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**APPENDIX A**

**Wording of Interview Questions**

**Dependent Variables**

*Voting*- binary indicator for an individual self-reporting to have not voted in the 2016 election (0) or to have voted in the 2016 election (1).

*Participation scale*- Scale composed of six different participatory acts an individual could have engaged in. These are all binary indicators, and include: (1) going to a political meeting, rallies, speeches, or dinners, (2) wearing a campaign button, putting a campaign sticker on their car, placing a sign in their car or in front of their house, (3) working for a party or candidate, (4) contributing money to a campaign, or (5) contacting a U.S. representative or Senator. These are added together to run from engaging in none of these acts (0) to engaging in all of these acts (5).

*Political Invisibility*- Coded as zero if an individual engaged in one or more of the acts listed above in the participation scale. Coded as one if an individual engaged in none of the acts.

*Protest Participation*- binary indicator for an individual joining in a protest march in the past twelve months. Coded as one if an individual did protest and zero if they did not.

**Key Independent Variables**

*Political Trust*- based on respondent’s answer to the question: How often can you trust the federal government in Washington to do what is right? Scale includes: Never (0), Some of the time (.25), About half of the time (.5), Most of the time (.75), and Always (1).

*Race*- Self-identification of the respondent’s racial identity as a person of color (0) or White (1). People of color include individuals who identified as Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or Hispanic.

**Control Variables**

*Partisan*- Binary indicator for an individual expressing no party attachment (0) or at least some party attachment (1). The “1” category includes those who expressed either a “strong” party identification or a “not very strong” identification, thus leaving out those who stated they were independent, but leaned towards one party.

*Ideologue*- Binary indicator for an individual identifying as moderate (0) or at least some liberal or conservative attachment (1). The “1” category includes those who expressed themselves as “slightly” liberal/conservative, thus leaving out only those who stated they were moderate.

*Gender*- Self-identification of the respondent’s gender as male (0) or female (1).

*Age group*- Twelve categories, scaled to run from 18-20 (0) to 75 or older (1).

*Income groups*- Twenty-eight categories, scaled to run from under $5,000 (0) to more than $250,000 (1).

*Education*- Thirteen categories, scaled to run from “Less than 1st grade” (0) to “Doctorate degree” (1).

*Political knowledge scale*- Constructed from four questions, where 0 is the incorrect answer and 1 is the correct answer. These are then added together and rescaled to run from no correct answers (0) to four correct answers (1). Below are the specific questions:

* *For how many years is a United States Senator elected – that is, how many years are there in one full term of office for a U.S. Senator?
Correct answer: 6.*
* *On which of the following does the U.S. federal government currently spend the least [Foreign Aid, Medicare, National Defense, Social Security]?
Correct answer: Foreign Aid.*
* *Do you happen to know which party currently has the most members in the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington?
Correct answer: Republicans.*
* *Do you happen to know which party currently has the most members in the U.S. Senate?
Correct answer: Republicans.*

*Religiosity*- Binary indicator for an individual indicating that religion is not an important part of their life (0) or is an important part of their life (1).

*Party Identification*- Seven categories, scaled to run from strong Democrat (0) to strong Republican (1).

*Ideology*- Three categories, scaled to run from liberal (0) to conservative (1).

*External Efficacy*- Ten categories based on responses to both “Public officials don’t care much what people like me think” and “People like me don’t have any say about what the government does,” scaled to run from disagree strongly (0) to agree strongly (1).

*Full Efficacy Scale*- Twenty-point scale based on responses to the four questions “Public officials don’t care much what people like me think, People like me don’t have any say about what the government does, Politics and Government are too complicated to understand, I have a good understanding of political issues” scaled to run from lowest level of efficacy (0) to highest level (1).

*Trump, Obama, Clinton, and Congress Feeling Thermometers*- Response to how people would rate these actors/entities on a feeling thermometer running from 0 to 100, rescaled to run from most negative (0) to most positive (1).

*Mobilize*- Binary indicator used to measure if an individual was approached during the 2016 election season by an individual either associated with a political party or an individual associated with a group other than a political party. Individuals are coded as 1 if they were approached by either type of individual and 0 if not.

