / 2,407 (49%)
3. Homemaker		233 / 3,258 (7.2%)	73 / 851 (8.6%)	160 / 2,407 (6.6%)
4. Retired		913 / 3,258 (28%)	239 / 851 (28%)	674 / 2,407 (28%)
5. Student		74 / 3,258 (2.3%)	21 / 851 (2.5%)	53 / 2,407 (2.2%)
6. Unemployed		133 / 3,258 (4.1%)	42 / 851 (4.9%)	91 / 2,407 (3.8%)
7. Unable to Work		136 / 3,258 (4.2%)	25 / 851 (2.9%)	111 / 2,407 (4.6%)
8. Refused		17 / 3,258 (0.5%)	6 / 851 (0.7%)	11 / 2,407 (0.5%)
9. Other		8 / 3,258 (0.2%)	4 / 851 (0.5%)	4 / 2,407 (0.2%)
(Missing)		1	0	1

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A2. Respondent Descriptives and Attention Check

Variable	N	Overall, N = 3,259 ¹	Attention Check	
			Not Passed, N = 851 ¹	Passed, N = 2,408 ¹
Attention Check (Detailed)	3,259			
Don't Know		496 / 3,259 (15%)	496 / 851 (58%)	0 / 2,408 (0%)
Your local council members		2,408 / 3,259 (74%)	0 / 851 (0%)	2,408 / 2,408 (100%)
The House of Lords		152 / 3,259 (4.7%)	152 / 851 (18%)	0 / 2,408 (0%)
The Prime Minister		170 / 3,259 (5.2%)	170 / 851 (20%)	0 / 2,408 (0%)
The Ministry of Justice		33 / 3,259 (1.0%)	33 / 851 (3.9%)	0 / 2,408 (0%)
¹ n / N (%)				

APPENDICES

Robustness Checks

Robustness Check #1

Attention Check - Focusing on Attentive Respondents (Tables A1 and A2)

Overview: We introduced a simple attention check after our first vignette to ensure that respondents were paying attention. We asked respondents to indicate “who, in the previous scenario, plans on raising taxes and charges” (see Table A2 for multiple choice response options). Out of a total of 3259 respondents who took part in the experiment, 851 failed the attention check and 2,408 passed it.

Modeling Approach: To assess the impact of the attention-check we fit a few hierarchical random intercept model with vignettes nested in individuals. We compare the overall sample to a subsample of respondents who correctly answered the attention check and those who did not.

Results:

Overall, the experimental effects are stronger among attentive respondents (see Table A3)

The effects of political interest (control) are not significant among attentive respondents.

Table A3b provides an overview of the experiment among inattentive respondents. Outcome-related motivations (material cost and success chance) are not significant among this group. Additionally, experimental factors only account for a small R^2 among this group.

Takeaway:

The attention check we incorporated does matter. Not only are the experimental effects stronger among attentive respondents, the experiment also explains more variance among attentive respondents. Our analyses in the paper and future analyses are based on attentive sample.

APPENDICES

Table A3. Hierarchical Models - Attention Check

Dependent Variable: Intended Participation	M0: Experiment (Full Sample)		M1: Experiment (Attentive Sample)		M2: Full Model (Full Sample)		M3: Full Model (Attentive Sample)	
Predictors	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se
Intercept	2.38 ***	0.03	2.39 ***	0.03	2.17 ***	0.15	2.37 ***	0.17
<u>Material Cost (ref. Uncertain)</u>								
Cost Certain	0.08 ***	0.01	0.10 ***	0.02	0.07 ***	0.01	0.09 ***	0.02
<u>Activity Type (ref. Public Meeting)</u>								
Petition	0.26 ***	0.02	0.30 ***	0.02	0.25 ***	0.02	0.28 ***	0.02
Peaceful Demo	-0.31 ***	0.02	-0.36 ***	0.02	-0.31 ***	0.02	-0.35 ***	0.02
<u>Success Chance (ref. Little Chance)</u>								
Uncertain Chance	0.07 ***	0.02	0.09 ***	0.02	0.08 ***	0.02	0.11 ***	0.02
Good Chance	0.16 ***	0.02	0.19 ***	0.02	0.17 ***	0.02	0.20 ***	0.02
Blank	0.08 **	0.03	0.11 **	0.03	0.09 **	0.03	0.12 ***	0.04
<u>Vignette Sequence (ref. 1st Vignette)</u>								
Vignette 2	0.03 *	0.02	0.05 **	0.02	0.04 *	0.02	0.05 **	0.02
Vignette 3	0.05 ***	0.02	0.06 ***	0.02	0.06 **	0.02	0.06 **	0.02
Respondent Characteristics								
<u>Country (ref. Netherlands)</u>								
United Kingdom	-0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.15 ***	0.03	-0.14 ***	0.04
<u>Political Attitudes</u>								
Political Trust					-0.05 ***	0.02	-0.05 **	0.02
Political Interest					0.08 ***	0.02	0.05	0.02
Internal Efficacy (Understand)					0.07 **	0.02	0.05 *	0.02
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)					0.05 **	0.02	0.05 **	0.02
External Efficacy (Legal Options)					0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02
External Efficacy (System Options)					-0.07 ***	0.02	-0.06 **	0.02

