Supplemental Appendix:

Trust in Government and the American Public's Responsiveness to Rising Inequality

This appendix includes (for the CANES):

- Descriptive statistics
- Question wording and variable coding
- Loadings and eigenvalues of each principal components factor analysis
- Full OLS regression models for Tables 3, 4 and 5 in the main paper

  The influence of trust for conservatives and non-conservatives

  The influence of trust for the affluent and non-affluent

  Alternative moderators of responsiveness to inequality
- Models that use a Gini coefficient of inequality rather than the top one percent

  Associated with Footnote 13 in the main paper
- Random Effects models that do not include state fixed effects

  Associated with Footnote 15 in the main paper
- A table showing descriptive statistics for state income inequality (the top one percent) and how much it varies across all 50 states, plus DC from 1984-2015.

Associated with Footnote 15 in the main paper

- A table showing how the correlation between demographics/party ID and trust in government have changed over time

  Associated with Footnote 18 in the main paper

- A regression model that interacts state income inequality, political trust, and a variable for time, illustrating that this moderating relationship has not systematically strengthened/weakened over time

  Associated with Footnote 18 in the main paper

Descriptive Statistics

The CANES data used in the analysis were from the following years: 1984, 1988, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2016.

	Obs	Variable	Mean	Std dev	Min	Max
1	17028	Pro-redistributive factor score	0.483	0.241	-0.001	1.001
2	25812	State top 1% income share	18.135	5.541	9.437	34.422
3	22319	Trust in government factor score	0.300	0.186	0.001	1.000
4	25816	Age group	2.479	1.009	1.000	4.000
5	23942	Income	2.838	1.143	1.000	5.000
6	25531	Education	1.856	0.826	1.000	3.000
7	25764	Female	0.542	0.498	0.000	1.000
8	25612	White	0.696	0.460	0.000	1.000
9	25729	Married	0.514	0.500	0.000	1.000
10	25530	Homeowner	0.654	0.476	0.000	1.000
11	25689	Union household	0.160	0.367	0.000	1.000
12	25765	Unemployed	0.047	0.212	0.000	1.000
13	25616	Party identification (Republican direction)	0.448	0.349	0.000	1.000
14	19101	Ideology (Conservative direction)	0.538	0.243	0.000	1.000
15	23067	Egalitarianism facto score	0.652	0.200	0.000	0.999
16	22545	Feeling thermometer: Blacks	0.686	0.212	0.000	1.000
17	22190	Feeling thermometer: Hispanics	0.661	0.216	0.000	1.000
18	22562	Feeling thermometer: The Poor	0.729	0.194	0.000	1.000
19	22609	Feeling thermometer: Big Business	0.544	0.225	0.000	1.000
20	25812	State median household income (thousands of 2016 dollars)	55.030	8.067	34.004	76.260
21	25812	State unemployment rate	6.301	1.910	2.300	14.800

CANES Survey Questions Used

The exact wording for each question is contained in the Cumulative ANES data file codebooks, available from the American National Election Studies (ANES) Data Center. `https://electionstudies.org/data-center/`

The Cumulative ANES codebook is available at `https://electionstudies.org/project/anes-time-series-cumulative-data-file/`

Below I detail how each question was recoded for the analyses, displayed in the paper in Tables 3-5 (CANES). I also show the factor loadings for: support for redistribution, trust in government, and egalitarianism, as well as the questions used to construct these measures. Note that I used data from the 2012 and 2016 ANES time series studies to ensure that all four trust in government questions were included through 2016 in the CANES data. I discuss this in greater detail in Footnote 12 in the main paper.