**Trust Measures Not Used in the Analysis**

* *Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?*
* *Do you think that people in government [waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it]?*
* *How many of the people running the government are corrupt?*

**APPENDIX B**

**Supplemental Analysis**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A1**. **Relationship Between Political Trust and Participation,** **Using Party ID and Ideology** |
|  | Turnout | Participation Scale | Political Invisibility | Protest |
| Party ID | 1.024 | 1.025 | 0.984 | 0.867 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.05) | (0.17) | (0.34) |
| Ideology | 0.678\* | 0.749\*\*\* | 1.366^ | 0.292\*\* |
|  | (0.13) | (0.04) | (0.23) | (0.12) |
| Female | 1.104 | 0.981 | 0.810^ | 1.165 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.04) | (0.10) | (0.29) |
| Age | 5.101\*\*\* | 1.529\*\*\* | 0.226\*\*\* | 0.180\*\* |
|  | (1.28) | (0.10) | (0.05) | (0.10) |
| Education | 5.551\*\* | 1.978\*\*\* | 0.262\*\* | 2.464 |
|  | (3.06) | (0.29) | (0.12) | (3.52) |
| Income | 3.036\*\*\* | 1.149\* | 0.385\*\*\* | 0.606 |
|  | (0.74) | (0.08) | (0.09) | (0.31) |
| Political Knowledge | 1.982\*\* | 1.545\*\*\* | 0.412\*\*\* | 1.946 |
| (0.50) | (0.10) | (0.09) | (1.10) |
| Religiosity | 1.172 | 0.965 | 0.941 | 0.809 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.04) | (0.13) | (0.20) |
| White | 2.294\*\* | 1.186\* | 0.529\* | 0.872 |
|  | (0.63) | (0.10) | (0.13) | (0.42) |
| Political Trust  | 1.990 | 1.260 | 0.593 | 1.400 |
|  | (0.90) | (0.18) | (0.25) | (1.14) |
| Political Trust x White | 0.180\*\* | 0.664\* | 3.281\* | 0.901 |
| (0.11) | (0.12) | (1.80) | (0.90) |
| Observations | 3563 | 3498 | 3498 | 3790 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Negative Binomial | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.07 |

Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. All coefficients are exponentiated. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. Coefficients for logistic regression models are odds-ratios.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A2. Relationship Between Political Trust and Participation, controlling for having been the recipient of a mobilization effort** |
|  | Turnout | Participation Scale | Political Invisibility | Protest |
| Partisan | 1.778\*\*\* | 1.088 | 0.663\*\* | 1.170 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.09) | (0.10) | (0.38) |
| Ideologue | 1.330^ | 1.416\*\*\* | 0.740^ | 1.876\* |
|  | (0.20) | (0.14) | (0.12) | (0.60) |
| Female | 1.128 | 0.952 | 0.831 | 1.303 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.08) | (0.13) | (0.33) |
| Age | 4.327\*\*\* | 1.006 | 0.246\*\*\* | 0.120\*\*\* |
|  | (1.11) | (0.16) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| Education | 6.157\*\* | 3.419\*\*\* | 0.229\* | 3.066 |
|  | (3.42) | (1.14) | (0.13) | (4.62) |
| Income | 2.536\*\*\* | 0.828 | 0.493\* | 0.508 |
|  | (0.65) | (0.13) | (0.14) | (0.27) |
| Political Knowledge | 1.992\*\* | 2.101\*\*\* | 0.478\*\* | 2.014 |
| (0.51) | (0.33) | (0.13) | (1.25) |
| Religiosity | 0.994 | 0.800\*\* | 1.097 | 0.593\* |
|  | (0.15) | (0.06) | (0.18) | (0.13) |
| Mobilized | 1.352\* | 2.151\*\*\* | 0.614\*\* | 2.541\*\*\* |
|  | (0.20) | (0.18) | (0.10) | (0.67) |
| White | 2.342\*\* | 1.348 | 0.446\*\* | 0.665 |
|  | (0.66) | (0.25) | (0.13) | (0.31) |
| Political Trust  | 1.935 | 2.154\* | 0.505 | 1.449 |
|  | (0.89) | (0.74) | (0.26) | (1.09) |
| Political Trust x White | 0.182\*\* | 0.416\* | 5.719\* | 1.293 |
| (0.12) | (0.17) | (3.97) | (1.26) |
| Observations | 3504 | 3783 | 3498 | 3790 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Negative Binomial | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.07 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. All coefficients are exponentiated. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. Coefficients for logistic regression models are odds-ratios. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A3. Relationship Between Political Trust and Participation,** **Controlling for Feelings about Current Government Officials** |
|  | Turnout | Participation Scale | Political Invisibility | Protest |
| Partisan | 1.727\*\*\* | 1.094 | 0.679\* | 1.077 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.33) |
| Ideologue | 1.404\* | 1.461\*\*\* | 0.693\* | 1.878^ |
|  | (0.22) | (0.15) | (0.11) | (0.61) |
| Female | 1.160 | 0.924 | 0.834 | 1.035 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.08) | (0.13) | (0.26) |
| Age | 4.850\*\*\* | 1.076 | 0.216\*\*\* | 0.121\*\*\* |
|  | (1.29) | (0.17) | (0.06) | (0.07) |
| Education | 6.475\*\*\* | 2.868\*\* | 0.225\* | 1.257 |
|  | (3.66) | (0.98) | (0.14) | (1.79) |
| Income | 2.859\*\*\* | 0.838 | 0.449\*\* | 0.516 |
|  | (0.75) | (0.14) | (0.13) | (0.28) |
| Political Knowledge | 1.936\* | 2.025\*\*\* | 0.499\* | 1.245 |
| (0.50) | (0.34) | (0.14) | (0.74) |
| Religiosity | 1.037 | 0.890 | 1.074 | 0.934 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.08) | (0.19) | (0.23) |
| Trump Feeling Thermometer | 2.737\*\* | 1.787\*\* | 0.413\*\* | 0.281\* |
| (0.88) | (0.37) | (0.14) | (0.17) |
| Obama Feeling Thermometer | 3.206\*\*\* | 1.306 | 0.389\* | 1.057 |
| (1.13) | (0.32) | (0.15) | (0.76) |
| Clinton Feeling Thermometer | 1.145 | 2.041\*\* | 0.776 | 4.518\* |
| (0.42) | (0.54) | (0.31) | (2.73) |
| Congress Feeling Thermometer | 0.834 | 0.500\*\* | 1.053 | 0.286^ |
| (0.27) | (0.11) | (0.36) | (0.19) |
| White | 1.317 | 1.030 | 0.801 | 1.172 |
|  | (0.22) | (0.10) | (0.15) | (0.32) |
| Political Trust  | 0.475\* | 1.064 | 2.2\* | 0.909 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.25) | (0.85) | (0.56) |
| Observations | 3456 | 3451 | 3451 | 3733 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Negative Binomial | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.10 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. All coefficients are exponentiated. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A4. Racially Contingent Relationship Between Political** **Trust and Participation, Controlling for Feelings about** **Current Government Officials** |
|  | Turnout | Participation Scale | Political Invisibility | Protest |
| Partisan | 1.732\*\*\* | 1.096 | 0.678\* | 1.082 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.33) |
| Ideologue | 1.371\* | 1.447\*\*\* | 0.711\* | 1.858^ |
|  | (0.21) | (0.15) | (0.12) | (0.61) |
| Female | 1.150 | 0.927 | 0.841 | 1.039 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.08) | (0.13) | (0.26) |
| Age | 5.016\*\*\* | 1.095 | 0.209\*\*\* | 0.121\*\*\* |
|  | (1.34) | (0.17) | (0.06) | (0.07) |
| Education | 7.141\*\*\* | 3.028\*\* | 0.206\* | 1.286 |
|  | (3.99) | (1.04) | (0.12) | (1.85) |