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A3. Hierarchical Models - Attention Check

Dependent Variable: Intended Participation	M0: Experiment (Full Sample)	M1: Experiment (Attentive Sample)	M2: Full Model (Full Sample)	M3: Full Model (Attentive Sample)
<u>Demographics</u>				
Gender: Female			0.01	0.03
Age (years > 18)			0.00	0.00
<u>Education (ref. Primary Education)</u>				
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College			-0.09	0.07
University / Higher			-0.12	0.08
Postgraduate			-0.18 *	0.08
<u>Occupation (ref. Self-Employed)</u>				
Salaried Employee			0.00	0.07
Homemaker			-0.05	0.09
Retired			0.03	0.07
Student			-0.10	0.13
Unemployed			0.10	0.10
Unable to Work			0.06	0.10
Refused			0.00	0.24
Other			-0.05	0.32
				-0.24
				0.37

APPENDICES

Table A3. Hierarchical Models - Attention Check

Dependent Variable: Intended Participation	M0: Experiment (Full Sample)	M1: Experiment (Attentive Sample)	M2: Full Model (Full Sample)	M3: Full Model (Attentive Sample)
Random Effects				
σ^2	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18
τ_{00}	0.15 vignette:id	0.13 vignette:id	0.14 vignette:id	0.13 vignette:id
ICC	0.48 id	0.44 id	0.45 id	0.42 id
N	0.79	0.77	0.77	0.75
Observations	24 vignette 3052 id	24 vignette 2329 id	24 vignette 2702 id	24 vignette 2098 id
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	8647 0.070 / 0.801	6693 0.096 / 0.792	7728 0.103 / 0.793	6062 0.119 / 0.783
				* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A3b. Hierarchical Models - Experiment among Inattentive Sample

	M0: Experiment (Inattentive Sample)	
<i>Predictors</i>	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>
Intercept	2.32 ***	0.07
<u><i>Material Cost (ref: Uncertain)</i></u>		
Cost Certain	0.01	0.03
<u><i>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</i></u>		
Petition	0.13 ***	0.04
Peaceful Demo	-0.15 ***	0.04
<u><i>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</i></u>		
Uncertain Chance	0.01	0.04
Good Chance	0.07	0.04
Blank	-0.01	0.07
<u><i>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</i></u>		
Vignette 2	-0.03	0.04
Vignette 3	0.01	0.04
<u><i>Country (ref: Netherlands)</i></u>		
United Kingdom	-0.02	0.06
Random Effects		
σ^2	0.18	
τ_{00} vignette:id	0.16	
τ_{00} id	0.58	
ICC	0.81	
N_{vignette}	24	
N_{id}	723	
Observations	1954	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.015 / 0.812	
	* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001	

Robustness Check #2

The hierarchical models presented in the paper provide a holistic overview of the effects. Yet, given that our experiment has a cross-over design with variance between individuals and variance within individuals, one may also attempt to disentangle between-person effects of the experiment from within-person effects. Doing so may be helpful for a few reasons. First, between-person effects capture differences between individuals, yet the moderating effects of trust may be rather cognitive such that trust attitudes influence how people respond to different circumstances. Within-person effects are best suited to assess these possibility. Second, the within-person specification also provides a stricter estimate by allowing each individual to serve as their own baseline.

Modeling Approach: The between-respondent part of the experiment refers to Vignette 1. The within-respondent estimation rely on all 3 vignettes. We use a within-person fixed effects specification to estimate within-person effects.

Results and Takeaways:

As shown in Tables A4, and A5 our substantive conclusions remain largely unchanged. The effects of activity type on intended participation are similar in the between-person experiment (see Table A4 M0) and the within-person experiment (see Table A5 M0). Invitations to sign petition lead to higher willingness to participate compared to invitations to join a public meeting. Conversely invitations to join a peaceful demonstration lead to lower willingness to participate. Similarly outcome incentives, personal material costs and success chance enhance willingness to participate. Lastly, as seen in the within-person experiment, respondents rated the second and third vignettes more positively than vignettes 1.⁴⁵ We control for this in our hierarchical models. Looking to the interactions, both within-person and between person estimates yield a similar picture (compare Table A4 M3 and M4 to Table A5 M1). Political trust decreases willingness to participate when respondents are invited to take part in non-institutional activities. And counter to our expectations it does not moderate the effect of outcome-related motivations.

Given these similarities, we rely on the hierarchical random intercept model in the main paper as it provides a holistic overview of the findings.