- VCF0806; ISSUES: Government Health Insurance Scale (7-point)

  Coded so that; 1=Private insurance plan, 4=midpoint, 7=Government insurance plan

- VCF0809; ISSUES: Guaranteed Jobs and Income Scale (7-point)

  Coded so that; 1=Government let each person get ahead on his own, 4=midpoint, 7=Government see to job and good standard of living

- VCF0839; ISSUES: Government Services-Spending Scale (7-point)

  Coded so that; 1=Government should provide many fewer services; reduce spending a lot, 4=midpoint, 7=Government should provide many more services: increase spending a lot

- Support for redistribution factor score

  Constructed from VCF0806, VCF0809, VCF0839

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

Table 1: Principal Components Factor Analysis for Redistributive Support

Variable	Loading
VCF0806	0.806
VCF0809	0.800
VCF0839	0.788
Observations	17,028
Eigenvalue	1.911
Proportion of variance	0.637

- VCF0604; SYSTEM SUPPORT: Trust the Federal Government To Do What is Right

  Coded so that; 1=None of the time/never, 2=Some of the time, 3=Most of the time, 4=Just about always

- VCF0605; SYSTEM SUPPORT: Federal Government Run by Few Interests or for the Benefit of All

  Coded so that; 1=Few big interests, 2=Benefit of all

- VCF0606; SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Does the Federal Government Waste Tax Money

  Coded so that; 1=A lot, 2=Some, 3=Not very much

- VCF0608; SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Many Government Officials are Crooked

  Coded so that; 1=Quite a few/quite a lot, 2=Not many, 3=Hardly any

- Trust in government factor

  Constructed from VCF0604, VCF0605, VCF0606, VCF0608

Table 2: Principal Components Factor Analysis for Trust in Government

Variable	Loading
VCF0604	0.622
VCF0605	0.729
VCF0606	0.653
VCF0608	0.673
Observations	22,319
Eigenvalue	1.796
Proportion of variance	0.449

- VCF0101; DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Age

  Coded so that; 1=18-29, 2=30-44, 3=45-64, 4=65 and older

- VCF0104; DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent- Gender

  Coded so that; 1=Female, 0=Male

- VCF0105b; DEMOGRAPHICS: Race-ethnicity summary, 4 categories

  Coded so that; 1=White, non-Hispanic=1, 0=Non-white

- VCF0110; DEMOGRAPHICS: Education 4-category

  Coded so that 1=HS or less, 2=Some college, 3=College degree

- VCF0114; DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Family - Income Group

  Coded so that 1=0 to 16 percentile=1, 2=17 to 33 percentile, 3=34 to 67 percentile, 4=68 to 95 percentile, 5=96 to 100 percentile

- VCF0147; DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Marital status

  Coded so that 1=Married, 0=Not married

- VCF0146; DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Family - Home Ownership

  Coded so that 1=Own home, 0=Do not own home

- VCF0127; DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Union Membership

  Coded so that 1=Union household, 0=Non-union household

- VCF0116; DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 7-category

  Coded so that 1=Unemployed, 0=Not unemployed

- VCF0301; PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent - 7-point Scale

  Coded so that 1=Strong Democrat, 4=Independent, 7=Strong Republican

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

- VCF0803; IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Scale

  Coded so that 1=Extremely liberal, 4=Moderate, 7=Extremely conservative

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

- VCF0206; GROUP THERMOMETER: Blacks

  Coded so that 0=Coldest, 50=midpoint, 97-100=Warmest

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

- VCF0217; GROUP THERMOMETER: Chicanos/Hispanics

  Coded so that 0=Coldest, 50=midpoint, 97-100=Warmest

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

- VCF0223; GROUP THERMOMETER: Poor People

  Coded so that 0=Coldest, 50=midpoint, 97-100=Warmest

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

- VCF0209; GROUP THERMOMETER: Big Business

  Coded so that 0=Coldest, 50=midpoint, 97-100=Warmest

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

- VCF9013; EQUALITARIANISM: Society Ensure Equal Opportunity to Succeed

  Coded so that 1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree somewhat, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree somewhat, 4=Agree strongly

- VCF9016; EQUALITARINISM: Not Big Problem if Some Have More Chance in Life

  Coded so that 1=Agree strongly, 2=Agree somewhat, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Disagree somewhat, 4=Disagree strongly

- VCF9017; EQUALITARIANISM: Should Worry Less About How Equal People Are

  Coded so that 1=Agree strongly, 2=Agree somewhat, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Disagree somewhat, 4=Disagree strongly

