Trust the Police? Self-Selection of Motivated Agents into the German Police Force

Guido Friebel, Michael Kosfeld, and Gerd Thielmann

Online Appendix

Table 7: Distribution of Trust and Trustworthy Behavior (in Percentage)

		High school students	Police applicants
Trust A	Send 0	18.46	16.99
	Send 50	57.56	50.98
	Send 100	23.98	32.03
Trustworthiness B if A sends 50	Return 0	25.44	18.30
	Return 100	74.56	81.70
... if A sends 100	Return 0	25.13	19.83
	Return 200	74.87	80.17
	N	959	459

Table 8: Covariates

	Total	High school students	Police applicants	p−value
Female	0.569	0.655	0.405	0.000
Age	19.870	19.555	20.473	0.000
ln(Income)	4.957	4.713	5.425	0.000
City type				0.000
large	0.104	0.078	0.155	
medium	0.207	0.199	0.223	
small	0.319	0.352	0.254	
rural	0.370	0.371	0.368	
Migration (y/n)	0.068	0.070	0.066	0.820
Education father				0.000
no	0.011	0.009	0.018	
Volks-/Hauptschule	0.126	0.097	0.179	
Mittlere Reife	0.393	0.363	0.451	
FH-Reife	0.070	0.068	0.074	
Abitur	0.364	0.418	0.260	
other	0.013	0.015	0.009	
don't know	0.023	0.030	0.009	
Education mother				0.000
no	0.010	0.006	0.017	
Volks-/Hauptschule	0.184	0.155	0.241	
Mittlere Reife	0.273	0.251	0.315	
FH-Reife	0.113	0.111	0.116	
Abitur	0.366	0.419	0.265	
other	0.019	0.021	0.015	
don't know	0.035	0.037	0.031	
Sensation seeking	50.721	49.794	52.492	0.000
Proactivity	34.505	33.737	35.974	0.000
Participation lotteries				0.000
never	0.619	0.577	0.697	
1-2	0.279	0.293	0.252	
3-10	0.086	0.109	0.044	
11-25	0.011	0.014	0.007	
more often	0.005	0.007	0	
Body height	173.987	172.872	176.118	0.000
Risk preference	5.188	5.041	5.468	0.000
N	1,331	874	457	

Note: Income = monthly income; city type = type of city grown up in until age of 15; sensation seeking is based on NISS (Roth and Hammelstein 2012); proactivity on Frese et al. (1997); participation in lotteries considers last 12 months; body height is measured in cm; risk preference = general risk question from SOEP. Statistical significance is based on t-tests or alternatively, Fisher's exact test (female, migration) and χ^2-test (city type, education father/mother, participation lotteries).

Table 9: High School Students Compared to Representative Data

	Representative data Hesse	High school students
Female	0.528	0.655
Migration (y/n)	0.072	0.070
Education parents		
Volks-/Hauptschule	0.065	0.097 (father), 0.155 (mother)
Mittlere Reife	0.278	0.363 (father), 0.251 (mother)
FH-Reife/Abitur	0.644	0.486 (father), 0.530 (mother)

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt (Statistisches Jahrbuch 2012, Deutschland und Internationales) for gender and migration background; Hessisches Statistisches Landesamt (individual calculation) for parents' education. In case education of father and mother differ, the highest education was taken.

Table 10: Trust and Trustworthiness

	Trust A	Trustworthiness B if A sends 50	Trustworthiness B if A sends 100
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Police applicant	0.061	0.068**	0.086***
	(0.043)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Female	0.056	0.038	0.117***
	(0.056)	(0.035)	(0.035)
Age	0.010	−0.000	−0.006
	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.007)
ln(Income)	0.012	0.007	−0.008
	(0.020)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Migration	−0.105	0.051	0.075
	(0.073)	(0.047)	(0.047)
Education father	0.071*	−0.004	0.001
	(0.043)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Education mother	−0.068	0.009	0.021
	(0.043)	(0.027)	(0.027)
City type	0.034	0.020	−0.010
	(0.039)	(0.024)	(0.025)
Sensation seeking	−0.003	0.001	−0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Proactivity	0.002	0.000	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Lottery	0.027	−0.004	−0.004
	(0.038)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Risk preference	0.024**	−0.005	−0.008
	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Body height	0.007**	0.001	0.003
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Constant	0.451	1.480***	1.306***
	(0.604)	(0.383)	(0.384)
N	1,331	1,331	1,331
R^2	0.021	0.009	0.019

Note: The table reports the full set of covariates for specifications (3), (6), and (9) in Table 3 of the main paper. OLS with standard errors in parentheses. Education father and mother are coded as dummies (1 = Abitur, 0 otherwise), the same for city type (1 = non-rural, 0 = rural) and lottery (1 = participated at least once, 0 = never). *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table 11: Reward and Punishment

	Average investment C				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Police applicant	4.215**	3.673**	2.876*	2.813*	3.173*
	(1.682)	(1.640)	(1.638)	(1.619)	(1.626)
Trust		8.851***		6.170***	
		(1.043)		(1.104)	
Trustworthiness50			6.975***	5.140**	
			(1.985)	(1.989)	
Trustworthiness100			10.027***	7.825***	
			(1.981)	(1.998)	
NoTrust_NotTrustworthy					−13.694***
					(2.690)
Trust_Trustworthy					9.387***
					(1.534)
Female	−3.107	−3.602*	−4.543**	−4.562**	−4.643**
	(2.159)	(2.104)	(2.104)	(2.080)	(2.089)
Age	−0.113	−0.199	−0.0522	−0.126	−0.020
	(0.450)	(0.439)	(0.437)	(0.432)	(0.434)
ln(Income)	0.103	−0.004	0.136	0.056	0.019
	(0.758)	(0.738)	(0.735)	(0.727)	(0.731)
Migration	4.055	4.983*	2.948	3.853	3.412
	(2.853)	(2.781)	(2.770)	(2.743)	(2.750)
Education father	2.764	2.133	2.797*	2.348	2.779*
	(1.681)	(1.639)	(1.631)	(1.614)	(1.620)
Education mother	1.636	2.237	1.362	1.844	1.565
	(1.668)	(1.627)	(1.619)	(1.603)	(1.609)
City type	−0.781	−1.085	−0.814	−1.013	−0.968
	(1.498)	(1.460)	(1.454)	(1.438)	(1.444)
Sensation seeking	0.003	0.031	0.004	0.024	0.019
	(0.093)	(0.090)	(0.090)	(0.089)	(0.089)
Proactivity	0.119	0.099	0.103	0.093	0.114
	(0.118)	(0.115)	(0.115)	(0.113)	(0.114)
Lottery	−1.044	−1.286	−1.053	−1.221	−1.270
	(1.470)	(1.433)	(1.426)	(1.410)	(1.417)
Risk preference	0.817*	0.607	0.928**	0.756*	0.806*
	(0.449)	(0.438)	(0.436)	(0.432)	(0.433)
Body height	−0.219*	−0.284**	−0.258**	−0.294***	−0.276**
	(0.116)	(0.113)	(0.113)	(0.112)	(0.112)
Constant	68.525***	64.537***	45.108**	47.920**	73.039**
	(23.487)	(22.883)	(22.927)	(22.674)	(22.639)
N	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331
R^2	0.020	0.070	0.079	0.100	0.091

Note: The table reports the full set of covariates for specifications (3) to (7) in Table 4 of the main paper. OLS with standard errors in parentheses. Education father and mother are coded as dummies (1 = Abitur, 0 otherwise), the same for city type (1 = non-rural, 0 = rural) and lottery (1 = participated at least once, 0 = never). *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$