Online Appendix for: *Does Light Contact with the Police Motivate Political Participation? Evidence from Traffic Stops*

May 6, 2022

Contents

A 2016 and 2018 CCES

A.1 CCES Sample

The Cooperative Congressional Election Study, or CCES, is a large sample survey. In 2016, it involved 60 teams and obtained a sample of 64,600 respondents. In 2018, it involved 60 teams and obtained a sample of 60,000 respondents. Respondents were recruited through the survey firm YouGov and interviews were conducted before and after the election. Respondents consented to take part in this study and their identities are fully anonymized. Data used in this study was downloaded from the CCES website, as data are made publicly available.

A.2 Descriptive Statistics for Each CCES Study

Table 1: Counts of Activity Participation and Receiving a Ticket

	2016	2018
Number of Respondents	64600	60000
Number who...		
Attended a local political meeting	6238	7175
Put up a political sign	8540	9163
Worked for a candidate or campaign	3215	3089
Donated money	12390	11802
Did at any action of above	18361	18451
Received a Traffic Ticket	8182	3698

Table 2: Summary Statistics of Control Variables for Each CCES (Unweighted)

	2016 CCES				2018 CCES			
	Min.	Mean	Max.	S.D.	Min.	Mean	Max.	S.D.
White	0.00	0.80	1.00	0.40	0.00	0.74	1.00	0.44
Black	0.00	0.10	1.00	0.30	0.00	0.09	1.00	0.28
Latinx	0.00	0.03	1.00	0.18	0.00	0.03	1.00	0.18
Other Race	0.00	0.07	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.13	1.00	0.34
Female	0.00	0.56	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.56	1.00	0.50
Education Level	1.00	3.75	6.00	1.47	1.00	3.78	6.00	1.51
Independent	0.00	0.37	1.00	0.48	0.00	0.35	1.00	0.48
Democrat	0.00	0.38	1.00	0.48	0.00	0.37	1.00	0.48
Republican	0.00	0.26	1.00	0.44	0.00	0.27	1.00	0.45
Interest	1.00	3.27	4.00	0.91	-2.00	3.18	4.00	1.18
Born Again	0.00	0.28	1.00	0.45	0.00	0.27	1.00	0.45
Family Income	1.00	6.48	16.00	3.26	1.00	6.48	16.00	3.34

A.3 Full Table for the CCES Regressions

Tables 3 shows the full regression results for CCES models presented in the paper.

Table 3: Explaining Political and Civic Participation in 2016 and 2018 Using CCES Data

	(1) Logistic	(2) Poisson
(Intercept)	−4.62***	−4.03***
	(0.05)	(0.04)
Police Contact (Ticket)	0.26***	0.18***
	(0.03)	(0.01)
Black	−0.21***	−0.18***
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Latinx	0.06	0.06*
	(0.05)	(0.03)
Other	−0.12***	−0.08***
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Family Income	0.06***	0.04***
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education Level	0.14***	0.11***
	(0.01)	(0.00)
Female	−0.19***	−0.11***
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Born Again	0.02	0.01
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Party: Dem	0.42***	0.30***
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Party: Rep	0.06**	0.01
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Interest	0.84***	0.74***
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Age	0.00***	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)
2018	0.10***	0.09***
	(0.02)	(0.01)
AIC	101227.37	168182.02
BIC	101359.00	168313.65
Log Likelihood	-50599.69	-84077.01
Deviance	99856.33	97641.41
Num. obs.	89514	89514

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

A.4 CCES Regressions by Year

Table 4: CCES Models by Year

	2016: Any	2016: Count	2018: Any	2018: Count
(Intercept)	−4.91***	−4.23***	−4.34***	−3.74***
	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.05)
Police Contact	0.26***	0.18***	0.24***	0.19***
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Black	−0.20***	−0.14***	−0.23***	−0.17***
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Latinx	0.08	0.09	0.04	0.04
	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.05)
Other	−0.06	−0.02	−0.15***	−0.09***
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Family Income	0.06***	0.04***	0.06***	0.04***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education Level	0.13***	0.11***	0.14***	0.12***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Female	−0.19***	−0.14***	−0.19***	−0.11***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Born Again	0.06*	0.03	−0.03	−0.01
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Party: Dem	0.45***	0.32***	0.39***	0.27***
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Party: Rep	0.07*	0.04	0.05	0.01
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Interest	0.95***	0.83***	0.75***	0.66***
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Age	−0.00	−0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
AIC	50166.69	81845.92	50987.87	83208.70
BIC	50279.37	81967.26	51101.60	83331.19
Log Likelihood	-25070.35	-40908.96	-25480.93	-41590.35
Deviance	50004.26	37253.13	49757.45	37746.43
Num. obs.	42937	42937	46577	46577