⁴⁵ Robustness checks indicate that the positive effect of these vignettes do not interact with the experimental manipulations. Moreover, the subsequent positive ratings solely occur in the UK sample

Table A4. Vignette 1 Between-Person Effects - Attentive Sample

Predictors (Intercept)	M0: Experiment		M1: Respondent Characteristics		M2: Political Attitudes		M3: Trust & Experiment		M4: Full- Interaction	
	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se
	2.46 ***	0.05	2.72 ***	0.17	2.55 ***	0.19	2.38 ***	0.23	2.10 ***	0.32
<u>Vignette Dimensions</u>										
<u>Material Cost (ref: Uncertain)</u>										
Cost Certain	0.08 *	0.04	0.07 *	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.14	0.10	0.14	0.10
<u>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</u>										
Petition	0.25 ***	0.04	0.25 ***	0.04	0.26 ***	0.04	0.48 ***	0.13	0.49 ***	0.13
Peaceful demo	-0.42 ***	0.04	-0.41 ***	0.04	-0.41 ***	0.04	-0.17	0.13	-0.17	0.13
<u>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</u>										
Uncertain Chance	0.12 *	0.05	0.10 *	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.15
Good Chance	0.19 ***	0.05	0.19 ***	0.05	0.19 ***	0.05	0.21	0.15	0.21	0.15
Blank	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.10 *	0.05	0.03	0.15	0.03	0.15
<u>Respondent Characteristics</u>										
Gender: Female			-0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04
Age (years > 18)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>Country (ref: Netherlands)</u>										
United Kingdom	-0.07	0.04	-0.09 *	0.04	-0.19 ***	0.04	-0.18 ***	0.04	-0.18 ***	0.04

APPENDICES

Table A4. Vignette 1 Between-Person Effects - Attentive Sample

	M0: Experiment	M1: Respondent Characteristics	M2: Political Attitudes	M3: Trust & Experiment	M4: Full- Interaction
<i>Education (ref: Primary Education)</i>					
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College		-0.19 *	-0.16	0.09	-0.16
University / Higher		-0.20 *	-0.20 *	0.10	-0.20 *
Postgraduate		-0.30 **	-0.31 **	0.10	-0.30 **
<i>Occupation (ref: Self-Employed)</i>					
Salaried Employee		-0.08	-0.07	0.08	-0.07
Homemaker		-0.11	-0.13	0.11	-0.13
Retired		-0.05	-0.05	0.09	-0.05
Student		-0.26	-0.29	0.15	-0.28
Unemployed		-0.03	-0.02	0.12	-0.01
Unable to Work		-0.08	-0.11	0.11	-0.10
Refused		0.10	0.09	0.27	0.09
Other		-0.57	-0.63	0.42	-0.59
<i>Political Attitudes</i>					
Political Trust			-0.07 ***	0.02	0.04
Political Interest			0.04	0.03	0.06
Internal Efficacy (Understand)			0.04	0.04	0.11
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)			0.06 **	0.02	0.04

Table A4. Vignette 1 Between-Person Effects - Attentive Sample

	M0: Experiment	M1: Respondent Characteristics	M2: Political Attitudes	M3: Trust & Experiment	M4: Full- Interaction
Interactions: Political Trust & Vignette Dimensions					
<i>Political Trust * Sacrifice</i>					
Political Trust * Sacrifice Certain			-0.03	0.03	-0.03
<i>Political Trust * Activity Type</i>					
Political Trust * Petition			-0.08	0.04	-0.08 *
Political Trust * Peaceful Demonstration			-0.08 *	0.04	-0.08 *
<i>Political Trust * Success Chance</i>					
Political Trust * Uncertain Chance			0.03	0.05	0.03
Political Trust * Good Chance			-0.01	0.05	-0.01
Political Trust * Blank Chance			0.02	0.05	0.02
Interactions: Political Trust & Political Attitudes (Controls)					
Political Trust * Political Interest					-0.01
Political Trust * Int. Eff. (Understand)					-0.03
Political Trust * Int. Eff. (Qualified)					0.01
Observations	2220	2187	2124	2124	2124
R ² / R ² adjusted	0.107 / 0.105	0.113 / 0.105	0.132 / 0.122	0.135 / 0.122	0.135 / 0.122
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001					

APPENDICES

Table A5. All Vignettes Within-Person Effects - Attentive Sample

<i>Predictors</i>	M0: Experiment		M1: Trust & Experiment	
	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>
Vignette Dimensions				
<u><i>Material Sacrifice (ref: Uncertain)</i></u>				
Sacrifice Certain	0.09 ***	0.02	0.12 **	0.05
<u><i>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</i></u>				
Petition	0.29 ***	0.02	0.44 ***	0.06
Peaceful_demo	- 0.35 ***	0.02	-0.08	0.06
<u><i>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</i></u>				
Uncertain Chance	0.08 ***	0.02	0.05	0.06
Good Chance	0.17 ***	0.02	0.09	0.06
Blank	0.11 **	0.04	0.02	0.09
<u><i>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</i></u>				
Vignette 2	0.05 **	0.02	0.05 **	0.02
Vignette 3	0.07 ***	0.02	0.07 ***	0.02
Interactions: Political Trust & Vignette Dimensions				
<u><i>Political Trust * Sacrifice</i></u>				
Political Trust * Sacrifice Certain			-0.01	0.02
<u><i>Political Trust * Activity Type</i></u>				
Political Trust * Petition			- 0.05 **	0.02
Political Trust * Peaceful Demonstration			- 0.09 ***	0.02
<u><i>Political Trust * Success Chance</i></u>				
Political Trust * Uncertain Chance			0.01	0.02
Political Trust * Good Chance			0.03	0.02
Political Trust * Blank			0.03	0.03
Observations	6693		6684	
R ² / R ² adjusted	0.207 / -0.218		0.213 / -0.211	

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Note: Individual Fixed-Effects Models

Modeling Notes on Robustness Checks 3 - 6:

All subsequent robustness checks are based on the attentive sample.