| Income | 2.908\*\*\* | 0.840 | 0.441\*\* | 0.518 |
|  | (0.76) | (0.14) | (0.12) | (0.28) |
| Political Knowledge | 1.870\* | 2.000\*\*\* | 0.516\* | 1.234 |
| (0.49) | (0.34) | (0.15) | (0.73) |
| Religiosity | 1.008 | 0.879 | 1.106 | 0.925 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.07) | (0.19) | (0.22) |
| Trump Feeling Thermometer | 2.642\*\* | 1.682\*\* | 0.427\*\* | 0.276\* |
| (0.84) | (0.33) | (0.14) | (0.17) |
| Obama Feeling Thermometer | 3.283\*\*\* | 1.320 | 0.379\* | 1.074 |
| (1.15) | (0.32) | (0.15) | (0.77) |
| Clinton Feeling Thermometer | 1.132 | 1.991\*\* | 0.785 | 4.510\* |
| (0.41) | (0.52) | (0.31) | (2.72) |
| Congress Feeling Thermometer | 0.816 | 0.499\*\* | 1.076 | 0.282^ |
| (0.26) | (0.12) | (0.37) | (0.19) |
| White | 2.578\*\* | 1.544\* | 0.404 | 1.508 |
|  | (0.76) | (0.31) | (0.13) | (0.73) |
| Political Trust | 1.234 | 1.949^ | 0.838 | 1.266 |
|  | (0.58) | (0.78) | (0.43) | (1.07) |
| Political Trust x White | 0.180\*\* | 0.369\* | 5.604\* | 0.536 |
| (0.12) | (0.16) | (3.93) | (0.54) |
| Observations | 3456 | 3451 | 3451 | 3733 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Negative Binomial | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. All coefficients are exponentiated. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A5. Other Explanations for Contingent Relationship** **Between Political Trust and Participation Scale** |
|  | Ideology | Party ID | Income | Education | Political Efficacy |
| Partisan | 1.169^ | 1.152 | 1.150 | 1.152 | 1.167^ |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
| Ideologue | 1.440\*\*\* | 1.434\*\*\* | 1.436\*\*\* | 1.435\*\*\* | 1.449\*\*\* |
|  | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) |
| Female | 0.891 | 0.945 | 0.947 | 0.945 | 0.934 |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Age | 1.225 | 1.145 | 1.150 | 1.142 | 1.141 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) |
| Education | 2.844\*\* | 3.206\*\*\* | 3.249\*\*\* | 2.939^ | 3.160\*\*\* |
|  | (0.93) | (1.09) | (1.13) | (1.70) | (1.10) |
| Income | 0.834 | 0.833 | 0.962 | 0.831 | 0.829 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.27) | (0.14) | (0.14) |
| Political Knowledge | 2.050\*\*\* | 2.205\*\*\* | 2.215\*\*\* | 2.208\*\*\* | 2.202\*\*\* |
| (0.34) | (0.36) | (0.36) | (0.36) | (0.37) |
| Religiosity | 0.957 | 0.827\* | 0.823\* | 0.826\* | 0.825\* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| White | 0.961 | 0.930 | 0.930 | 0.928 | 0.941 |
|  | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.09) |
| Ideology | 0.675\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.13) |  |  |  |  |
| Political Trust | 1.334 | 1.391 | 1.661 | 1.153 | 5.706\*\*\* |
|  | (0.42) | (0.49) | (0.79) | (1.24) | (2.34) |
| Trust x Ideology | 0.760 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.43) |  |  |  |  |
| Party ID |  | 1.008 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.23) |  |  |  |
| Trust x Party ID |  | 0.935 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.55) |  |  |  |
| Trust x Income |  |  | 0.678 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.49) |  |  |
| Trust x Education |  |  |  | 1.246 |  |
|  |  |  | (1.66) |  |
| Political Efficacy |  |  |  |  | 2.443\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.70) |
| Trust x Political Efficacy |  |  |  |  | 0.083\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.05) |
| Observations | 3498 | 3498 | 3498 | 3557 | 3567 |
| Method | Negative Binomial | Negative Binomial | Negative Binomial | Negative Binomial | Negative Binomial |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A6. Other Explanations for Contingent Relationship****Between Political Trust and Political Invisibility** |
|  | Ideology | Party ID | Income | Education | Political Efficacy |
| Partisan | 0.640\*\* | 0.657\*\* | 0.657\*\* | 0.658\*\* | 0.657\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
| Ideologue | 0.669\* | 0.725\* | 0.722\* | 0.720\* | 0.713\* |
|  | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) |
| Female | 0.872 | 0.837 | 0.834 | 0.835 | 0.844 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.13) |
| Age | 0.210\*\*\* | 0.229\*\*\* | 0.230\*\*\* | 0.230\*\*\* | 0.231\*\*\* |
|  | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) |
| Education | 0.280\* | 0.260\* | 0.263\* | 0.281 | 0.277\* |
|  | (0.17) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.29) | (0.16) |
| Income | 0.490\* | 0.502\* | 0.451 | 0.497\* | 0.504\* |
|  | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.22) | (0.14) | (0.14) |
| Political Knowledge | 0.489\*\* | 0.460\*\* | 0.459\*\* | 0.459\*\* | 0.454\*\* |
| (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.12) |
| Religiosity | 0.914 | 1.047 | 1.043 | 1.040 | 1.040 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) |