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

A.5 CCES Regressions by Activity Done

Table 5: CCES Models by Activity Done

	Meeting	Sign	Work	Donate
(Intercept)	-5.41^{***}	-4.55^{***}	-7.33^{***}	-6.94^{***}
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.13)	(0.07)
Police Contact	0.23^{***}	0.24^{***}	0.17^{***}	0.30^{***}
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Black	-0.10^{*}	-0.36^{***}	-0.12^{*}	-0.25^{***}
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Latinx	0.26^{***}	-0.05	0.22^{*}	-0.01
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.06)
Race: Other	0.01	-0.26^{***}	-0.11^{*}	-0.08^{*}
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Family Income	0.06^{***}	0.03^{***}	0.02^{***}	0.08^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education Level	0.19^{***}	0.04^{***}	0.25^{***}	0.17^{***}
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Female	-0.14^{***}	-0.14^{***}	-0.14^{***}	-0.16^{***}
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Born Again	0.13^{***}	0.11^{***}	0.08^{*}	-0.20^{***}
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.02)
Party: Dem	0.21^{***}	0.38^{***}	0.70^{***}	0.43^{***}
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.02)
Party: Rep	-0.15^{***}	0.24^{***}	-0.03	-0.09^{***}
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.02)
Interest	0.75^{***}	0.75^{***}	0.96^{***}	1.04^{***}
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Age	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Year: 2018	0.25^{***}	0.17^{***}	-0.00	0.03
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
AIC	60761.27	75934.72	35030.13	79557.92
BIC	60892.90	76066.35	35161.76	79689.55
Log Likelihood	-30366.64	-37953.36	-17501.07	-39764.96
Deviance	59752.55	74439.41	34289.27	78180.24
Num. obs.	89514	89514	89514	89514

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

A.6 CCES Regressions by Race

Table 6: CCES Models by Race

	CCES: Any	CCES: Count
(Intercept)	-4.42^{***}	-3.82^{***}
	(0.06)	(0.04)
Police Contact	0.28^{***}	0.20^{***}
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Black	-0.19^{***}	-0.19^{***}
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Income	0.07^{***}	0.04^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education	0.14^{***}	0.11^{***}
	(0.01)	(0.00)
Female	-0.16^{***}	-0.09^{***}
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Born Again	0.03	0.03^{*}
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Party	-0.08^{***}	-0.07^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Interest	0.87^{***}	0.76^{***}
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Age	0.00^{***}	0.00^{**}
	(0.00)	(0.00)
2018	0.12^{***}	0.10^{***}
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Police Contact * Black	0.03	0.02
	(0.08)	(0.05)
AIC	87253.20	144758.69
BIC	87364.03	144869.53
Log Likelihood	-43614.60	-72367.35
Deviance	85318.25	83126.23
Num. obs.	75809	75809

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

B 2016 ANES Pilot

B.1 Full Table for the ANES Regressions

Table 7: Explaining Plans for Future Political Action Using 2016 ANES Pilot Data

	ANES: Any	ANES: Count
(Intercept)	2.04***	1.34***
	(0.60)	(0.33)
Police Contact	0.55*	0.54***
	(0.25)	(0.13)
Black	0.41	0.24
	(0.36)	(0.19)
Other Race	0.49	0.26
	(0.30)	(0.16)
Family Income	−0.00	−0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education Level	−0.01	−0.02
	(0.07)	(0.04)
Female	−0.42*	−0.20
	(0.21)	(0.12)
Born Again	−0.05	0.15
	(0.23)	(0.13)
Partisanship	−0.09	−0.06*
	(0.05)	(0.03)
Interest	−1.11***	−0.80***
	(0.16)	(0.10)
Age	−0.01*	−0.01**
	(0.01)	(0.00)
AIC	530.42	1011.90
BIC	578.09	1059.56
Log Likelihood	-254.21	-494.95
Deviance	562.87	606.23
Num. obs.	563	563