For robustness checks 3-6 we fit a hierarchical model based on all 3 vignettes in the experiments. We model a random intercept for vignettes nested in each respondent.

The approach doesn't disentangle within from between-respondent effects, but based on robustness check 2, among attentive respondents, between and within-person effects do not differ much. Accordingly, for simplicity's sake, we use hierarchical random effects models in subsequent robustness checks.

Robustness Check #3

Assessing The Positive Effect of Vignette Number (*Table A6 also Table A7*)

Overview: When analyzing the full experiment (vignettes 1,2 and 3), it appears that vignettes 2 and vignettes 3 are rated, on average, more positively than the first vignette. This suggests that the more respondents are asked to indicate how much they're willing to attend an event, the more willing they are to do so. These effects aren't particularly large, but they are important.

Inquiry: One possibility is that the vignettes end up being more positive because respondents change the weight they attribute to the experiment dimension. E.g. sacrifice certainty or success chance may become more salient in the 2nd and 3rd vignette if respondents update their considerations. One way to test this is with interaction effects of the vignette number and each experiment dimension).

Results:

Table A6 - Model 1: None of our treated dimensions (sacrifice certainty, activity type or success chance) interact with the vignette number. This suggests that the effect of vignette number is primarily due to respondents stating they are more willing to join the event the more they are asked about it.

Specification: Another robustness check (#4 - Table A7 - discussed below), suggests that the vignette effect only occurs in the UK experiment. It is statistically insignificant in the Dutch experiment.

APPENDICES

Takeaway:

In the UK respondents were more likely to express intent to join the initiative in vignettes 2 and 3 than vignette 1. This effect is not due to experimental factors being rated more positively; it is distinct. It is important to adjust for this effect in our models (we do so).

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A6. Effect of Vignette Number - Full Experiment				
Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Joining Initiative	M0: Experiment		M1: Experiment & Vignette Number	
<i>Predictors</i>	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>
(Intercept)	2.52 ***	0.14	2.54 ***	0.14
Vignette Dimensions				
<u><i>Material Sacrifice (ref: Uncertain)</i></u>				
Sacrifice Certain	0.10 ***	0.02	0.07 **	0.03
<u><i>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</i></u>				
Petition	0.29 ***	0.02	0.24 ***	0.03
Peaceful_demo	-0.35 ***	0.02	-0.32 ***	0.03
<u><i>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</i></u>				
Uncertain Chance	0.09 ***	0.02	0.11 **	0.04
Good Chance	0.19 ***	0.02	0.16 ***	0.04
Blank	0.11 **	0.03	0.11 **	0.04
<u><i>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</i></u>				
Vignette 2	0.05 *	0.02	0.01	0.05
Vignette 3	0.06 ***	0.02	0.05	0.05
Respondent Characteristics				
Gender: Female	-0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.03
Age (years > 18)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u><i>Country (ref: Netherlands)</i></u>				
United Kingdom	-0.04	0.03	-0.04	0.03
<u><i>Education (ref: Primary Education)</i></u>				
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College	-0.12	0.08	-0.13	0.08
University / Higher	-0.12	0.08	-0.12	0.08
Postgraduate	-0.23 *	0.09	-0.23 *	0.09
<u><i>Occupation (ref: Self-Employed)</i></u>				
Salaried Employee	-0.05	0.07	-0.05	0.07
Homemaker	-0.08	0.09	-0.08	0.09
Retired	0.00	0.08	-0.01	0.08
Student	-0.11	0.13	-0.11	0.13
Unemployed	-0.01	0.10	-0.01	0.10
Unable to Work	-0.06	0.10	-0.05	0.10
Refused	0.14	0.23	0.13	0.23
Other	-0.19	0.37	-0.19	0.38
Interactions: Political Trust & Vignette Number				
<u><i>Vignette Number * Sacrifice</i></u>				
Vignette 2 * Sacrifice Certain			0.05	0.04
Vignette 3 * Sacrifice Certain			0.02	0.04
<u><i>Vignette Number * Activity Type</i></u>				
Vignette 2 * Petition			0.06	0.05
Vignette 2 * Peaceful Demonstration			-0.05	0.05
Vignette 3 * Petition			0.09	0.05
Vignette 3 * Peaceful Demonstration			-0.06	0.05
<u><i>Vignette Number * Success Chance</i></u>				
Vignette 2 * Uncertain Chance			-0.04	0.05
Vignette 2 * Good Chance			0.06	0.05

APPENDICES

Table A6. Effect of Vignette Number - Full Experiment				
Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Joining Initiative	M0: Experiment		M1: Experiment & Vignette Number	
<i>Predictors</i>	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>coef.</i>	<i>se</i>
Vignette 3 * Uncertain Chance			-0.01	0.05
Vignette 3 * Good Chance			0.01	0.05
<i>Random Effects</i>				
σ^2	0.17		0.17	
τ_{00}	0.13	vignette:id	0.13	vignette:id
	0.43	id	0.44	id
ICC	0.77		0.77	
N	24	vignette	24	vignette
	2294	id	2294	id
Observations	6592		6592	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.100 / 0.792		0.101 / 0.793	
* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$				
<i>Note: Sample subsetted on successful attention check</i>				
<i>Model: Hierarchical Random Intercept Model w. vignettes nested in respondents</i>				

Robustness Check # 4

Country-Level Analysis (Table A7)

Overview: We were curious to see how our results differed across countries. To do so, we fit our models across countries.

