## Supplementary Information for Trust in Survey Results. A Cross-country Replication Experiment

Ádám Stefkovics<sup>1\*</sup> and Zoltán Kmetty<sup>1,2</sup>

- <sup>1</sup>HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences, Budapest, Hungary.
- <sup>2</sup>ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences, Budapest, Hungary.
- \*stefkovics.adam@tk.hu

Table A1. An example of the vignettes

Example vignette text in Study 1 (Italicized texts were manipulated)

The American Automobile Association (AAA) recently presented the results of a representative survey, according to which 72% of Americans are in favor of higher tax allowances for commuters due to rising gasoline prices. For the survey, 1,000 randomly selected people were interviewed.

How much do you trust the result of this survey? [1 (not at all) to 7 (completely)]

Example vignette text in Study 2 (Italicized texts were manipulated)

CNN recently presented the results of a representative survey, according to which 61% of Americans say it is generally good for the American economy that people come to live here from other countries. For the survey, 1,000 randomly selected people were interviewed.

How much do you trust the result of this survey? [1 (not at all) to 7 (completely)]

Table A2. Survey Trustworthiness by SNS – Study 1 (Commuting)

		Hungar	у		US	
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	4.11	.08	< .001	4.18	.26	< .001
Vignette dimensions						
Survey results: 36% in favor	21	.14	.148	.04	.12	.716
Sponsor: TDRC (HU) / ATRI (US)	06	.04	.099	25	.04	< .001
Sample size: 1000	.24	.05	< .001	.69	.05	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.4	.05	< .001	1.17	.05	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.08	.04	.028	.03	.04	.467
Random selection: mentioned	04	.04	.242	.14	.04	.001
Controls						
Age (in years)	0	0	.685	01	0	.063
Gender: Male	.39	.15	.009	.11	.13	.424
SNS	15	.15	.315	.07	.12	.591
Trust in science	.62	.1	< .001	.6	.09	< .001
Variances of random effects						
Variance: constant		2.13			1.49	
Variance: residual		.53			.71	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		19.9%			32.3%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		8.1%			67.7%	
Model fit						
Variance explained (Level 1)		5.4%			26.8%	
Variance explained (Level 2)		9.7%			8.6%	
Variance explained (overall)		8.9%			15.4%	
Deviance		5153			5452	

 $<sup>{\</sup>tt 8} \quad \textit{Note:} \ \, \text{TDRC=Transportation Development Research Center, ATRI=American Transportation Research Institute}$ 

Table A3. Survey Trustworthiness by SNS – Study 2 (Migration)

	_	Hungai	ry		US	
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	01	.59	.983	1.29	.56	.022
Vignette dimensions						
Survey results: 61% say it is bad	.76	.15	< .001	.02	.14	.913
Sponsor: HVG / Fox	.27	.05	< .001	11	.05	.047
Sample size: 1000	.29	.06	< .001	.56	.07	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.44	.06	< .001	.98	.07	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.01	.05	.841	.06	.05	.26
Random selection: mentioned	.14	.05	.007	.1	.05	.058
Controls						
Age (in years)	01	.01	.011	.00	.00	.654
Gender: Male	.03	.15	.832	.11	.15	.476
SNS	01	.15	.925	.11	.14	.455
Trust in science	.79	.11	< .001	.39	.1	< .001
Variances of random effects						
Variance: constant		2.13			1.91	
Variance: residual		.87			1.01	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		29.0%			34.6%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		71.0%			65.4%	
Model fit						
Variance explained (Level 1)		6.5%			13.7%	
Variance explained (Level 2)		16.8%			5.0%	
Variance explained (overall)		14.0%			8.2%	
Deviance		5772			5808	

Table A4. Survey Trustworthiness with 2-way interactions – Study 1 (Commuting)

