

Appendix for: Does Learning about Government Transparency Boost Trust?

May 2024

A Questionnaire Example

Q1.1.

INFORMED CONSENT

I confirm that I have received the information provided in [this](#) file and declare having read and understood its content. I confirm that I am 18 years of age or older, and volunteer to take part in this research. (Consent for minors or incapacitated individuals should be obtained from their legal tutors). Taking note that my data are processed in full compliance with the Law, I freely consent to my data to be used in the manner and uses described. I also declare having understood my rights and limitations, as well as how to exercise them.

- I consent, begin the study.
- I do not consent, I do not wish to participate.

Q2.1. First we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

Q2.2. How do you describe yourself?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary / third gender
- Prefer to self-describe
- Prefer not to say

Q2.3. How old are you?

- Under 18
- 18-24 years old
- 25-34 years old
- 35-44 years old
- 45-54 years old
- 55-64 years old
- 65+ years old

Q2.4. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino origin?

- Yes
- No

Q2.5. Choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be

- White or Caucasian
- Black or African American
- American Indian/Native American or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other

Prefer not to say

Q2.6. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- Less than high school degree
- High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED)
- Some college but no degree
- Associate degree in college (2-year)
- Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)
- Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA)
- Professional degree beyond a bachelor's degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
- Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD)

Q2.7. What best describes your employment status over the last three months?

- Working full-time
- Working part-time
- Unemployed and looking for work
- A homemaker or stay-at-home parent
- Student
- Retired
- Other

Q2.8. Where are you employed?

- PRIVATE-FOR-PROFIT company, business or individual, for wages, salary or commissions
- PRIVATE-NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization
- Local GOVERNMENT employee (city, county, etc.)
- State GOVERNMENT employee; 5-Federal GOVERNMENT employee
- Federal GOVERNMENT employee
- SELF-EMPLOYED in own NOT INCORPORATED business, professional practice, or farm
- SELF-EMPLOYED in own INCORPORATED business, professional practice, or farm
- Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm

Q2.9. What was your total household income before taxes during the past 12 months?

- Less than \$25,000
- \$25,000-\$49,999
- \$50,000-\$74,999
- \$75,000-\$99,999
- \$100,000-\$149,999
- \$150,000 or more
- Prefer not to say

Q2.10. What is your US Zip Code?

91911

Q3.1.
Were you born in the United States of America?

- Yes
- No

Q3.2. Are you a citizen of the United States of America?

- Yes
- No

Q3.3. Did you vote in the last election?

- Yes
- No

Q3.4.
Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?

- Republican
- Democrat
- Independent
- Other
- No preference

Q3.5. Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q3.6.
Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

- Strong
- Not very strong

Q3.7.
Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q3.8. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

- Extremely liberal
- Somewhat liberal
- Neither conservative nor liberal
- Somewhat conservative
- Extremely conservative

Q3.9. Please select the boxes that correspond to US political parties.

- Republican
- Democratic
- No preference

Q4.1. Now, we would like to ask about your thoughts on the government. Please take your time and answer honestly.

Q4.2. Below is a list of some institutions in this country. As far as the people running these institutions are concerned, how much confidence would you say you have in them?

Executive branch of the federal government	<input type="text" value="A lot"/>
U.S. Supreme Court	<input type="text" value="None at all"/>
Congress	<input type="text" value="A little"/>
Military	<input type="text" value="A great deal"/>

First Click: 8.935
Last Click: 36.409
Page Submit: 37.78
Click Count: 22

Q5.1.

Government organizations often share a variety of information with the public, but doing so comes with significant costs and risks. We are interested in understanding your thoughts on making different kinds of information public.

In general, how important do you think it is for a government organization to publicly share...

Q5.2. ... information about funding and expenditures (such as salaries, purchases of equipment and supplies)?

- Not at all important
- Slightly important
- Moderately important
- Very important
- Extremely important

Q5.3. ...recordings and transcripts of public meetings?

- Not at all important
- Slightly important
- Moderately important
- Very important
- Extremely important

Q5.4. ...information about the organization's performance?

- Not at all important
- Slightly important
- Moderately important

- Very important
- Extremely important

First Click: 4.484
 Last Click: 44.961
 Page Submit: 46.101
 Click Count: 19

Q6.1.

In the following section, you'll be informed about 8 public organizations in hypothetical U.S. cities.

Please carefully consider each one and provide honest answers to the questions that follow.

Q7.1.


Northbrookville City has a Police Department.

The department only discloses information that is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

In detail, they publish:

- very limited information about funding and expenditures,
- abundant information about public meetings, and
- abundant information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Northbrookville City Police Department...



First Click: 4.784
 Last Click: 31.918
 Page Submit: 32.981
 Click Count: 15

Q7.1.


Redmond Valley has a Police Department.


The department discloses more information than it is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

In detail, they publish:

- abundant information about funding and expenditures,
- very limited information about public meetings, and
- very limited information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Redmond Valley Police Department...






First Click: 18,871
 Last Click: 38,587
 Page Submit: 39,516
 Click Count: 9

Q7.1.
 Oakmont Ridge has a Police Department.

The department discloses more information than it is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

- In detail, they publish:
- very limited information about funding and expenditures,
 - abundant information about public meetings, and
 - very limited information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Oakmont Ridge Police Department...



First Click: 11,398
 Last Click: 50,088
 Page Submit: 51,007
 Click Count: 18


Q7.1.
 Hillcrest Park has a Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services.

The department discloses more information than it is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

- In detail, they publish:
- abundant information about funding and expenditures,
 - abundant information about public meetings, and
 - very limited information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Hillcrest Park Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services...





First Click: 16.341
Last Click: 29.047
Page Submit: 31.666
Click Count: 7

Q7.1.


Maplewood Ridge has a Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services.

The department only discloses information that is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

In detail, they publish:

- very limited information about funding and expenditures,
- abundant information about public meetings, and
- very limited information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Maplewood Ridge Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services...



First Click: 39.208
Last Click: 51.214
Page Submit: 52.336
Click Count: 7

Q7.1.


Windhamville has a Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services.

The department discloses more information than it is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

In detail, they publish:

- abundant information about funding and expenditures,
- very limited information about public meetings, and
- abundant information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Windhamville Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services...



First Click: 3.91
 Last Click: 38.637
 Page Submit: 39.441
 Click Count: 14


Q7.1.
 Cedarbrook Springs has a Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services.

The department discloses more information than it is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

In detail, they publish:

- very limited information about funding and expenditures,
- very limited information about public meetings, and
- very limited information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Cedarbrook Springs Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services...



First Click: 7.889
 Last Click: 73.995
 Page Submit: 74.686
 Click Count: 20


Q7.1.
 Lakeville Heights has a Police Department.

The department discloses more information than it is strictly required by the State Freedom of Information Act.

In detail, they publish:

- abundant information about funding and expenditures,
- abundant information about public meetings, and
- abundant information about their performance.

Q7.2. What percent of the time do you think citizens can trust the Lakeville Heights Police Department...



First Click: 4.749
Last Click: 19.438
Page Submit: 20.342
Click Count: 9

Embedded Data

aid: 6614234a-6376-ec32-41d6-a39b8f9b7432
BlockNumber: 4
Var1_1: Police Department
Var2_1: very limited
Var3_1: abundant
Var4_1: abundant
Var5_1: only discloses information that is
Var1_2: Police Department
Var2_2: abundant
Var3_2: very limited
Var4_2: very limited
Var5_2: discloses more information than it is
Var1_3: Police Department
Var2_3: very limited
Var3_3: abundant
Var4_3: very limited
Var5_3: discloses more information than it is
Var1_4: Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services
Var2_4: abundant
Var3_4: abundant
Var4_4: very limited
Var5_4: discloses more information than it is
Var1_5: Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services
Var2_5: very limited
Var3_5: abundant
Var4_5: very limited
Var5_5: only discloses information that is
Var1_6: Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services
Var2_6: abundant
Var3_6: very limited
Var4_6: abundant
Var5_6: discloses more information than it is
Var1_7: Department of Sanitation and Environmental Services
Var2_7: very limited
Var3_7: very limited
Var4_7: very limited
Var5_7: discloses more information than it is
Var1_8: Police Department
Var2_8: abundant
Var3_8: abundant
Var4_8: abundant
Var5_8: discloses more information than it is
CombinationId_1: 10
CombinationId_2: 9
CombinationId_3: 13
CombinationId_4: 5
CombinationId_5: 7
CombinationId_6: 3
CombinationId_7: 11
CombinationId_8: 8

B Sample

B.1 Demographic Distributions

B.1.1 Gender Distribution

Gender	ACS Data	Experiment Sample
Male	161,952,654 (48.8%)	82 (41.0%)
Female	169,954,983 (51.2%)	117 (58.5%)
Non-binary / third gender		1 (0.5%)

B.1.2 Age Group Distribution

Age Group	ACS Data	Experiment Sample
18–24 years old	30,208,434 (9.1%)	1 (0.5%)
25–34 years old	44,270,418 (13.3%)	5 (2.5%)
35–44 years old	41,365,542 (12.5%)	23 (11.5%)
45–54 years old	40,587,276 (12.2%)	18 (9.0%)
55–64 years old	42,276,244 (12.7%)	34 (17.0%)
65+ years old	72,974,075 (22%)	119 (59.5%)

B.1.3 Hispanic Origin Distribution

Hispanic Origin	ACS Data	Experiment Sample
Yes	62,529,064 (18.8%)	3 (1.5%)
No	269,378,573 (81.2%)	197 (98.5%)

B.1.4 Education Distribution

Education Level	ACS Data	Experiment Sample
Bachelor's degree or higher	72,608,097 (35%)	86 (43%)
Less than Bachelor's degree	134,862,870 (65%)	114 (57%)

B.1.5 Income Group Distribution

Income Group	ACS Data	Experiment Sample
Less than \$25,000	22,176,331 (17.39%)	28 (14.51%)
\$25,000-\$49,999	24,334,164 (19.08%)	66 (34.20%)
\$50,000-\$74,999	21,443,341 (16.81%)	37 (19.17%)
\$75,000-\$99,999	16,276,811 (12.76%)	25 (12.95%)
\$100,000-\$149,999	20,741,047 (16.26%)	22 (11.40%)
\$150,000 or more	22,573,036 (17.70%)	15 (7.77%)

B.1.6 Race Distribution

Race	ACS Data	Experiment Sample
White or Caucasian	241.8M (72.9%)	183 (91.96%)
Black or African American	47.2M (14.2%)	6 (3.02%)
American Indian / Native American or Alaska Native	8.7M (2.6%)	1 (0.50%)
Asian	23.6M (7.1%)	6 (3.02%)
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1.5M (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Other	-	3 (1.51%)
Total	322.8M (100%)	199 (100%)

C Additional Models

C.1 Models to Test Hypothesis 1

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the results of each model for all three dependent variables respectively: perception of integrity, benevolence, and effectiveness.¹

¹The “Min. group size: 3” shown on the tables is caused by the only case with 5 missing evaluations, mentioned in the main paper’s Research Design section. All the rest of the respondents evaluated 8 vignettes.

Table 1: Perception of Integrity - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_int
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	238.3997
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6879.0431
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	36.467	1.507	24.193	0.000	33.513	39.422
org[T.Police Department]	0.586	0.793	0.739	0.460	-0.969	2.140
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	1.911	0.836	2.286	0.022	0.273	3.550
tran_fin[T.abundant]	14.869	0.797	18.659	0.000	13.307	16.430
tran_pm[T.abundant]	8.467	0.794	10.668	0.000	6.912	10.023
tran_perf[T.abundant]	14.347	0.797	17.995	0.000	12.784	15.910
Group Var	289.666	2.217				