Results:

Our main models already revealed that respondents in the UK had lower levels of intended participation than respondents in the Netherlands.

We can observe a few differences between countries.

Vignette Number doesn't have an effect in the Netherlands. Only in the UK do subsequent vignettes yield higher intended participation.

The negative direct effect of trust is slightly stronger in the Netherlands.

The interaction between trust and peaceful demonstration is only significant in the UK. The interaction between trust and petition is significant in the Netherlands (although differences across countries may not be significant).

Main effects and interactions of activity type:

Distrusting respondents in the UK are just as likely to attend a public meeting as join a peaceful demonstration. But trusting respondents in the UK prefer public meetings to peaceful demonstrations (Table A7 M2 - UK)

In the Netherlands distrusting respondents prefer joining a public meeting to attending a peaceful demonstration. And trusting respondents in the Netherlands are just as likely to join a public meeting as joining a peaceful demonstration. (Table A7 M2 - NL)

But note, that usually trusting respondents are less likely to participate overall (see Table A7 M1)

When faced with an uncertain chance of success, Dutch respondents are more likely to get involved than UK respondents.

The same (above) holds in the face of a good chance.

The default attitude about success chance among UK respondents, when success chance is left blank, is similar to the effects of having little chance. But in the Netherlands, the default is closer to having an uncertain chance of success.

Takeaway:

APPENDICES

There are important differences between countries. These differences help specify the vignette number effect and are indicative in the case of the interaction between trust and demonstration. Controlling for country-effects is important (we do so).

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A7. Country-Level Analysis

Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Joining Initiative	M0: Baseline UK		M1: Political Attitudes UK		M1: Political Attitudes NL		M2: Interactions UK		M2: Interactions NL			
	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se		
<i>Predictors</i> (Intercept)	2.56 ***	0.20	2.40 ***	0.22	2.36 ***	0.23	2.06 ***	0.24	2.23 ***	0.37	1.54 ***	0.37
Vignette Dimensions												
<u>Material Sacrifice (ref: Uncertain)</u>												
Sacrifice Certain	0.09 ***	0.02	0.11 ***	0.02	0.09 ***	0.02	0.10 ***	0.02	0.10	0.06	0.21 **	0.07
<u>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</u>												
Petition	0.27 ***	0.03	0.31 ***	0.03	0.27 ***	0.03	0.31 ***	0.03	0.39 ***	0.08	0.50 ***	0.08
Peaceful_demo	0.27 ***	0.03	0.42 ***	0.03	0.28 ***	0.03	0.42 ***	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.27 **	0.08
<u>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</u>												
Uncertain Chance	0.04	0.03	0.14 ***	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.15 ***	0.03	0.09	0.08	0.13	0.09
Good Chance	0.13 ***	0.03	0.24 ***	0.03	0.13 ***	0.03	0.24 ***	0.03	0.11	0.08	0.22 *	0.09
Blank	0.07	0.05	0.16 ***	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.18 ***	0.05	-0.08	0.13	0.30 *	0.14
<u>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</u>												
Vignette 2	0.07 **	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.07 **	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.07 **	0.03	0.03	0.03
Vignette 3	0.11 ***	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.10 ***	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.10 ***	0.03	0.02	0.03

APPENDICES

Table A7. Country-Level Analysis

Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Joining Initiative	MO: Baseline UK		MO: Baseline NL		M1: Political Attitudes UK		M1: Political Attitudes NL		M2: Interactions UK		M2: Interactions NL	
	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se
Predictors												
Respondent Characteristics												
Gender: Female	-0.06	0.05	0.00	0.04	-0.06	0.05	0.07	0.05	-0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05
Age (years > 18)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Education (ref: Primary Education)												
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College	-0.15	0.10	-0.05	0.15	-0.14	0.10	-0.03	0.15	-0.14	0.10	-0.02	0.15
University / Higher	-0.16	0.10	-0.03	0.16	-0.16	0.10	-0.06	0.16	-0.16	0.10	-0.05	0.16
Postgraduate	-0.25*	0.12	-0.14	0.16	-0.22	0.12	-0.20	0.16	-0.22	0.12	-0.18	0.16
Occupation (ref: Self-Employed)												
Salaried Employee	-0.01	0.11	-0.08	0.09	-0.03	0.11	-0.05	0.09	-0.03	0.11	-0.05	0.09
Homemaker	-0.12	0.14	-0.04	0.12	-0.13	0.14	-0.05	0.12	-0.14	0.14	-0.04	0.12
Retired	0.01	0.11	-0.01	0.11	0.01	0.11	-0.01	0.11	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.11
Student	-0.02	0.28	-0.13	0.16	-0.19	0.29	-0.10	0.16	-0.21	0.29	-0.09	0.16
Unemployed	0.11	0.15	-0.14	0.15	0.07	0.15	-0.02	0.15	0.06	0.15	0.01	0.15
Unable to Work	-0.23	0.16	0.04	0.13	-0.26	0.16	0.01	0.13	-0.26	0.16	0.01	0.13
Refused	-0.12	0.32	0.42	0.34	-0.14	0.31	0.35	0.38	-0.16	0.31	0.35	0.38
Other	-0.18	0.38			-0.23	0.37			-0.23	0.38		