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

B.2 ANES Regressions by Activity Done

Table 8: ANES Regressions by Activity Planned

	Meeting	Seek Info	Give Money
(Intercept)	3.78***	3.20***	3.42***
	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Police Contact	0.41**	0.67***	0.43***
	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Black	0.39*	0.13	0.19
	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Race: Other	0.08	0.34*	0.14
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Family Income	−0.00	−0.00**	−0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education Level	0.02	−0.02	0.06
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Female	−0.16	−0.06	−0.25*
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Born Again	0.10	0.10	0.04
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Partisanship	−0.01	−0.04	−0.07**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Interest	−0.51***	−0.45***	−0.46***
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Age	−0.01***	−0.01	−0.01*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
R^2	0.17	0.18	0.17
Adj. R^2	0.16	0.17	0.16
Num. obs.	563	563	563
RMSE	1.17	1.12	1.12

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

B.3 ANES Regressions by Race

Table 9: ANES Regressions by Race

	ANES: Any	ANES: Count
(Intercept)	2.32***	1.53***
	(0.65)	(0.36)
Police Contact	0.54	0.46**
	(0.31)	(0.17)
Black	1.00*	0.56*
	(0.44)	(0.25)
Income	−0.00	−0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education	−0.03	−0.01
	(0.08)	(0.04)
Female	−0.19	−0.05
	(0.23)	(0.14)
Born again	−0.07	0.08
	(0.25)	(0.15)
Party	−0.07	−0.04
	(0.06)	(0.03)
Interest	−1.35***	−1.06***
	(0.20)	(0.13)
Age	−0.02*	−0.01**
	(0.01)	(0.00)
Police Contact * Black	−1.32	−0.43
	(0.75)	(0.37)
AIC	434.73	830.85
BIC	480.78	876.90
Log Likelihood	-206.37	-404.42
Deviance	466.25	493.79
Num. obs.	486	486

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

C 2020 Lucid Survey

C.1 Additional Information on Lucid

For our survey experiment, we contracted Lucid, a survey firm, to recruit participants (adults, living in the United States) from their subject pool. To acquire informed consent, we included a letter as the first page of the survey, where respondents were asked to read the letter and whether they agree to participate in the study. Only after reading the letter and explicitly agreeing to the study did the study begin. If they declined to participate, they were directed to exit the survey platform. If the participant agreed to participate, they were given our survey—hosted by the survey platform Qualtrics. Upon completion of the study, respondents were debriefed about the purpose of the study and the specifics of the experiment — and were given the opportunity to withdraw their data at that time if they so chose.

While we the researchers did not directly pay participants, Lucid does incentivize participation. Lucid's statement on payment is as follows: "Lucid manages relationships with suppliers who handle incentives to participants directly. Researchers pay Lucid a cost per completed interview (CPI) and Lucid pays suppliers who then provide a portion of those earnings to participants in the form of cash, gift cards, or loyalty reward points. Lucid does not directly handle incentives to research participants and does not control the payment amount or type."

An IRB ruled this study exempt from review, as respondents were subject to "benign behavioral interventions," they were not deceived, we did not intervene in political processes, and respondents cannot be identified via their responses. The survey was ruled "benign" as the only potential risks for the respondent was possible minor discomfort disclosing information about themselves, a slight increase in anxiety in response to the vignette, or embarrassment if individual responses became public and could be traced back to specific individuals. However, the last is extremely unlikely to occur as we will only present aggregations of responses and respondents are anonymized (as they are recruited through Lucid, and the researchers never have access to directly identifiable information).

C.2 Question Wording

For our experiment, respondents were told: "Now, we're going to ask you to participate in an exercise. Imagine you're experiencing the following scenario. Then, let us know what you think about what happened to you." Following this, respondents were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. These were:

- **Control Condition:** You are driving to the grocery store. Look down and notice that you are almost out of gas. The light for "empty" just came on. So, you decide to stop at the gas station. When you get there, you get out of the car and pay to fill up your gas tank. Several minutes pass as you pump the gas. Eventually, when your tank is full, you get your receipt and get back into your car. You turn your car on and notice that the "empty" light is off and now your gas tank is full. You continue driving to the store, where you find most of the things on your list. You check out and head home.