Table 2: Perception of Benevolence - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_ben
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	241.2937
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6890.8075
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	37.832	1.528	24.759	0.000	34.838	40.827
org[T.Police Department]	1.309	0.798	1.640	0.101	-0.255	2.873
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	1.545	0.841	1.836	0.066	-0.104	3.194
tran_fin[T.abundant]	12.996	0.802	16.210	0.000	11.424	14.567
tran_pm[T.abundant]	10.582	0.799	13.251	0.000	9.017	12.147
tran_perf[T.abundant]	14.314	0.802	17.844	0.000	12.741	15.886
Group Var	300.238	2.279				

Table 3: Perception of Efficiency - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_eff
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	258.6319
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6934.3953
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	36.183	1.518	23.829	0.000	33.207	39.159
org[T.Police Department]	0.767	0.826	0.928	0.353	-0.852	2.385
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	2.187	0.870	2.513	0.012	0.481	3.893
tran_fin[T.abundant]	14.385	0.830	17.338	0.000	12.759	16.011
tran_pm[T.abundant]	7.913	0.827	9.574	0.000	6.293	9.533
tran_perf[T.abundant]	15.367	0.830	18.510	0.000	13.739	16.994
Group Var	282.465	2.098				

C.2 Models to Test H3

Table 4: Perc. of Ben. with Interactions (H3) - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_ben
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	241.4391
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6883.3691
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	38.100	1.728	22.046	0.000	34.713	41.487
org[T.Police Department]	0.937	1.698	0.552	0.581	-2.391	4.265
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	0.713	1.182	0.604	0.546	-1.602	3.029
tran_fin[T.abundant]	14.175	1.147	12.354	0.000	11.926	16.423
tran_pm[T.abundant]	9.957	1.138	8.752	0.000	7.727	12.187
tran_perf[T.abundant]	14.019	1.176	11.926	0.000	11.715	16.323
org[T.Police Department]:tran_fin[T.abundant]	-2.425	1.613	-1.504	0.133	-5.587	0.736
org[T.Police Department]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	1.388	1.603	0.866	0.387	-1.754	4.530
org[T.Police Department]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	0.160	1.670	0.096	0.923	-3.112	3.433
org[T.Police Department]:motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	1.732	1.642	1.055	0.292	-1.487	4.950
Group Var	299.433	2.274				

Table 5: Perc. of Int. with Interactions (H3) - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_int
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	237.4173
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6868.1955
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	36.204	1.705	21.233	0.000	32.862	39.546
org[T.Police Department]	1.098	1.684	0.652	0.514	-2.202	4.398
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	0.142	1.172	0.121	0.904	-2.155	2.438
tran_fin[T.abundant]	16.740	1.138	14.714	0.000	14.510	18.970
tran_pm[T.abundant]	9.107	1.128	8.072	0.000	6.895	11.318
tran_perf[T.abundant]	13.949	1.166	11.967	0.000	11.664	16.233
org[T.Police Department]:tran_fin[T.abundant]	-3.594	1.599	-2.247	0.025	-6.728	-0.459
org[T.Police Department]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	-1.097	1.590	-0.690	0.490	-4.213	2.018
org[T.Police Department]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	0.291	1.655	0.176	0.860	-2.953	3.536
org[T.Police Department]:motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	3.604	1.628	2.213	0.027	0.413	6.795
Group Var	288.571	2.214				

Table 6: Perc. of Eff. with Interactions (H3) - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_eff
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	258.6988
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6926.7422
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	36.141	1.734	20.846	0.000	32.743	39.539
org[T.Police Department]	0.856	1.757	0.487	0.626	-2.587	4.299
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	0.890	1.222	0.728	0.466	-1.506	3.286
tran_fin[T.abundant]	15.350	1.187	12.929	0.000	13.023	17.677
tran_pm[T.abundant]	8.234	1.177	6.994	0.000	5.927	10.541
tran_perf[T.abundant]	15.325	1.216	12.602	0.000	12.941	17.708
org[T.Police Department]:tran_fin[T.abundant]	-1.891	1.669	-1.133	0.257	-5.162	1.380
org[T.Police Department]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	-0.543	1.659	-0.327	0.744	-3.794	2.709
org[T.Police Department]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	-0.212	1.727	-0.123	0.902	-3.597	3.172
org[T.Police Department]:motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	2.640	1.699	1.554	0.120	-0.690	5.969
Group Var	282.217	2.096				

C.3 Models to test H_4

Table 7: Perception of Integrity (H4) - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_int
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	236.0073
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6866.4829
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	38.940	1.641	23.723	0.000	35.723	42.157
org[T.Police Department]	0.546	0.795	0.687	0.492	-1.012	2.104
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	1.806	0.834	2.166	0.030	0.172	3.440
tran_fin[T.abundant]	12.237	1.325	9.234	0.000	9.640	14.835
tran_pm[T.abundant]	5.217	1.315	3.969	0.000	2.641	7.794
tran_perf[T.abundant]	10.137	1.330	7.621	0.000	7.530	12.744
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	1.766	1.583	1.116	0.265	-1.336	4.868
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	3.692	1.602	2.304	0.021	0.552	6.833
tran_pm[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	5.029	1.611	3.121	0.002	1.871	8.187
Group Var	290.411	2.232				

Table 8: Perception of Benevolence (H4) - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc_ben
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	240.2076
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6882.0543
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	39.477	1.664	23.729	0.000	36.216	42.737
org[T.Police Department]	1.315	0.802	1.640	0.101	-0.257	2.887
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	1.478	0.841	1.757	0.079	-0.171	3.127
tran_fin[T.abundant]	11.456	1.337	8.568	0.000	8.835	14.076
tran_pm[T.abundant]	8.566	1.326	6.458	0.000	5.966	11.165
tran_perf[T.abundant]	11.083	1.342	8.259	0.000	8.453	13.713
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	0.353	1.597	0.221	0.825	-2.777	3.483
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	2.868	1.617	1.774	0.076	-0.301	6.036
tran_pm[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	3.865	1.626	2.377	0.017	0.679	7.051
Group Var	300.653	2.287				

Table 9: Perception of Efficiency (H4) - Mixed Linear Model Regression Results

Model:	MixedLM	Dependent Variable:	perc.eff
No. Observations:	1600	Method:	REML
No. Groups:	200	Scale:	256.1978
Min. group size:	8	Log-Likelihood:	-6922.0413
Max. group size:	8	Converged:	Yes
Mean group size:	8.0		

	Coef.	Std.Err.	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	38.448	1.662	23.134	0.000	35.191	41.706
org[T.Police Department]	0.854	0.828	1.032	0.302	-0.768	2.477
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	2.150	0.868	2.477	0.013	0.449	3.851
tran_fin[T.abundant]	11.413	1.380	8.268	0.000	8.707	14.118
tran_pm[T.abundant]	5.585	1.369	4.078	0.000	2.901	8.269
tran_perf[T.abundant]	11.017	1.385	7.952	0.000	8.302	13.733
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	0.968	1.649	0.587	0.557	-2.263	4.199
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	5.378	1.669	3.223	0.001	2.107	8.649
tran_pm[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	3.734	1.678	2.225	0.026	0.445	7.023
Group Var	282.857	2.108				

D Robustness Check

D.1 Multicollinearity of the Predictors

Table 10: Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) for the Predictors in the Regression Model

Variable	VIF
Intercept	8.06158
org[T.Police Department]	1.02416
motiv[T.discloses more information than it is]	1.02274
tran_fin[T.abundant]	2.82752
tran_pm[T.abundant]	2.78309
tran_perf[T.abundant]	2.8129
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_pm[T.abundant]	2.98628
tran_fin[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	2.80573
tran_pm[T.abundant]:tran_perf[T.abundant]	2.83894

Correlation Matrix of the Predictors and Manipulated Variables




Figure 1: Correlation Matrix of the Predictors and Manipulated Variables.