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A7. Country-Level Analysis

Dependent Variable:	M0: Baseline UK		M1: Political Attitudes UK		M2: Interactions UK		M2: Interactions NL			
Likelihood of Joining Initiative	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se		
<i>Predictors</i>										
<u>Political Attitudes</u>										
Political Trust			-0.05 *	0.02	0.09 ***	0.02	0.00	0.12	0.08	0.10
Political Interest			0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.09	0.09
Internal Efficacy (Understand)			0.00	0.04	0.08 *	0.03	0.03	0.09	0.11	0.09
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)			0.08 **	0.03	0.06 **	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.07
<u>Interactions: Political Trust & Vignette Dimensions</u>										
<u>Political Trust * Sacrifice</u>										
Political Trust * Sacrifice Certain							0.00	0.02	-0.03	0.02
<u>Political Trust * Activity Type</u>										
Political Trust * Petition							-0.05	0.03	-0.06 *	0.03
Political Trust * Peaceful Demonstration							0.12 ***	0.03	-0.05	0.03
<u>Political Trust * Success Chance</u>										
Political Trust * Uncertain Chance							-0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03
Political Trust * Good Chance							0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03
Political Trust * Blank Chance							0.06	0.05	-0.04	0.04
<u>Interactions: Political Trust & Political Attitudes (Controls)</u>										
Political Trust * Political Interest							0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.03
Political Trust * Int. Eff. (Understand)							-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03

APPENDICES

Table A7. Country-Level Analysis

Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Joining Initiative	MO: Baseline UK		MO: Baseline NL		M1: Political Attitudes UK		M1: Political Attitudes NL		M2: Interactions UK		M2: Interactions NL	
	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se	coef.	se
Predictors												
Political Trust * Int. Eff. (Qualified)												
Random Effects												
σ^2	0.22		0.12		0.22		0.12		0.22		0.12	
τ_{00}	0.05 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id	0.05 vignette:id	0.05 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id	0.05 vignette:id	0.05 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id	0.21 vignette:id
ICC	0.44 id	0.43 id	0.43 id	0.43 id	0.41 id	0.41 id	0.43 id	0.43 id	0.41 id	0.41 id	0.41 id	0.41 id
N	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette	24 vignette
Observations	1051 id	1243 id	1027 id	1027 id	1195 id	1195 id	1027 id	1027 id	1195 id	1195 id	1195 id	1195 id
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.081 / 0.714	0.124 / 0.863	0.098 / 0.713	0.098 / 0.713	0.149 / 0.860	0.149 / 0.860	0.101 / 0.718	0.101 / 0.718	0.151 / 0.861	0.151 / 0.861	0.151 / 0.861	0.151 / 0.861
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001												
Note: Sample subsetted on successful attention check												
Model: Hierarchical Random Intercept Model w. vignettes nested in respondents												

Robustness Check # 5

Full Interactions with Political Attitudes (Table A8)

Overview: We also include in our models potential interactions between trust and other political attitudes. These political attitudes serve as controls in our models. We aren't interested in their effects but are rather interested in accurately estimating the interaction between trust and the factors in our vignette experiment. Overall inclusion of these additional interactions doesn't change our main results.

APPENDICES

Table A8. Hierarchical Models - Interactions - Attention Check				
<i>Predictors</i>	M0: Interaction Model - Attentive Sample		M1: Full Interaction Model - Attentive Sample	
	coef.	se	coef.	se
(Intercept)	2.24 ***	0.18	1.98 ***	0.30
<u><i>Material Sacrifice (ref: Uncertain)</i></u>				
Sacrifice Certain	0.15 **	0.05	0.15 **	0.05
<u><i>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</i></u>				
Petition	0.42 ***	0.06	0.42 ***	0.06
Peaceful_demo	-0.09	0.06	-0.09	0.06
<u><i>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</i></u>				
Uncertain Chance	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.06
Good Chance	0.14 *	0.06	0.14 *	0.06
Blank	0.02	0.09	0.02	0.09
<u><i>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</i></u>				
Vignette 2	0.05 **	0.02	0.05 **	0.02
Vignette 3	0.06 **	0.02	0.06 **	0.02
<u><i>Country (ref: Netherlands)</i></u>				
United Kingdom	-0.14 ***	0.04	-0.14 ***	0.04
Respondent Characteristics				
Gender: Female	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03
Age (years > 18)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u><i>Education (ref: Primary Education)</i></u>				
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College	-0.11	0.08	-0.12	0.08
University / Higher	-0.14	0.09	-0.14	0.09
Postgraduate	-0.25 **	0.09	-0.25 **	0.09
<u><i>Occupation (ref: Self-Employed)</i></u>				
Salaried Employee	-0.04	0.07	-0.04	0.07
Homemaker	-0.07	0.10	-0.07	0.10
Retired	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08
Student	-0.15	0.14	-0.15	0.14
Unemployed	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.11
Unable to Work	-0.06	0.10	-0.06	0.10
Refused	0.08	0.27	0.08	0.27
Other	-0.24	0.37	-0.26	0.37
<u><i>Political Attitudes</i></u>				
Political Trust	-0.01	0.02	0.09	0.09
Political Interest	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.06

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A8. Hierarchical Models - Interactions - Attention Check				
	M0: Interaction Model - Attentive Sample		M1: Full Interaction Model - Attentive Sample	
<i>Predictors</i>	coef.	se	coef.	se
Internal Efficacy (Understand)	0.05 *	0.02	0.08	0.07
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)	0.05 **	0.02	0.06	0.05
External Efficacy (Legal Options)	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.05
External Efficacy (System Options)	-0.06 **	0.02	-0.05	0.05
Interactions: Political Trust & Vignette Dimensions				
<u><i>Political Trust * Sacrifice</i></u>				
Political Trust * Sacrifice Certain	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02
<u><i>Political Trust * Activity Type</i></u>				
Political Trust * Petition	-0.05 *	0.02	-0.05 *	0.02
Political Trust * Peaceful Demonstration	-0.09 ***	0.02	-0.09 ***	0.02
<u><i>Political Trust * Success Chance</i></u>				
Political Trust * Uncertain Chance	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Political Trust * Good Chance	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Political Trust * Blank Chance	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03
Interactions: Political Trust & Political Attitudes (Controls)				
Political Trust * Political Interest			-0.01	0.02
Political Trust * Int. Eff. (Understand)			-0.01	0.02
Political Trust * Int. Eff. (Qualified)			0.00	0.02
Political Trust * Ext. Eff. (Legal Options)			-0.01	0.02
Political Trust * Ext. Eff. (System Options)			0.00	0.02
Random Effects				
σ^2	0.18		0.18	
τ_{00}	0.13 <small>vignette:id</small>		0.13 <small>vignette:id</small>	
	0.42 <small>id</small>		0.42 <small>id</small>	
ICC	0.75		0.76	
N	24 <small>vignette</small>		24 <small>vignette</small>	
	2098 <small>id</small>		2098 <small>id</small>	
Observations	6062		6062	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.122 / 0.785		0.122 / 0.785	
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001				

Robustness Check # 6

3-way Interactions (Political Trust, (Success Chance or Material Benefits), Activity Type (Tables A9 & A10)

Overview: Based on feedback received during the review process, we also model in our last robustness check a 3-way interaction between trust, activity type and material benefits or success chance. We were interested in seeing whether the null interaction between trust and conditions of participation held for all 3 types of actions included in the experiment. Our conclusions in the paper remain unchanged.

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A9. Hierarchical Models - 3-way Interactions [Sacrifice x Trust x Activity] - Attention Check		
M0: Triple Interaction Model - Attentive Sample		
<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Estimates</i>	<i>std. Error</i>
Intercept	2.19 ***	0.18
<u>Material Sacrifice (ref: Uncertain)</u>		
Sacrifice Certain	0.17 *	0.08
<u>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</u>		
Petition	0.36 ***	0.08
Peaceful_demo	0	0.08
<u>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</u>		
Uncertain Chance	0.11 ***	0.02
Good Chance	0.19 ***	0.02
Blank	0.12 ***	0.04
<u>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</u>		
Vignette 2	0.05 **	0.02
Vignette 3	0.06 **	0.02
<u>Country (ref: Netherlands)</u>		
United Kingdom	-0.14 ***	0.04
Respondent Characteristics		
Female	0.02	0.03
Age	0	0
<u>Education (ref: Primary Education)</u>		
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College	-0.11	0.08
University / Higher	-0.14	0.09
Postgraduate	-0.25 **	0.09
<u>Occupation (ref: Self-Employed)</u>		
Salaried Employee	-0.04	0.07
Homemaker	-0.07	0.1
Retired	0.01	0.08
Student	-0.15	0.14
Unemployed	0.08	0.11
Unable to Work	-0.07	0.1
Refused	0.07	0.27
Other	-0.24	0.37
<u>Political Attitudes</u>		
Political Trust	0.01	0.02
Political Interest	0.05	0.02
Internal Efficacy (Understand)	0.05 *	0.02
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)	0.05 **	0.02
External Efficacy (Legal Options)	0.01	0.02
External Efficacy (System Options)	-0.06 **	0.02

APPENDICES

Table A9. Hierarchical Models - 3-way Interactions [Sacrifice x Trust x Activity] - Attention Check		
M0: Triple Interaction Model - Attentive Sample		
3-way Interactions: Political Trust x Sacrifice x Activity Type		
<i>Political Trust * Sacrifice</i> <i>[ref: Public Meeting]</i>		
Political Trust * Sacrifice Certain	-0.03	0.03
<i>Political Trust * Activity Type</i> <i>[ref: Sacrifice Uncertain]</i>		
Political Trust * Petition	-0.03	0.03
Political Trust * Peaceful Demonstration	-0.13 ***	0.03
<i>Sacrifice * Activity Type</i> <i>[ref: Low Trust]</i>		
Sacrifice x Activity: Petition	0.11	0.12
Sacrifice x Activity: Peaceful Demo.	-0.2	0.12
<i>Political Trust * Sacrifice * Activity Type</i>		
Political Trust x Sacrifice x Petition	-0.04	0.04
Political Trust x Sacrifice x Peaceful Demo.	0.07	0.04
Random Effects		
σ^2	0.18	
τ_{00} vignette:id	0.13	
τ_{00} id	0.42	
ICC	0.75	
N vignette	24	
N id	2098	
Observations	6062	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.122 / 0.784	
	* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001	

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Table A10. Hierarchical Models - 3-way Interactions [Success Chance x Trust x Activity] - Attention Check		
M0: Triple Interaction Model (Success Chance) - Attentive Sample		
<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Estimates</i>	<i>std. Error</i>
Intercept	2.24 ***	0.19
<u><i>Material Sacrifice (ref: Uncertain)</i></u>		
Sacrifice Certain	0.09 ***	0.02
<u><i>Activity Type (ref: Public Meeting)</i></u>		
Petition	0.47 ***	0.11
Peaceful_demo	-0.06	0.11
<u><i>Success Chance (ref: Little Chance)</i></u>		
Uncertain Chance	0.12	0.1
Good Chance	0.21 *	0.11
Blank	-0.04	0.15
<u><i>Vignette Sequence (ref: 1st Vignette)</i></u>		
Vignette 2	0.05 **	0.02
Vignette 3	0.06 **	0.02
<u><i>Country (ref: Netherlands)</i></u>		
United Kingdom	-0.14 ***	0.04
Respondent Characteristics		
Gender: Female	0.02	0.03
Age (years > 18)	0	0
<u><i>Education (ref: Primary Education)</i></u>		
High School / Tertiary / Tech.College	-0.11	0.08
University / Higher	-0.14	0.09
Postgraduate	-0.25 **	0.09
<u><i>Occupation (ref: Self-Employed)</i></u>		
Salaried Employee	-0.04	0.07
Homemaker	-0.08	0.1
Retired	0	0.08
Student	-0.16	0.14
Unemployed	0.07	0.11
Unable to Work	-0.06	0.1
Refused	0.08	0.27

APPENDICES

Other	-0.25	0.37
<u>Political Attitudes</u>		
Political Trust	-0.02	0.03
Political Interest	0.05	0.02
Internal Efficacy (Understand)	0.05 *	0.02
Internal Efficacy (Qualified)	0.05 **	0.02
External Efficacy (Legal Options)	0.01	0.02
External Efficacy (System Options)	-0.06 **	0.02
3-way Interactions: Political Trust & Success Chance x Activity Type		
<u>Political Trust * Success Chance [ref: Public Meeting]</u>		
Political Trust x Success Chance: Uncertain	0.01	0.03
Political Trust x Success Chance: Good Chance	0.02	0.03
Political Trust x Success Chance: Blank	0.08	0.05
<u>Political Trust * Activity Type [ref: Little Chance]</u>		
Political Trust x Activity: Petition	-0.03	0.03
Political Trust x Activity: Peaceful Demo.	-0.09 **	0.03
<u>Success Chance * Activity Type [ref: Low Trust]</u>		
Success Chance: Uncertain x Activity: Petition	0.01	0.15
Success Chance: Uncertain x Activity: Peaceful Demo.	-0.13	0.15
Success Chance: Good Chance x Activity: Petition	-0.18	0.15
Success Chance: Good Chance x Activity: Peaceful Demo.	-0.02	0.15
Success Chance: Blank x Activity: Petition	0.05	0.23
Success Chance: Blank x Activity: Peaceful Demo.	0.17	0.23
<u>Political Trust * Success Chance * Activity Type</u>		
Political Trust x Success Chance: Uncertain x Petition	-0.04	0.05
Political Trust x Success Chance: Uncertain x Peaceful Demo.	0.03	0.05
Political Trust x Success Chance: Good Chance x Petition	0.01	0.05
Political Trust x Success Chance: Good Chance x Peaceful Demo.	-0.01	0.05
Political Trust x Success Chance: Blank Chance x Petition	-0.07	0.07

APPENDIX CHAPTER 4

Political Trust x Success Chance: Blank Chance x Peaceful Demo.	-0.06	0.07
Random Effects		
σ^2	0.18	
τ_{00} vignette:id	0.13	
τ_{00} id	0.42	
ICC	0.75	
N vignette	24	
N id	2098	
Observations	6062	
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	0.123 / 0.785	
* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$		