- **Ticket Treatment:** You are driving to the grocery store. Behind you, you see flashing red and blue lights. A police officer is pulling you over, so you pull to the side of the road. The police officer in uniform comes up to your car window and asks for your driver's license and vehicle registration without telling you anything else. You give these to him, and then he returns to his vehicle. Several minutes pass as you wait in your car. Eventually, the officer approaches your car again. He tells you that you were driving 10 miles over the speed limit. Then, he returns your license and registration – and he writes you a $150 ticket for speeding.You continue driving to the store, where you find most of the things on your list. You check out and head home.

- **Search Treatment:** You are driving to the grocery store. Behind you, you see flashing red and blue lights. A police officer is pulling you over, so you pull to the side of the road. The police officer in uniform comes up to your car window and asks for your driver's license and vehicle registration without telling you anything else. You give these to him, and then he returns to his vehicle. Several minutes pass as you wait in your car. Eventually, the officer approaches your car again. He asks you to step out of the car and you agree, getting out of your vehicle. While you are waiting on the side of the road, the officer searches your car – the interior and the trunk. He does not find anything in his search. He tells you that you were driving 10 miles over the speed limit. Then, he returns your license and registration – and he writes you a $150 ticket for speeding. You continue driving to the store, where you find most of the things on your list. You check out and head home.

C.3 Manipulation Checks

To understand whether respondents actually read and retained the treatment, we asked respondents to tell us about the scenario they read about. The specific question asked was: "What happened in the scenario you just read a few minutes ago?" The possible answers were:

- The police pulled me over while I was driving to the grocery store, and I got a ticket;
- The police pulled me over while I was driving to the grocery store, my car was searched, and I got a ticket
- I pulled over on my way to the grocery store to get gas;
- I drove to the bank.

With this variable, we generated three dichtomous variables corresponding to whether the respondent reported that (1) they were pulled over and given a ticket, (2) they were pulled over, searched, and given a ticket, or (3) they pulled over to get gas. Table 10 predicts each of these variables using the respondent's assigned treatment condition. For each model, respondents were significantly more likely to report seeing the condition that they were assigned to. This suggests that the respondents read and understood the treatment.

Table 10: Predicting response to manipulation check

	Ticket Condition	Search Condition	Control Condition
Intercept	-2.01^*	-1.51^*	0.64^*
	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.12)
Search Condition	0.47^*	2.62^*	-3.46^*
	(0.23)	(0.19)	(0.27)
Ticket Condition	3.09^*	-0.27	-3.31^*
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.25)
AIC	925.28	951.06	721.92
BIC	939.96	965.74	736.59
Log Likelihood	-459.64	-472.53	-357.96
Deviance	919.28	945.06	715.92
Num. obs.	984	984	984

Note: $^*p < 0.05$

C.4 Summary Statistics

The median age was 43 years old, which is slightly higher than the national median age according to the U.S. Census (38 years old). There was an even split on gender, with 492 female respondents and 490 male respondents. The median income of respondents was in the 50-75k category,[1] which is comparable to the national median income $68,703.[2] Finally, the average level of education was "some college," which is also comparable to national averages. In 2019, 28.1% of the population attained high school (as their highest level of education) and 22.5% completed college.[3]

Table 11: Sample Characteristics

Characteristic	N
White	543
Black	441
Female	492
Male	490
Less than HS	407
HS	89
Some College	30
Completed Post-HS Training	61
Some Graduate School	177
Graduate Degree	218
HHI <$25k	191
HHI $25k-50k	255
HHI $50k-75k	176
HHI $75k-100k	109
HHI $100k-125k	69
HHI $125k-150k	44
HHI $150k-175k	25
HHI $175k-2000k	13
HHI <$200k	47
Party: Democratic	465
Party: Republican	247
Party: Independent	199

Table 12: Summary Statistics Key Variables

	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Standard Deviation.
Num. Likely Activities	0.00	1.20	4.00	1.37
Any Activities	0.00	0.56	1.00	0.50
Feeling Toward Police	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.32
Age	18.00	45.20	86.00	16.79

[1]Link: Census.gov
[2]Link: Census.gov
[3]Link: Census.gov

C.5 Balance Tests

Below, we test for whether our treatments are randomly distributed by predicting treatment condition by a range of variables using a multinomial regression shown in Table 13. This shows that generally the conditions are randomly assigned.

Table 13: Multinomial Regression Prediction Treatment Group to Test for Balance

	Search	Ticket
(Intercept)	−0.16	0.25
	(0.63)	(0.64)
Received a Ticket	0.09	0.11
	(0.27)	(0.26)
Proximal Contact	0.17	0.09
	(0.21)	(0.20)
Concerned about COVID-19	0.17	0.18
	(0.27)	(0.26)
Is an Officer	−0.19	0.15
	(0.38)	(0.35)
Has a License	0.13	−0.08
	(0.36)	(0.37)
Driving Frequency	0.12	−0.06
	(0.11)	(0.11)
Age	0.00	−0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)
White	−0.19	−0.14
	(0.20)	(0.20)
Male	−0.09	−0.07
	(0.18)	(0.18)
Education: HS	−0.28	−0.31
	(0.33)	(0.32)
Education: Some College	−0.16	−0.13
	(0.51)	(0.49)
Education: Completed Post-HS Training	−0.34	−0.45
	(0.38)	(0.37)
Education: Some Graduate	−0.20	−0.27
	(0.30)	(0.30)
Education: Graduate Degree	−0.26	−0.28
	(0.26)	(0.25)
HHI: 25k-50k	−0.18	0.42
	(0.28)	(0.28)
HHI: 50k-75k	−0.66*	−0.30
	(0.30)	(0.30)
HHI: 75k-100k	0.03	0.14
	(0.35)	(0.36)
HHI: 100k-125k	0.13	0.33
	(0.40)	(0.41)
HHI: 125k-150k	−0.35	−0.29
	(0.45)	(0.46)
HHI: 175k-200k	0.30	0.18
	(0.78)	(0.82)
HHI: >200k	−0.50	−0.21
	(0.33)	(0.34)
Democrat	−0.12	0.08
	(0.23)	(0.22)
Republican	0.37	0.38
	(0.26)	(0.26)
AIC	1953.85	1953.85
BIC	2182.35	2182.35
Log Likelihood	-928.92	-928.92
Deviance	1857.85	1857.85
Num. obs.	863	863

* indicates $p < 0.05$.

C.6 Interactive Poisson Models

Table 14: Statistical models

	(1) All	(2) White	(3) Black
(Intercept)	0.25*	0.59***	−0.03
	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Search Condition	−0.10	−0.49*	0.18
	(0.14)	(0.23)	(0.19)
Ticket Condition	−0.10	−0.30	0.07
	(0.15)	(0.23)	(0.21)
Police Feeling Thermometer	−0.35*	−0.84***	0.16
	(0.17)	(0.23)	(0.26)
Search:Police	0.54*	1.04**	0.18
	(0.22)	(0.32)	(0.35)
Ticket:Police	0.45	0.71*	0.21
	(0.23)	(0.33)	(0.36)
AIC	3097.54	1749.84	1346.57
BIC	3126.87	1775.62	1371.08
Log Likelihood	−1542.77	−868.92	−667.29
Deviance	1679.55	1004.44	661.99
Num. obs.	981	542	439

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$

C.7 Assessing Alternative Moderators and Outcomes

As the survey was fielded shortly after the murder of George Floyd Jr. and during some of the ensuing protests, we are concerned about the context may be a possible confounding factor of the results of our survey experiment. To address these concerns, we take two approaches with a specific focus on white respondents due to our focus on the results for white respondents in the heart of the paper. These additional analyses demonstrate that the main results presented in the body of the paper are robust, that other moderators appear to not play a role in the identified link, and that the experiment did not appear to shift underlying levels of government trust.

First, we test whether it is not attitudes toward the police that moderate the identified relationship, but attitudes toward other prominent figures (i.e., then-President Donald Trump), societal groups (i.e., Black Americans), or the protests themselves. To test this, we reestimate our key interactive model using three different moderators that may tap into feelings of the moment. Two of these are feeling thermometers of (1) group – Black people – and (2) an individual – then President Trump – that may be linked to feelings toward the moment and movement. Each of these was asked in the same battery as feelings toward the police. Unfortunately, we did not ask about feelings towards the Black Lives Matter movement in this battery, so we cannot directly incorporate such a measure. Our final alternative moderator is support for the George Floyd protests, where one indicates strongly support and and seven indicates strongly oppose. The full text of the question is as follows: "How much do you support or oppose the protests that are happening?" We show these logistic regressions in Table 15, which include white respondents only. As can be seen, no moderating relationship is detected in any of the alternative models. This provides some support for the idea that our results are not simply a byproduct of the moment, but instead, reflect a more durable connection that exists between light contact and political participation that is moderated by prior attitudes about the police.

Second, we consider whether whites with a positive affinity toward the police are more likely to participate because they are primed to think more fondly of government or act in solidarity – especially during a period where they may feel that an institution or group they approve of is under attack. To this end, we test whether respondents report altered levels of trust based on an interaction of their prior feelings toward the police and treatment condition predict trust in government and whether they believe the government is run by a few big interests or for the benefit of all. The first is asked as a grid, where the stem asks respondents: "How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?" The three items are trust in the federal government, trust in the respondent's state government, and trust in the respondent's local government, with one indicating strongly agree and seven indicating strongly disagree. This amounts to three different dependent variables. The last variable comes from the question: "Would you say that the government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all people?" Each of these is modeled using an OLS regression. Respondents could answer either "A few big interests looking out for themselves" (0) or "For the benefit of all people" (1). This is modeled using a logistic regression. The results of these regressions are shown in Table 16, where reach regression only includes white respondents. As can be seen, there are not statistically significant relationships between our treatment and the outcomes. This provides

some support for the idea that our results are not a byproduct of white respondents doubling down on their impressions of government.

Table 15: Poisson Models Explaining Number of Activities Given a Variety of Moderators

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
(Intercept)	0.25*	−0.48	0.05	1.10***
	(0.10)	(0.25)	(0.11)	(0.13)
Search Condition	−0.10	0.71*	−0.02	−0.13
	(0.14)	(0.33)	(0.16)	(0.18)
Ticket Condition	−0.10	0.54	−0.05	0.17
	(0.15)	(0.32)	(0.16)	(0.18)
Police Feeling Thermometer	−0.35*			
	(0.17)			
Search:Police	0.54*			
	(0.22)			
Ticket:Police	0.45			
	(0.23)			
Black Feeling Thermometer		0.74*		
		(0.32)		
Search:Black		−0.76		
		(0.43)		
Ticket:Black		−0.54		
		(0.42)		
Trump Feeling Thermometer			0.05	
			(0.18)	
Search:Trump			0.36	
			(0.25)	
Ticket:Trump			0.34	
			(0.24)	
Opposition to George Floyd Protests				−0.40***
				(0.05)
Search:George Floyd				0.12
				(0.07)
Ticket:George Floyd				−0.03
				(0.08)
AIC	3097.54	1748.60	1752.76	1407.40
BIC	3126.87	1774.35	1778.54	1432.59
Log Likelihood	−1542.77	−868.30	−870.38	−697.70
Deviance	1679.55	1008.46	1007.36	730.94
Num. obs.	981	540	542	492

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

Table 16: Regressions Explaining Perceptions of Government

	I trust the ... government.			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Federal	State	Local	
	OLS	*OLS*	*OLS*	*Logit*
(Intercept)	5.52^{***}	4.44^{***}	4.28^{***}	-1.97^{***}
	(0.33)	(0.31)	(0.29)	(0.53)
Search Condition	−0.59	−0.72	−0.14	−0.41
	(0.47)	(0.44)	(0.41)	(0.79)
Ticket Condition	−0.19	−0.34	−0.09	−0.07
	(0.49)	(0.46)	(0.43)	(0.75)
Police Feeling Thermometer	-1.83^{***}	-1.13^{**}	-1.32^{**}	0.65
	(0.46)	(0.43)	(0.41)	(0.70)
Search:Police	0.19	0.56	−0.03	0.45
	(0.65)	(0.61)	(0.57)	(1.04)
Ticket:Police	0.01	0.34	0.00	0.74
	(0.67)	(0.63)	(0.59)	(0.99)
R^2	0.08	0.03	0.06	
Adj. R^2	0.07	0.02	0.05	
Num. obs.	543	543	543	541
AIC				539.98
BIC				565.74
Log Likelihood				−263.99
Deviance				527.98

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$