- VCF9018; EQUALITARIANISM: U.S. Fewer Problems if Everyone Treated Equally

  Coded so that 1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree somewhat, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree somewhat, 4=Agree strongly

- Egalitarianism factor score

  Constructed from VCF9013, VCF9016, VCF9017, VCF9018

  Recoded to range between 0 and 1

Table 3: Principal Components Factor Analysis for Egalitarianism

Variable	Loading
VCF9013	0.635
VCF9016	0.702
VCF9017	0.713
VCF9018	0.656
Observations	23,067
Eigenvalue	1.835
Proportion of variance	0.459

Full Regression Models (CANES 1984-2016)

Below, I display the full OLS regression models that are associated with Table 4 (among conservatives and non-conservatives), Table 5 (among the affluent and non-affluent) and Table 6 (alternative moderators) in the main paper. Only the variables and interactions of interest (Inequality $\times$ Trust) were shown in the main paper in order to save space.

Table 4: Trust in Government, Ideology, and Mass Responsiveness to Inequality

	(1) Liberals/Moderates		(2) Conservatives	
State top 1% income share	-0.002***	(0.001)	-0.004***	(0.001)
Trust in government	-0.076**	(0.036)	-0.064	(0.054)
Top 1% × Trust in government	0.008***	(0.002)	0.012***	(0.003)
18-29 years old (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
30-44 years old	-0.004	(0.006)	-0.000	(0.008)
45-64 years old	-0.007	(0.007)	-0.003	(0.009)
65 years and older	-0.020**	(0.008)	-0.023**	(0.009)
Income percentile 0-16 (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
Income percentile 17-33	-0.000	(0.008)	-0.022	(0.014)
Income percentile 34-67	-0.036***	(0.007)	-0.046***	(0.012)
Income percentile 68-95	-0.058***	(0.008)	-0.071***	(0.011)
Income percentile 96-100	-0.069***	(0.013)	-0.101***	(0.014)
HS or less (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
Some college	-0.012**	(0.006)	-0.029***	(0.007)
College degree	-0.012*	(0.006)	-0.031***	(0.007)
Female	0.002	(0.004)	0.034***	(0.005)
White	-0.028***	(0.005)	-0.059***	(0.008)
Married	0.015***	(0.005)	-0.011	(0.007)
Homeowner	-0.021***	(0.005)	-0.009	(0.007)
Union household	-0.001	(0.006)	0.011*	(0.006)
Unemployed	0.029***	(0.009)	0.028	(0.019)
Party ID	-0.125***	(0.010)	-0.191***	(0.011)
Ideology scale	-0.226***	(0.018)	-0.211***	(0.026)
Egalitarianism factor score	0.248***	(0.013)	0.253***	(0.015)
Feeling thermometer: Blacks	0.007	(0.019)	-0.015	(0.020)
Feeling thermometer: Hispanics	0.005	(0.017)	-0.039*	(0.020)
Feeling thermometer: Poor	0.109***	(0.013)	0.097***	(0.016)
Feeling thermometer: Big Business	-0.109***	(0.011)	-0.094***	(0.015)
State median household income	0.003***	(0.001)	0.001	(0.001)
State unemployment rate	-0.001	(0.002)	-0.003	(0.003)
Constant	0.402***	(0.058)	0.669***	(0.074)
Year Fixed Effects?	✓		✓	
State Fixed Effects?	✓		✓	
Observations	6,739		4,776	
R-squared	0.335		0.419	

Dependent variable is pro-redistributive score
Source is CANES (1984-2016)
OLS coefficients
Robust standard errors clustered by state-year in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed

Table 5: Trust in Government, Income, and Mass Responsiveness to Inequality

	(1) Non-Affluent		(2) Affluent	
State top 1% income share	-0.003***	(0.001)	-0.003***	(0.001)
Trust in government	-0.090**	(0.039)	-0.018	(0.050)
Top 1% × Trust in government	0.010***	(0.002)	0.007**	(0.003)
18-29 years old (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
30-44 years old	-0.004	(0.006)	0.003	(0.009)
45-64 years old	-0.014**	(0.007)	0.007	(0.010)
65 years and older	-0.032***	(0.007)	0.000	(0.011)
Income percentile 0-16 (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
Income percentile 17-33	-0.005	(0.007)	—	—
Income percentile 34-67	-0.037***	(0.006)	—	—
Income percentile 68-95 (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
Income percentile 96-100	—	—	-0.021***	(0.007)
HS or less (Ref.)	—	—	—	—
2.educ3	-0.019***	(0.005)	-0.020***	(0.007)
3.educ3	-0.028***	(0.006)	-0.013*	(0.008)
Female	0.016***	(0.004)	0.012**	(0.005)
White	-0.038***	(0.006)	-0.042***	(0.007)
Married	0.002	(0.005)	0.005	(0.006)
Homeowner	-0.018***	(0.005)	-0.006	(0.008)
Union household	0.004	(0.006)	0.004	(0.006)
Unemployed	0.030***	(0.010)	0.017	(0.017)
Party ID	-0.163***	(0.009)	-0.150***	(0.011)
Ideology	-0.192***	(0.014)	-0.280***	(0.017)
Egalitarianism	0.273***	(0.012)	0.230***	(0.013)
FT: Blacks	-0.012	(0.015)	0.015	(0.023)
FT: Hispanics	-0.007	(0.015)	-0.029	(0.024)
FT: Poor	0.101***	(0.013)	0.102***	(0.014)
FT: Big Business	-0.096***	(0.011)	-0.136***	(0.014)
State median household incomme	0.002**	(0.001)	0.002***	(0.001)
State unemployment rate	-0.004	(0.003)	-0.000	(0.003)
Constant	0.500***	(0.056)	0.458***	(0.056)
Year Fixed Effects?	✓		✓	
State Fixed Effects?	✓		✓	
Observations	7,125		4,390	
R-squared	0.456		0.565	

Dependent variable is pro-redistributive score
Source is CANES (1984-2016)
OLS coefficients
Robust standard errors clustered by state-year in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed

Table 6: Alternative Moderators of Mass Responsiveness to Inequality

	B	SE
State top 1% income share	-0.000	(0.002)
Trust in government	-0.046	(0.029)
Top 1% × Trust in government	0.008***	(0.002)
Feeling thermometer: Blacks	-0.021	(0.050)
Top 1% × FT: Blacks	0.001	(0.003)
Feeling thermometer: Hispanics	-0.025	(0.052)
Top 1% × FT: Hispanics	0.001	(0.003)
Feeling thermometer: Poor	0.109***	(0.036)
Top 1% × FT: Poor	-0.000	(0.002)
Feeling thermometer: Big Business	-0.080**	(0.031)
Top 1% × FT: Big Business	-0.001	(0.002)
18-29 years old (Ref.)	—	—
30-44 years old	-0.002	(0.005)
45-64 years old	-0.007	(0.005)
65 years and older	-0.022***	(0.006)
Income percentile 0-16 (Ref.)	—	—
Income percentile 17-33	-0.008	(0.007)
Income percentile 34-67	-0.040***	(0.006)
Income percentile 68-95	-0.064***	(0.006)
Income percentile 96-100	-0.085***	(0.008)
HS or less (Ref.)	—	—
Some college	-0.020***	(0.004)
College degree	-0.022***	(0.005)
Female	0.015***	(0.003)
White	-0.039***	(0.005)
Married	0.004	(0.004)
Homeowner	-0.016***	(0.004)
Union household	0.005	(0.005)
Unemployed	0.029***	(0.009)
Party ID	-0.116***	(0.023)
Top 1% × Party ID	-0.002**	(0.001)
Ideology	-0.157***	(0.034)
Top 1% × Ideology	-0.003*	(0.002)
Egalitarianism	0.238***	(0.030)
Top 1% × Egalitarianism	0.001	(0.002)
State median household income	0.002***	(0.001)
State unemployment rate	-0.002	(0.002)
Constant	0.457***	(0.056)
Year Fixed Effects?	✓	
State Fixed Effects?	✓	
Observations	11,515	
R-squared	0.501	