| White | 0.849 | 0.890 | 0.880 | 0.880 | 0.870 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.15) |
| Political Trust | 2.598 | 0.998 | 1.191 | 1.457 | 1.072 |
|  | (1.57) | (0.52) | (0.69) | (2.21) | (0.91) |
| Ideology | 2.486\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (1.01) |  |  |  |  |
| Trust x Ideology | 0.389 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.35) |  |  |  |  |
| Party ID |  | 0.714 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.26) |  |  |  |
| Trust x Party ID |  | 1.858 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (1.59) |  |  |  |
| Trust x Income |  |  | 1.298 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (1.47) |  |  |
| Trust x Education |  |  |  | 0.870 |  |
|  |  |  | (1.86) |  |
| Political Efficacy |  |  |  |  | 1.255 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.62) |
| Trust x Political Efficacy |  |  |  |  | 1.516 |
|  |  |  |  | (1.87) |
| Observations | 3498 | 3498 | 3498 | 3557 | 3567 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A7. Other Explanations for Contingent Relationship** **Between Political Trust and Participating in a Protest** |
|  | Ideology | Party ID | Income | Education | Political Efficacy |
| Partisan | 1.320 | 1.184 | 1.240 | 1.242 | 1.245 |
|  | (0.43) | (0.38) | (0.40) | (0.40) | (0.40) |
| Ideologue | 1.666 | 1.893\* | 1.852^ | 1.851^ | 1.873\* |
|  | (0.55) | (0.60) | (0.60) | (0.59) | (0.60) |
| Female | 1.150 | 1.310 | 1.295 | 1.286 | 1.289 |
|  | (0.29) | (0.33) | (0.33) | (0.32) | (0.33) |
| Age | 0.181\*\* | 0.147\*\*\* | 0.151\*\*\* | 0.152\*\*\* | 0.148\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Education | 2.321 | 2.720 | 2.978 | 10.294 | 2.985 |
|  | (3.24) | (3.87) | (4.28) | (22.77) | (4.22) |
| Income | 0.572 | 0.549 | 0.980 | 0.537 | 0.540 |
|  | (0.30) | (0.27) | (0.61) | (0.27) | (0.28) |
| Political Knowledge | 1.853 | 2.148 | 2.129 | 2.081 | 2.107 |
| (1.06) | (1.27) | (1.26) | (1.24) | (1.26) |
| Religiosity | 0.814 | 0.614\* | 0.591\* | 0.593\* | 0.603\* |
|  | (0.21) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.14) |
| White | 0.820 | 0.785 | 0.758 | 0.765 | 0.761 |
|  | (0.21) | (0.20) | (0.19) | (0.20) | (0.20) |
| Ideology | 0.155\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.09) |  |  |  |  |
| Political Trust | 0.634 | 0.359 | 3.456^ | 13.932 | 2.003 |
|  | (0.42) | (0.24) | (2.57) | (32.94) | (2.04) |
| Trust x Ideology | 7.149 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (8.20) |  |  |  |  |
| Party ID |  | 0.168\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.10) |  |  |  |
| Trust x Party ID |  | 33.598 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (38.97) |  |  |  |
| Trust x Income |  |  | 0.219 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.31) |  |  |
| Trust x Education |  |  |  | 0.051 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.16) |  |
| Political Efficacy |  |  |  |  | 1.432 |
|  |  |  |  | (1.04) |
| Trust x Political Efficacy |  |  |  |  | 0.838 |
|  |  |  |  | (1.11) |
| Observations | 3790 | 3790 | 3790 | 3851 | 3860 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A8. Relationship Between Political Trust and Participation, Contingent on Political Efficacy, using Full Efficacy Scale** |
|  | Turnout | Participation Scale | Political Invisibility | Protest |
| Partisan | 1.785\*\*\* | 1.170^ | 0.657\*\* | 1.239 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.40) |
| Ideologue | 1.378\* | 1.449\*\*\* | 0.717\* | 1.869^ |
|  | (0.20) | (0.15) | (0.11) | (0.60) |
| Female | 1.120 | 0.935 | 0.839 | 1.295 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.08) | (0.13) | (0.33) |
| Age | 4.513\*\*\* | 1.125 | 0.228\*\*\* | 0.149\*\*\* |
|  | (1.14) | (0.18) | (0.06) | (0.08) |
| Education | 5.220\*\* | 3.336\*\*\* | 0.275\* | 2.962 |
|  | (2.95) | (1.16) | (0.16) | (4.21) |
| Income | 2.484\*\*\* | 0.838 | 0.500\* | 0.538 |
|  | (0.64) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.28) |
| Political Knowledge | 2.101\*\* | 2.219\*\*\* | 0.453\*\* | 2.121 |
| (0.53) | (0.37) | (0.12) | (1.27) |
| Religiosity | 1.055 | 0.824\* | 1.030 | 0.601\* |
|  | (0.16) | (0.07) | (0.17) | (0.14) |
| White | 1.232 | 0.943 | 0.872 | 0.763 |
|  | (0.20) | (0.09) | (0.15) | (0.20) |
| Full Efficacy Scale | 0.505 | 5.376\*\*\* | 2.286 | 0.940 |
| (0.35) | (2.36) | (1.68) | (0.93) |
| Political Trust | 0.485 | 10.178\*\*\* | 2.623 | 0.946 |
|  | (0.47) | (6.20) | (2.73) | (1.26) |
| Political Trust x Full Efficacy Scale | 2.136 | 0.027\*\*\* | 0.310 | 3.113 |
| (3.56) | (0.03) | (0.56) | (6.47) |
| Observations | 3496 | 3490 | 3490 | 3781 |
| Method | Logistic Regression | Negative Binomial | Logistic Regression | Logistic Regression |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.05 |
| Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001. All coefficients are exponentiated. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed. |