		Hungar	у		US	
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	2.25	.58	< .001	1.33	.56	.018
Vignette dimensions						
Survey results: $36\%$ in favor	26	.19	.162	.03	.18	.889
Sponsor: TDRC (HU) / ATRI (US)	12	.12	.333	27	.14	.048
Sample size: 1000	.26	.2	.205	.83	.23	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.4	.21	.055	1.56	.24	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.19	.13	.151	.18	.16	.245
Random selection: mentioned	.1	.13	.455	.31	.15	.046
Controls						
Age (in years)	0	0	.948	01	0	.055
Gender: Male	.39	.15	.008	.1	.13	.461
Education: Diploma	44	.15	.004	.14	.14	.297
Trust in science	.64	.09	< .001	.59	.09	< .001
Two-way interactions						
TDRC/ATRI $\times$ 36% in favor	.04	.08	.648	.02	.09	.858
Representative $\times$ 1000	02	.09	.803	08	.11	.474
Representative $\times$ 10000	.07	.1	.45	08	.11	.472
Random selection $\times$ 1000	.01	.1	.895	02	.11	.858
Random selection $\times$ 10000	07	.1	.447	18	.11	.099
representative:random	08	.08	.281	07	.09	.458
Variances of random effects						
Variance: constant		2.1			1.49	
Variance: residual		.53			.71	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		2.2%			32.3%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		79.8%			67.7%	
Model fit						
Variance explained (Level 1)		5.4%			26.8%	
Variance explained (Level 2)		11.0%			8.6%	
Variance explained (overall)		9.9%			15.4%	
Deviance		5142			5447	

Note: TDRC=Transportation Development Research Center, ATRI=American Transportation Research Institute

Table A5. Survey Trustworthiness with 2-way interactions – Study 2 (Migration)

		Hungai	ry		US	
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	47	.71	.511	-1.75	.78	.026
Vignette dimensions						
Survey results: 61% say it is bad	.66	.21	.001	.71	.21	.001
Sponsor: HVG / Fox	.23	.16	.142	.12	.17	.46
Sample size: 1000	.55	.27	.038	.61	.28	.031
Sample size: 10000	.89	.27	.001	1.53	.28	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.2	.17	.251	.29	.18	.11
Random selection: mentioned	.44	.17	.011	.34	.18	.064
Controls						
Age (in years)	02	.01	.003	0	0	.961
Gender: Male	.08	.15	.565	.15	.14	.286
Education: Diploma	47	.15	.002	.18	.15	.223
Trust in science	.73	.11	< .001	.58	.11	< .001
Two-way interactions						
HVG / Fox $\times$ 61% say it is bad	.03	.1	.802	16	.11	.142
Representative $\times$ 1000	07	.12	.564	03	.13	.809
Representative $\times$ 10000	0	.12	.969	17	.13	.186
Random selection $\times$ 1000	1	.12	.426	0	.13	.986
Random selection $\times$ 10000	3	.12	.014	2	.13	.118
representative:random	11	.1	.253	11	.11	.299
Variances of random effects						
Variance: constant		1.91			1.48	
Variance: residual		.87			1.01	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		31.3%			4.6%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		68.7%			59.4%	
Model fit						
Variance explained (Level 1)		6.5%			13.7%	
Variance explained (Level 2)		25.4%			26.4%	
Variance explained (overall)		2.3%			21.7%	
Deviance		5718			5699	

Table 6. Survey Trustworthiness split by education categories – Study 1 (Commuting)

		Iaximum 100l (Hun	_	Dip	loma (Hu	ngary)		faximum school (U	0	I	Diploma (	US)
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	4.54	.33	< .001	3.55	.43	< .001	2.63	.46	< .001	3.22	.27	< .001
Vignette dimensions												
Survey results: $36\%$ in favor	24	.19	.21	01	.24	.98	.25	.26	.33	08	.15	.60
Sponsor: TDRC (HU) / ATRI (US)	10	.05	.05	04	.07	.60	26	.09	.00	25	.05	< .001
Sample size: 1000	.21	.06	< .001	.30	.08	< .001	.57	.10	< .001	.73	.07	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.29	.06	< .001	.59	.08	< .001	.96	.10	< .001	1.26	.07	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.06	.05	.17	.12	.07	.06	.07	.08	.40	.02	.05	.76
Random selection: mentioned	06	.05	.23	03	.07	.68	.14	.08	.10	.15	.05	.00
Variances of random effects												
Variance: constant		2.41			2.27			1.95			1.57	
Variance: residual		.50			.55			.71			.71	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		17.2%			19.5%			26.7%			31.1%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		82.8%			8.5%			73.3%			68.9%	
Model fit												
Variance explained (Level 1)		3.8%			9.8%			2.2%			29.7%	
Variance explained (overall)		.3%			1.4%			5.7%			9.2%	

Note: TDRC=Transportation Development Research Center, ATRI=American Transportation Research Institute

Table A7. Survey Trustworthiness split by education categories – Study 2 (Migration)

		aximum ool (Hur	0	Dip	loma (Hu	ngary)		aximum school (U	0	I	Diploma (	US)
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	1.76	.35	< .001	1.77	.45	< .001	1.90	.54	.00	3.08	.30	< .001
Vignette dimensions												
Survey results: $61\%$ say it is bad	.94	.20	< .001	.40	.24	.10	.19	.30	.51	03	.16	.85
Sponsor: HVG / Fox	.27	.06	< .001	.27	.09	.00	.33	.10	.00	27	.06	< .001
Sample size: 1000	.21	.08	.01	.43	.10	< .001	.14	.12	.25	.70	.08	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.36	.07	< .001	.62	.11	< .001	.71	.12	< .001	1.09	.08	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	04	.06	.54	.09	.09	.29	.15	.10	.12	.02	.06	.77
Random selection: mentioned	.11	.06	.08	.18	.09	.04	.00	.10	.99	.14	.06	.03
Variances of random effects												
Variance: constant		2.59			1.94			2.33			1.84	
Variance: residual		.86			.89			.89			1.02	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		24.9%			31.4%			27.6%			35.7%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		75.1%			68.6%			72.4%			64.3%	
Model fit												
Variance explained (Level 1)		4.4%			8.2%			11.0%			17.7%	
Variance explained (overall)		7.0%			4.4%			3.3%			8.3%	

Table A8. Survey Trustworthiness split by SNS categories – Study 1 (Commuting)

	SNS	: Low (H	ungary)	SNS:	High (H	ungary)	S	NS: Low	(US)	SI	NS: High	(US)
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	4.32	.36	< .001	4.05	.37	< .001	3.18	.35	< .001	2.95	.32	< .001
Vignette dimensions												
Survey results: 36% in favor	05	.21	.80	26	.21	.23	15	.20	.454	.13	.17	.447
Sponsor: TDRC (HU) / ATRI (US)	14	.05	.01	.00	.06	.98	25	.07	< .001	24	.06	< .001
Sample size: 1000	.09	.06	.15	.38	.07	< .001	.62	.08	< .001	.74	.07	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.29	.07	< .001	.50	.07	< .001	1.15	.08	< .001	1.19	.08	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.02	.05	.65	.15	.06	.01	.04	.07	.510	.02	.06	.713
Random selection: mentioned	06	.05	.25	03	.06	.54	.20	.07	.004	.11	.06	.064
Variances of random effects												
Variance: constant		2.33			2.40			1.68			1.69	
Variance: residual		.45			.58			.69			.73	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		16.2%			19.5%			29.1%			3.2%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		83.8%			8.5%			7.9%			69.8%	
Model fit												
Variance explained (Level 1)		4.3%			7.9%			28.9%			25.5%	
Variance explained (overall)		0.0%			2.6%			6.7%			9.0%	

Note: TDRC=Transportation Development Research Center, ATRI=American Transportation Research Institute

Table A9. Survey Trustworthiness split by SNS categories – Study 2 (Migration)

	SNS:	Low (H	ungary)	SNS:	High (H	ungary)	S	NS: Low	(US)	SI	NS: High	(US)
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Constant	1.16	.39	.00	2.23	.39	< .001	2.84	.39	< .001	2.71	.37	< .001
Vignette dimensions												
Survey results: $61\%$ say it is bad	.41	.21	< .001	.53	.22	.02	06	.22	.79	.07	.20	.71
Sponsor: HVG / Fox	.41	.08	< .001	.14	.07	.03	10	.08	.21	12	.08	.12
Sample size: 1000	.27	.09	.00	.29	.08	< .001	.43	.10	< .001	.66	.09	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.36	.09	< .001	.51	.08	< .001	.84	.09	< .001	1.09	.09	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	05	.08	.53	.05	.07	.44	.11	.08	.17	.02	.08	.77
Random selection: mentioned	.12	.08	.13	.17	.07	.01	.09	.08	.24	.12	.08	.12
Variances of random effects												
Variance: constant		1.97			2.73			2.03			1.97	
Variance: residual		.96			.80			.96			1.07	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		32.8%			22.7%			32.1%			35.0%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		67.2%			77.3%			67.9%			65.0%	
Model fit												
Variance explained (Level 1)		5.9%			5.9%			11.1%			16.0%	
Variance explained (overall)		1.7%			3.6%			4.8%			6.8%	

Table A10. Survey Trustworthiness without political controls – Study 2 (Migration)

	Model with vignette dimensions and controls (Hungary)			Model with vignette dimensions and controls (US)			
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p	
Constant	.46	.58	.424	1.18	.57	.037	
Vignette dimensions							
Survey results: $61\%$ say it is bad	.76	.15	< .001	.03	.14	.813	
Sponsor: HVG/Fox	.27	.05	< .001	11	.05	.049	
Sample size: 1000	.29	.06	< .001	.56	.07	< .001	
Sample size: 10000	.44	.06	< .001	.98	.07	< .001	
Representativeness: mentioned	.01	.05	.827	.06	.05	.26	
Random selection: mentioned	.13	.05	.007	.1	.05	.06	
Controls							
Age (in years)	01	.01	.016	0	0	.755	
Gender: Male	.03	.15	.845	.1	.15	.514	
Education: Diploma	51	.16	.001	.19	.16	.24	
Trust in science	.84	.11	< .001	.38	.11	< .001	
Variances of random effects							
Variance: constant		2.07			1.91		
Variance: residual		.87			1.01		
Proportion of Level 1 variance		29.6%			34.6%		
Proportion of Level 2 variance		7.4%			65.4%		
Model fit							
Variance explained (Level 1)		6.5%			13.7%		
Variance explained (Level 2)		19.1%			5.0%		
Variance explained (overall)		15.8%			8.2%		
Deviance		5761			5806		

Table A11. Survey Trustworthiness with political controls and interaction of political controls – Study 2 (Migration)

	Issue left-	agreement right intera (Hungary)	Issue agreement and left-right interaction (Hungary)	Is: politic	Issue agreement and itical interest interac (Hungary)	Issue agreement and political interest interaction (Hungary)	Issue left-1	Issue agreement and left-right interaction (US)	nt and raction	Issue	Issue agreement and political interest interaction (US)	ent and erest on
	p	SE	d	q	SE	d	p	SE	d	q	SE	d
Constant	.04	.62	.952	02	.62	.971	-1.22	.72	.092	97	.72	.18
Vignette dimensions												
Survey results: 61% say it is bad	69.	.14	< .001	69.	.14	< .001	.54	.15	< .001	.47	.14	.001
Sponsor: HVG / Fox	.27	.05	< .001	.27	.05	< .001	11	.05	.036	11	.05	.037
Sample size: 1000	.29	90.	< .001	.29	90.	< .001	.56	20.	< .001	.56	20.	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.45	90.	< .001	.45	90.	< .001	76.	20.	< .001	26.	20.	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.01	.05	.845	.01	.05	.847	90.	.05	.277	90.	.05	.278
Random selection: mentioned	.13	.05	200.	.13	.05	200.	1.	.05	.055	.11	.05	.049
Controls												
Age (in years)	01	.01	.004	02	.01	.003			.994			696.
Gender: Male	80.	.15	.582	80.	.15	.588	.15	.14	.294	.15	.14	762.
Education: Diploma	48	.15	.002	47	.15	.002	.18	.15	.215	.19	.15	.206
Trust in science	.73	.11	< .001	.73	.11	< .001	9.	.11	< .001	.59	.11	< .001
Political controls												
Left-Right: Middle/NA	20.	.22	.736	.16	.19	.398	.82	.25	.001	.59	5.	.003
Left-Right: Right	.55	.23	.019	.56	.2	900.	1.01	.23	< .001	.83	.18	< .001
Political interest	.16	.07	.023	.16	80.	.036	01	80.	.883	01	1.	.917
Issue agreement: yes	.55	.33	660.	۲.	.48	.144	1.68	.25	< .001	1.45	∞.	20.
Issue agreement interactions												
Issue agreement $\times$ Left-Right: Middle/NA	.35	.42	.395				53	.38	.169			
Issue agreement $\times$ Left-Right: Right	.01	.44	.983				36	.32	.263			
Issue agreement $\times$ Political interest				00.	.14	266.				010	.18	.947
Variances of random effects												
Variance: constant		1.92			1.92			1.48			1.48	
Variance: residual		.87			.87			1.01			1.01	
Proportion of Level 1 variance		31.2%			31.2%			4.6%			4.6%	
Proportion of Level 2 variance		88.89			88.89			59.4%			59.4%	
Model fit												
Variance explained (Level 1)		6.5%			6.5%			13.7%			13.7%	
Variance explained (overall)		2.1%			2.1%			21.7%			21.7%	
Deviance		5725			5726			5705			5707	

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} Table A12. Survey Trustworthiness (Multilevel Mixed-Effects Ordered Logistic Regression Model) - Study 1 (Commuting) \\ \end{tabular}$ 

		Hungar	у		US	
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Vignette dimensions						
Survey results: 36% in favor	72	.46	.12	.12	.31	.71
Sponsor: TDRC (HU) / ATRI (US)	20	.11	.09	55	.10	< .001
Sample size: 1000	.64	.14	< .001	1.53	.14	< .001
Sample size: 10000	1.15	.14	< .001	2.66	.15	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.24	.11	.03	.06	.10	.54
Random selection: mentioned	09	.11	.43	.30	.10	.00
Controls						
Age (in years)	.00	.02	.85	02	.01	.10
Gender: Male	1.30	.48	.01	.22	.34	.51
Education: Diploma	-1.48	.49	.00	.51	.34	.14
Trust in science	2.16	.32	< .001	1.63	.23	< .001
Cutpoints (symmetric)						
Central 1	3.46	1.68		5.46	1.19	
Central 2	7.20	1.69		7.71	1.20	
Spacing 1	2.43	.11		2.09	.08	
Spacing 2	4.71	.17		4.49	.15	
Variances of random effects						
Variance: constant		21.62			9.54	

Note: TDRC=Transportation Development Research Center, ATRI=American Transportation Research Institute

Table A13. Survey Trustworthiness (Multilevel Mixed-Effects Ordered Logistic Regression Model) – Study 2 (Migration)

		Hungar	у		US	
	b	SE	p	b	SE	p
Vignette dimensions						
Survey results: 61% say it is bad	1.68	.36	< .001	1.19	.31	< .001
Sponsor: HVG/Fox	.50	.11	< .001	22	.11	.04
Sample size: 1000	.60	.13	< .001	1.27	.14	< .001
Sample size: 10000	.93	.13	< .001	1.98	.14	< .001
Representativeness: mentioned	.04	.11	.69	.07	.10	.49
Random selection: mentioned	.25	.11	.02	.23	.11	.03
Controls						
Age (in years)	04	.01	.00	.00	.01	.93
Gender: Male	.34	.37	.36	.49	.32	.13
Education: Diploma	-1.09	.38	.00	.42	.34	.21
Trust in science	1.78	.29	< .001	1.33	.25	< .001
Political controls						
Left-Right: Middle/NA	.26	.49	.60	1.25	.44	.01
Left-Right: Right	1.34	.50	.01	1.77	.41	< .001
Political interest	.39	.17	.02	08	.19	.67
Issue agreement: yes	1.81	.41	< .001	3.08	.33	< .001
Cutpoints (symmetric)						
Central 1	8.28	1.56		1.25	1.59	
Central 2	1.89	1.57		12.00	1.60	
Spacing 1	1.87	.08		1.68	.07	
Spacing 2	3.51	.12		3.67	.12	
Variances of random effects						
Variance: constant		11.95			7.65	

Table A14. Survey Trustworthiness filtered to the first vignettes. U.S.

	Study 1	Study 1 (Commuting)			Study 2 (Migration)		
	<i>b</i>	SE	p	b	SE	p	
(Intercept)	3.06	0.46	j0.001	3.18	0.44	< .001	
Vignette dimensions							
Survey results: 36% in favor	0.15	0.14	0.30				
Sponsor: TDRC	-0.23	0.14	0.12				
Sample size: 1000	0.82	0.18	j0.001	0.53	0.21	0.01	
Sample size: 10000	0.78	0.18	j0.001	0.74	0.21	< .001	
Representativeness: mentioned	-0.03	0.14	0.85	-0.02	0.17	0.92	
Random selection: mentioned	0.12	0.14	0.41	0.12	0.17	0.49	
Survey results: 61% say it is bad				-0.09	0.17	0.59	
Sponsor: FOX				-0.24	0.17	0.16	
Model fit							
N	447			430			
R2	6.6%			3.5%			
Deviance	1019.7			1298.311			