Dependent variable is pro-redistributive score
Source is CANES (1984-2016)
OLS coefficients
Robust standard errors clustered by state-year in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed

Gini Coefficient Model (CANES 1984-2016)

Below, I display the results from a model that uses a Gini coefficient of inequality (ranging theoretically from 0 to 1, with 0 meaning perfect equality and 1 meaning perfect inequality), rather than the top one percent income share in each state. This Gini coefficient is also from Mark Frank's data (`https://www.shsu.edu/~eco_mwf/inequality.html`) and is based on IRS tax data. This model show that the findings are not solely a product of using the top one percent income share. This is associated with Footnote 14 in the main paper.

Table 7: Trust in Government and Mass Responsiveness to Inequality

	B	SE
State Gini coefficient	-0.056	(0.074)
Trust in government	-0.247**	(0.106)
Gini × Trust in Government	0.576***	(0.177)
18-29 years old (Ref.)	—	—
30-44 years old	-0.002	(0.005)
45-64 years old	-0.005	(0.005)
65 years and older	-0.021***	(0.006)
Income percentile 0-16 (Ref.)	—	—
Income percentile 17-33	-0.007	(0.007)
Income percentile 34-67	-0.039***	(0.006)
Income percentile 68-95	-0.062***	(0.006)
Income percentile 96-100	-0.083***	(0.008)
HS or less (Ref.)	—	—
Some college	-0.020***	(0.004)
College degree	-0.021***	(0.005)
Female	0.016***	(0.003)
White	-0.040***	(0.004)
Married	0.004	(0.004)
Homeowner	-0.017***	(0.004)
Union household	0.006	(0.005)
Unemployed	0.029***	(0.009)
Party ID	-0.163***	(0.008)
Ideology	-0.223***	(0.012)
Egalitarianism	0.260***	(0.009)
FT: Blacks	-0.003	(0.013)
FT: Hispanics	-0.016	(0.014)
FT: Poor	0.102***	(0.010)
FT: Big Business	-0.109***	(0.009)
State median household income	0.001**	(0.000)
State unemployment rate	0.000	(0.002)
Constant	0.569***	(0.048)
Year Fixed Effects?	✓	
State Fixed Effects?	✓	
Observations	11,515	
R-squared	0.501	

Dependent variable is pro-redistributive score
Source is CANES (1984-2016)
OLS coefficients
Robust standard errors clustered by state-year in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed

Random Effects Model (CANES 1984-2016)

Below, I display the results from a random effects model that does not include state fixed effects. This means that variation in state income inequality is not restricted to *within* states, but both within and across states, over time. This is associated with Footnote 16 in the main paper.

Table 8: Trust in Government and Mass Responsiveness to Inequality

	B	SE
State top 1% income share	-0.002***	(0.001)
Trust in government	-0.062**	(0.031)
Top 1% × Trust in government	0.009***	(0.002)
18-29 years old (Ref.)	—	—
30-44 years old	-0.002	(0.005)
45-64 years old	-0.005	(0.005)
65 years and older	-0.021***	(0.006)
Income percentile 0-16 (Ref.)		
Income percentile 17-33	-0.007	(0.007)
Income percentile 34-67	-0.039***	(0.006)
Income percentile 68-95	-0.062***	(0.006)
Income percentile 96-100	-0.082***	(0.008)
HS or less (Ref.)	—	—
Some college	-0.020***	(0.004)
College degree	-0.021***	(0.005)
Female	0.015***	(0.003)
White	-0.040***	(0.004)
Married	0.004	(0.004)
Homeowner	-0.018***	(0.004)
Union household	0.005	(0.005)
Unemployed	0.029***	(0.009)
Party ID	-0.162***	(0.008)
Ideology	-0.223***	(0.012)
Egalitarianism	0.260***	(0.009)
FT: Blacks	-0.004	(0.013)
FT: Hispanics	-0.015	(0.014)
FT: Poor	0.102***	(0.010)
FT: Big Business	-0.109***	(0.009)
State median household income	0.001**	(0.000)
State unemployment rate	0.001	(0.002)
Constant	0.558***	(0.030)
Year Fixed Effects?	✓	
State Fixed Effects?	No	
Observations	11,515	
R-squared	0.502	