**APPENDIX C**

 **Interview Protocol, Research Site Information, and Interviewee Descriptions**

 This appendix begins by providing the full protocol utilized for this paper. As noted within the main text, not all questions were asked in each interview, nor was the order of these questions necessarily followed. Rather, these were the questions that I constructed interviews around. The semi-structured nature of these interviews meant that I often asked follow up questions that are not included in this protocol.

 Following the protocol, I provide a brief description of the research sites used for recruiting interviewees, as well as more detail on the coding process used for the interview data. In particular, this explains why I chose the sites that I did, how I used them for recruiting interviewees, and how the coding of the interviews led to some of the major findings put forward in the paper.

**Interview Protocol**

1. Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me today. Your input today is going to help my dissertation project, and will hopefully help those of us studying politics better understand the relationship between people and government. I want to emphasize that there are no wrong answers to any of these questions. I am here only to learn from you. So, let’s start- maybe you can tell me a bit more about where you live.

1a. How have you seen it change in the time you’ve been living there?

1b. Do you see it as being similar to or different from some of the other neighborhoods in the area?

2. What is one of the biggest challenges you see facing your neighborhood?

2a. Is that something most of your neighbors also see as a big challenge?

2b. How do you see people trying to deal with these issues? Who do they go to in order to get these things fixed? The government? Community organizations? Churches?

2c. (If not government) What do you think makes people turn to places other than government in these cases?

2c. (If government) Do people tend to find that the government responds in these cases?

3. People mean many things when they say the word “government.” Tell me a bit about what you think of when you hear the word government?

3a. Is there any particular experience, or conversation you’ve had, or person you talk to, or place you hear about politics that you think has had a big influence on you viewing government that way?

3b. Do you view government as being good or bad? Tell me more about that.

3c. Is there an area or issue where you feel like the government is too involved or does too much?

3d. What about an area where you feel the government doesn’t do enough?

4. Think about the past year or so; can you remember having contact with government in any way?

4a. What did that experience tell you about how government works?

4b. What can you tell me about that experience? Is there anything that stands out for you?

4c. Would you describe that experience as “typical” of what happens when you deal with government?

4d. What about in your current life? What is the biggest way you feel government currently affects your life?

4e. Any other contact you’ve had with government that stands out to you?

4f. Would you say that government affects your life every day?

4g. What about growing up? What do you remember hearing about government when you were growing up? Are there any experiences with government you remember?

4h. What do you remember learning about government in school? How do you think that has changed?

4i. Are there any government programs that you’ve ever benefited from? What were those experiences like?

4j. Would you prefer that the government be run more like a business?

5. What about among your friends and family? What do you hear from them about government?

5a. Has what you’ve heard from them fit with your own experiences?

5b. Is there any time where you felt like your views of government changed a lot?

6. If you felt the government had wronged you in some way, say by giving you an unfair parking ticket or making you wait in a long line for something they were supposed to send to you, what would you do?

6a. (If they say they couldn’t do anything) Do you think there are other people who would be more successful in fighting that kind of thing?

7. Some people really like to follow politics, but others really try to avoid it. What about you? Do you see yourself as being interested in politics?

7a. People do all sorts of things to try to change their communities, their cities, the world and so on. Is there anything that you do where you feel you are trying to change the world around you?

7b. Do you view any of those things as political?

7c. A lot of people struggle to get out to vote because they don’t have time, they have to work, or they just don’t feel like it. What about you? In the last couple of elections, have you been able to make it to vote?

7d. If you had a friend who wanted to get involved in politics, what would your advice be for them?

8. When you think about your friends and family, do they talk about politics?

8a. What are those conversations like?

8b. Are there other places you tend to hear about politics or see political news, such as social media sites?

9. What do you think politicians see when they see you?

9a. Tell me a bit more about that.

9b. Are there other things they might see that could cut against that image of you?

9c. What does it mean to you for politicians to see you as X?

9d. What do you think makes politicians see somebody like you that way?

9e. Can you think of an experience you had with someone in government that made you feel like X?

9f. How much do you think people in X group can change the way government operates?

9g. How much do you think people in X group agree on their feelings about government and politics?

9h. How many of your friends and family do you think would also claim that politicians see them as X?

10. Is there anything else you’d like me to know that we haven’t covered so far?

**Research Site Information**

 While the article demonstrates that race served as the dividing line of interest, I did not begin the interviews assuming that particular dimensions of variation between individuals would be the most important in terms of structuring government visibility or political trust. However, I knew that it would be essential for my interviewees to vary along dimensions that have generally been central to the study of political science (Schaffer 2016). Thus, I selected four sites to conduct my research in. These included: Site A, an urban, lower income, and racially diverse neighborhood; Site B, an urban, middle-class, and largely White neighborhood; Site C, an almost exclusively White, affluent suburb; and Site D, an economically diverse and predominantly White rural town.

As noted in the main text, I selected these sites as a way of generating variation along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, class, geography, and partisanship. Again, these were the same dimensions used in the purposive sampling done using a pool of research subjects gathered at a statewide celebration. To further expand the variation of individuals I heard from, and to get past any idiosyncrasies within these four sites, I also recruited several interviewees from a sample collected at a large fair that attracted individuals from all over the same state in which the four sites were located. The recruitment of these individuals was similarly purposive, in that it was designed to obtain variation along the same important dimensions of interest noted above.[[1]](#footnote-1)

 Within each of the four communities, I began with observation work at local meetings and social gatherings as a way to establish my presence and build trust with local residents. In total, I devoted over 100 hours to this initial ethnographic component. I then leveraged the connections made during this time to help recruit individuals for the interviews, often using “snowball sampling” to move away from talking to only the more active members of the community (Morse 1990). Further, this initial observation time gave me the opportunity to learn about the communities to ensure I was hearing from a set of viewpoints consistent with the diversity of those present in the area. In this way, my sampling process followed a sequential case study logic, in which each interviewee represented a new case that I drew on to inform the study of the next case (Small 2009). It thus became crucial to analyze the interview data as I worked through it to make sure I understood the diversity of the viewpoints I was hearing from, and which dimensions seemed to be particularly important in structuring that diversity .

To accomplish this, each interview was analyzed using a specific process. In particular, each was transcribed, and first coded to divide the data up into broad categories of interest. These categories were then put through a data reduction procedure that involved summarizing and comparing each category, allowing me to see what factors were important across interviews, as well as the dimensions that seemed to underlie the variation within these factors expressed across the interviewees (Rubin and Rubin, 2011). In utilizing abductive reasoning (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, 2011), these factors were then used to generate preliminary expectations, which were tested against the data and revised based on places where the evidence did not match up. This process was repeated as I conducted further interviews, and only completed once I felt I had reached a saturation point in which I was no longer hearing new information in the interviews (Small 2009), and had reached a set of conclusions that the data could not contradict.

Finally, I am aware of the potential for interviewer bias within this project, and the fact that my appearance likely “cued” particular ideas within my interviewees. However, I believe the lack of questions directly addressing social characteristics (e.g. race, gender, etc.) helped minimize the extent to which this bias was systematic. Further, most of my interviewees were either people I had developed a personal relationship with through my ethnographic work or were introduced to me by their own friends, creating a more comfortable environment for people to express themselves within. Finally, that some of my White interviewees seemed more inclined to discuss “our” shared tax burden shows the potential advantages of interviewer bias, an advantage matched by the potential lack of discussion of the criminal justice system among interviewees of color. This highlights that interviewer bias is ultimately less about eliminating systematic bias, and more about understanding “how it works and what it tells us,” (Lin 2000, p. 191).

**Interviewee Descriptions**

The table below provides the pseudonyms for each interviewee, the site from which they were recruited, whether they identified as White or a Person of Color, as well as the date on which the interview was conducted. I do not provide any other identifying information in order to protect the anonymity of the interviewees.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pseudonym** | **Date** | **Site^** | **Racial Identificaion** |
| Amy | 4/13/16 | F | White |
| Bernie and Lucie | 9/29/16 | B | White |
| Bogert | 8/22/16 | D | White |
| Carla | 8/19/16 | F | Person of Color |
| Carol Hill | 12/7/16 | B | White |
| Charlotte | 11/3/16 | A | White |
| Christine | 3/9/16 | F | White |
| Chuck Wes | 11/1/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Coach Y | 10/16/16 | B | Person of Color |
| Curt | 11/7/16 | D | White |
| Daisis Oasis | 3/7/16 | A | White |
| Dave | 4/11/16 | F | White |
| David | 4/20/16 | F | White |
| Deb | 4/6/16 | F | White |
| Dick and Jane | 12/15/16 | D | White |
| Dick Self | 12/19/16 | F | White |
| DK | 9/27/16 | B | White |
| Donna | 12/15/16 | D | White |
| DR | 10/28/16 | D | White |
| Emmie Brown | 10/19/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Eric Red | 12/9/16 | C | White |
| Hotmetal | 11/29/16 | B | White |
| Ishmael | 12/20/16 | F | White |
| Jackie | 6/22/16 | F | White |
| Jane | 10/11/16 | B | White |
| Jay | 11/8/16, 12/1/16\* | A | Person of Color |
| Jeff | 8/23/16 | D | White |
| Joe | 3/11/16 | F | White |
| Julie | 7/14/16 | F | White |
| Kathy | 7/26/16 | F | White |
| Katy | 10/27/16, 11/16/16\* | C | White |
| Kimmie Fagud | 11/10/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Kyle | 3/29/16 | F | White |
| Lisa | 11/2/16 | F | Person of Color |
| Marc | 8/30/16 | F | White |
| Maria Jackson | 2/26/16 | F | White |
| Marny | 12/6/16 | D | White |
| Maya | 10/18/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Michelle | 9/15/16 | F | Person of Color |
| MichMpls | 12/22/16 | F | White |
| Millie | 11/30/16 | B | White |
| Mohammed | 9/8/16 | F | Person of Color |
| PetPeeve | 10/13/16 | B | White |
| Publicus Anonymous | 11/17/16 | C | White |
| Robert and Laura | 12/2/16 | C | White |
| Rose | 9/26/16 | B | White |
| Rose Stone | 10/14/16 | C | White |
| Sam | 12/6/16 | D | White |
| Sanyare | 11/28/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Sierra | 7/12/16 | F | Person of Color |
| Sky | 11/4/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Stephanie Lawrence | 12/8/16 | C | White |
| TJ | 12/15/16 | A | Person of Color |
| Trey Turner | 12/16/16 | F | White |
| TS | 10/31/16 | A | Person of Color |
| William and Sophia | 10/4/16 | B | White |
| Zack Sloane | 12/13/16 | C | White |
| Zoe | 3/8/16 | F | White |
| ^Sites A, B, C and D are described above. Site F refers to the large fair from which the remaining interviewees were recruited.\*Interviews with both Jay and Katy were held over two sessions. |
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