Dependent variable is pro-redistributive score
Source is CANES (1984-2016)
OLS coefficients
Robust standard errors clustered by state-year in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed

State-Level Variation in Income Inequality, 1984-2015

Below, I display descriptive statistics of state-level income inequality (the income share of the top one percent) from 1984-2015. This is based on Mark Frank's state panel data. It shows that although inequality has increased more in some states than in others, there is still considerable variation *within* the U.S. states as well. The table shows the mean level of inequality, the standard deviation, the minimum value, maximum value, and the difference (max - min) for each state over this 30-year period. This is associated with Footnote 16 in the main paper.

	State	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Diff
1	Alabama	15.020	2.240	11.530	20.420	8.890
2	Alaska	10.550	1.830	7.610	13.900	6.290
3	Arizona	11.040	3.190	11.040	23.070	12.030
4	Arkansas	14.980	2.480	11.390	21.050	9.660
5	California	19.300	4.530	11.490	28.910	17.420
6	Colorado	15.850	3.400	10.150	21.300	11.150
7	Connecticut	24.800	6.580	13.580	36.070	22.490
8	Delaware	14.380	2.750	10.690	21.380	10.690
9	District of Columbia	20.300	3.250	15.570	28.150	12.580
10	Florida	22.960	4.720	15.670	31.780	16.110
11	Georgia	15.630	2.500	11.080	20.320	9.240
12	Hawaii	11.810	2.020	8.600	16.470	7.870
13	Idaho	13.780	2.680	9.200	20.460	11.260
14	Illinois	18.280	3.320	11.830	24.690	12.860
15	Indiana	13.440	1.730	10.110	16.570	6.460
16	Iowa	11.700	1.510	8.840	14.560	5.720
17	Kansas	14.100	2.150	10.400	18.290	7.890
18	Kentucky	14.070	1.550	11.660	17.110	5.450
19	Louisiana	15.270	2.670	11.690	23.670	11.980
20	Maine	13.040	1.990	9.990	17.160	7.170
21	Maryland	14.090	2.270	9.760	18.340	8.580
22	Massachusetts	19.870	5.240	11.690	31.900	20.210
23	Michigan	14.640	2.490	9.760	19.880	10.120
24	Minnesota	15.240	2.520	10.070	19.200	9.130
25	Mississippi	13.910	1.730	11.280	18.020	6.740
26	Missouri	15.020	2.290	11.040	19.010	7.970
27	Montana	13.720	2.640	9.490	18.830	9.340
28	Nebraska	13.620	2.370	9.280	17.830	8.550
29	Nevada	23.730	4.720	14.310	33.300	18.990
30	New Hampshire	15.450	2.750	9.940	22.320	12.380
31	New Jersey	18.410	2.990	11.940	24.010	12.070
32	New Mexico	12.870	2.380	9.680	17.720	8.040
33	New York	24.890	6.210	14.660	35.300	20.640
34	North Carolina	14.180	2.160	10.720	18.430	7.710
35	North Dakota	12.530	3.160	8.250	21.550	13.300
36	Ohio	13.920	1.830	10.240	17.170	6.930
37	Oklahoma	14.760	2.920	10.570	21.290	10.720
38	Oregon	14.220	2.230	10.130	18.750	8.620
39	Pennsylvania	15.880	2.310	11.870	20.390	8.520
40	Rhode Island	15.280	2.230	11.230	19.570	8.340
41	South Carolina	13.930	2.520	10.320	19.080	8.760
42	South Dakota	14.540	2.880	9.400	20.050	10.650
43	Tennessee	16.050	2.360	12.230	21.330	9.100
44	Texas	18.020	3.510	12.480	24.910	12.430
45	Utah	14.400	3.040	8.910	20.310	11.400
46	Vermont	13.350	2.390	9.860	18.590	8.730
47	Virginia	13.750	2.510	9.440	17.630	8.190
48	Washington	16.660	4.260	9.630	27.150	17.520
49	West Virginia	13.060	1.370	10.850	15.430	4.580
50	Wisconsin	14.310	2.180	10.150	17.830	7.680
51	Wyoming	21.230	7.350	8.930	33.940	25.010

Correlation Between Political Trust and Demographics/Party ID Over Time (CANES 1972-2012)

Below, I display correlations between: age, income, education, race, gender, party ID, and trust in government from 1972-2012. The results from this table show that with the exception of party ID, the magnitudes of the correlation coefficients (the signs may vary depending upon whether Democrats or Republicans control the government) do not appear to be systematically stronger/weaker over time. Race is another possible exception, but this may be a function of the Obama presidency rather than a long-term trend. Overall, this suggests that the types of people who trust/distrust the government have not meaningfully changed over time, and that a decline has taken place among the population at large, rather than among certain demographic subgroups. Overall, these results suggests that the types of people who trust the government have not meaningfully changed over time, but does show that trust has become somewhat more partisan over time. This is associated with Footnote 20 in the main paper.

Table 9: Correlation of Demographics/Party ID and Trust in Govt Over Time

	1972	1984	2000	2012
Age	-0.050**	-0.061**	0.009	-0.055***
Income	0.087***	0.026	0.075***	-0.070***
Education	0.079***	0.024	0.097***	0.002
Female	-0.012	0.035	-0.015	0.026*
White	0.119***	0.021	0.021	-0.187***
Party ID	0.160***	0.145***	-0.053**	-0.227***

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed

Assessing Possible Time Invariance (CANES 1984-2016)

Below, I display the results from a model (using the same variables as Table 3 in the main paper) that assesses possible time invariance, i.e., whether the inequality $\times$ trust interaction has become systematically stronger/weaker over time. To do this, I included a triple interaction (inequality $\times$ trust $\times$ time) term. Time is a simple indicator variable (1 = 1984, 2 = 1988, 3 = 1992, ...). If this term is statistically significant, then it would suggest that this moderating relationship has systematically changed over time. The OLS model below shows that it is not significant (p = 0.173), meaning we cannot reject the null hypothesis that this moderating relationship is stronger (weaker) today than in the past. This is associated with Footnote 20 in the main paper.

Table 10: Trust in Government and Mass Responsiveness to Inequality Over Time

	B	SE
Top 1% income share	0.004	(0.003)
Trust in government	0.072	(0.103)
Top 1% × Trust in government	-0.005	(0.007)
Time	0.003	(0.005)
Top 1% × Time	-0.001*	(0.000)
Trust in government × Time	-0.004	(0.013)
Top 1% × Trust × Time	0.001	(0.001)
18-29 years old (Ref.)	—	—
30-44 years old	-0.003	(0.005)
45-64 years old	-0.007	(0.005)
65 years and older	-0.024***	(0.006)
Income percentile 0-16 (Ref.)	—	—
Income percentile 17-33	-0.006	(0.007)
Income percentile 34-67	-0.039***	(0.006)
Income percentile 68-95	-0.063***	(0.006)
Income percentile 96-100	-0.080***	(0.008)
HS or less (Ref.)	—	—
Some college	-0.020***	(0.004)
College degree	-0.023***	(0.005)
Female	0.015***	(0.003)
White	-0.040***	(0.005)
Married	0.004	(0.004)
Homeowner	-0.016***	(0.004)
Union household	0.004	(0.005)
Unemployed	0.028***	(0.009)
Party ID	-0.160***	(0.008)
Ideology	-0.220***	(0.012)
Egalitarianism	0.263***	(0.009)
FT: Blacks	-0.000	(0.014)
FT: Hispanics	-0.017	(0.014)
FT: Poor	0.102***	(0.010)
FT: Big Business	-0.108***	(0.009)
State median household income	0.002***	(0.001)
State unemployment rate	0.001	(0.001)
Year Fixed Effects?	No	
State Fixed Effects?	✓	
Observations	11,515	
R-squared	0.504	

Dependent variable is pro-redistributive score
Source is CANES (1984-2016)
OLS coefficients
Robust standard errors clustered by state-year in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed