Online Appendix

Governing Digital China

Daniela Stockmann, and Ting Luo

June 20, 2025

Contents

A. Chapter 5: Robustness Check

Table O5.1: OLS regression results on trust in central government among WeChat users: jumping the firewall

	(1) Trust in Central Government	(2) Trust in Central Government
Lurking Politics on Wechat	-0.23*	-0.25*
	(0.13)	(0.14)
Discussing Politics on Wechat	-0.59***	-0.46**
	(0.18)	(0.20)
Space for Online Discourse on WeChat	2.12***	2.33***
	(0.35)	(0.37)
Diversity of Opinion on WeChat	0.63***	0.70***
	(0.20)	(0.19)
Tieba User	0.03	0.16
	(0.22)	(0.26)
Weibo User	0.42*	0.13
	(0.24)	(0.26)
Jumping the Firewall	-0.36**	
	(0.16)	
Traditional Media Consumption	1.62***	2.10***
	(0.44)	(0.47)
Political Concern	0.22*	0.20
	(0.13)	(0.15)
Privacy Behavior	-0.48**	-0.61**
	(0.22)	(0.24)
County total budget expenditure	-0.30	-0.44
	(0.42)	(0.51)
Communist Party Member	0.21	0.20
	(0.18)	(0.16)
Age(iv)	3.38*	2.49
	(1.99)	(1.86)
Age-squared	-3.26	-2.32
	(2.01)	(1.87)
Wealth	0.10	-0.01
	(0.30)	(0.30)
Education	0.73**	1.03***
	(0.33)	(0.30)
Male	-0.15	-0.19
	(0.12)	(0.13)
Urban Resident	-0.09	-0.09
	(0.15)	(0.18)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-1.24**	-1.10**
	(0.59)	(0.52)
Longitude	0.21	-0.06
	(0.51)	(0.52)
Latitude	-1.51**	-1.37**
	(0.59)	(0.60)
County Altitude	0.60	0.72
	(0.58)	(0.62)
Constant	7.19***	6.90***
	(0.63)	(0.63)
Observations	2,773	2,631
R-squared	0.15	0.15

Notes: Model 1 includes jumping the Great Chinese Firewall as a control. Model 2 drops all respondents who jumped the firewall, focusing only on those staying within the firewall. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Both models are run on the subpopulation of WeChat users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O5.2: OLS regression results on trust in central government among WeChat users: response bias

	Trust in Central Government
Lurking Politics on Wechat	-0.27**
	(0.13)
Discussing Politics on Wechat	-0.75***
	(0.16)
Space for Online Discourse on WeChat	1.94***
	(0.29)
Diversity of Opinion on WeChat	0.67***
	(0.17)
Tieba User	0.04
	(0.19)
Weibo User	0.46**
	(0.20)
Traditional Media Consumption	1.74***
	(0.43)
Political Fear:Yes	-0.34***
	(0.12)
Political Fear: Non-response	-0.19
	(0.15)
Political Concern: Yes	0.40***
	(0.13)
Political Concern: Non-response	-0.46
	(0.27)
Privacy Behavior	-0.53**
	(0.22)
County Total Budget Expenditure iv	-0.36
	(0.42)
Communist Party Member	0.16
	(0.17)
Age	3.22*
	(1.72)
Age-squared	-3.13*
	(1.76)
Wealth	0.05
	(0.28)
Education	0.65**
	(0.27)
Male	-0.15
	(0.10)
Urban Resident	-0.21
	(0.14)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-1.48**
	(0.56)
Longitude	0.04
	(0.48)
Latitude	-1.12**
	(0.49)
County Altitude	0.36
	(0.47)
Constant	7.71***
	(0.52)
Observations	2,889
R-squared	0.16

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of WeChat users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O5.3: OLS regression results on trust in local government among WeChat users

	Trust in Local Government
Lurking Politics on Wechat	-0.75***
	(0.18)
Discussing Politics on Wechat	0.28
	(0.22)
Space for Online Discourse on WeChat	1.37***
	(0.40)
Diversity of Opinion on WeChat	0.67**
	(0.26)
Tieba user	0.26
	(0.25)
Weibo user	0.32
	(0.20)
Traditional media consumption	1.03**
	(0.51)
Political Concern	0.22
	(0.19)
Privacy Behavior	-1.11***
	(0.27)
County Total Budget Expenditure iv	0.15
	(0.40)
Communist Party Member	0.04
	(0.24)
Age	-2.64
	(1.97)
Age-squared	3.61*
	(2.08)
Wealth	0.17
	(0.36)
Education	1.46***
	(0.28)
Male	-0.39***
	(0.12)
Urban Resident	0.37*
	(0.19)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.40
	(0.60)
Longitude	1.22**
	(0.60)
Latitude	-1.47***
	(0.55)
County Altitude iv	1.98***
	(0.74)
Constant	5.22***
	(0.61)
Observations	2,765
R-squared	0.11

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of WeChat users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O5.4: OLS regression results on trust in central government among WeChat users: benevolent leaders

	(1) Trust in Central Government	(2) Trust in Central Government
Lurking Politics on Wechat	-0.31**	-0.30**
	(0.12)	(0.12)
Discussing Politics on Wechat	-0.62***	-0.59***
	(0.18)	(0.18)
Space for Online Discourse on WeChat	1.13**	2.20***
	(0.45)	(0.36)
Benevolent Leaders	-0.90*	0.55
	(0.46)	(0.34)
Benevolent Leaders X Space on WeChat	1.63**	
	(0.67)	
Diversity of Opinion on WeChat	0.65***	1.21***
	(0.19)	(0.36)
Benevolent Leaders X Diversity on WeChat		-0.84*
		(0.50)
Tieba User	0.05	0.06
	(0.22)	(0.22)
Weibo User	0.35	0.41*
	(0.24)	(0.24)
Traditional Media Consumption	1.50***	1.52***
	(0.44)	(0.44)
Political Concern	0.25**	0.26*
	(0.13)	(0.13)
Privacy Behavior	-0.59***	-0.61***
	(0.22)	(0.22)
County Total Budget Expenditure	-0.40	-0.38
	(0.42)	(0.40)
Communist Party Member	0.23	0.22
	(0.18)	(0.18)
Age	2.87	2.86*
	(1.74)	(1.72)
Age-squared	-2.84	-2.84
	(1.77)	(1.75)
Wealth	0.06	0.04
	(0.30)	(0.30)
Education	0.72**	0.65**
	(0.32)	(0.32)
Male	-0.11	-0.13
	(0.12)	(0.12)
Urban Resident	-0.13	-0.09
	(0.14)	(0.15)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-1.25**	-1.34**
	(0.57)	(0.58)
Longitude	-0.07	0.08
	(0.53)	(0.50)
Latitude	-1.36**	-1.42**
	(0.57)	(0.59)
County Altitude	0.38	0.40
	(0.56)	(0.55)
Constant	7.99***	7.08***
	(0.59)	(0.62)
Observations	2,753	2,753
R-squared	0.16	0.16

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of WeChat users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O5.5: Multinomial probit regression results on trust in central government among WeChat users: different codings of the dependent variable

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Low Trust (0-4)	No Response	Low Trust(0-5)	No Response
Lurking Politics on WeChat	0.17	-0.07	0.04	-0.09
	(0.16)	(0.24)	(0.18)	(0.24)
Discussing Politics on WeChat	-0.14	-0.33	0.79***	-0.06
	(0.24)	(0.28)	(0.18)	(0.27)
Space for Online Discourse on WeChat	-1.17**	0.72	-2.18***	0.35
	(0.48)	(0.50)	(0.37)	(0.50)
Diversity of Opinion on WeChat	-0.63**	-0.31	-0.73***	-0.37
	(0.25)	(0.42)	(0.24)	(0.42)
Tieba User	-0.29	0.23	-0.02	0.25
	(0.33)	(0.29)	(0.20)	(0.31)
Weibo User	-0.44	-0.29	-0.59**	-0.41
	(0.33)	(0.29)	(0.23)	(0.30)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.94	-0.52	-2.14***	-0.96
	(0.58)	(0.77)	(0.56)	(0.76)
Political Concern	0.09	0.10	-0.29	0.03
	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.18)	(0.24)
Privacy Behavior	0.13	0.02	-0.14	-0.03
	(0.26)	(0.29)	(0.25)	(0.29)
County Total Budget Expenditure	-3.97***	-0.56	-1.27	-0.59
	(1.14)	(0.84)	(0.94)	(0.83)
Communist Party Member	-1.25***	0.15	-0.26	0.17
	(0.47)	(0.34)	(0.26)	(0.34)
Age	-3.42	2.37	-4.69**	1.83
	(2.22)	(2.61)	(2.15)	(2.70)
Age-squared	3.19	-3.88	4.22*	-3.43
	(2.43)	(2.89)	(2.17)	(2.97)
Wealth	0.31	-1.65***	0.30	-1.58***
	(0.39)	(0.51)	(0.34)	(0.50)
Education	-0.21	0.02	-0.30	-0.08
	(0.40)	(0.43)	(0.32)	(0.44)
Male	0.34**	0.20	0.07	0.19

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Low Trust (0-4)	No Response	Low Trust(0-5)	No Response
	(0.16)	(0.23)	(0.14)	(0.22)
Urban Resident	0.51*	0.33	0.15	0.34
	(0.26)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.21)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	0.20	1.83**	0.65	1.85**
	(0.61)	(0.88)	(0.71)	(0.87)
Longitude	-0.42	-3.82***	-0.36	-3.89***
	(0.66)	(0.89)	(0.69)	(0.91)
Latitude	1.06	1.18**	1.24	1.41**
	(0.76)	(0.54)	(0.85)	(0.56)
County Altitude	0.08	-5.43**	-0.69	-5.71***
	(0.61)	(2.07)	(0.68)	(2.15)
Constant	-1.51**	-1.85**	0.36	-1.29*
	(0.73)	(0.70)	(0.69)	(0.74)
Observations	2,811	2,811	2,811	2,811

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of WeChat users. In model 1, we coded 0 to 4 as low trust, 5 to 10 as high trust, and no response as the third category. In model 2, we coded 0 to 5 as low trust, 6 to 10 as high trust, and no response as the third category. In both models, high trust is the reference category for the regressions. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O5.6: Robustness check: various combinations of control variables

Core Variables	Max	Min	Mean	AvgSTD	Percent Significant	Percent +	Percent -	AvgT	N. of Permutations
Lurking Politics on WeChat	-0.02	-0.23	-0.11	0.11	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.03	131072
Discussing Politics on WeChat	-0.47	-0.94	-0.73	0.16	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.51	131072
Space for Online Discourse on WeChat	2.37	1.51	1.96	0.28	1.00	1.00	0.00	6.96	131072
Diversity of Opinion on WeChat	0.63	0.29	0.44	0.18	0.89	1.00	0.00	2.47	131072
Testing Variables	Max	Min	Mean	AvgSTD	Percent Significant	Percent +	Percent -	AvgT	N. of Permutations
Tieba User	0.48	-0.11	0.16	0.18	0.14	0.92	0.08	0.96	65536
Weibo User	0.79	0.06	0.44	0.19	0.69	1.00	0.00	2.40	65536
Traditional Media Consumption	1.97	1.17	1.57	0.43	1.00	1.00	0.00	3.63	65536
Political Concern	0.54	0.33	0.42	0.12	1.00	1.00	0.00	3.41	65536
Privacy Behavior	-0.09	-0.71	-0.41	0.20	0.63	0.00	1.00	2.10	65536
County Total Budget Expenditure	0.52	-0.56	-0.01	0.35	0.00	0.49	0.51	0.64	65536
Communist Party Member	0.21	-0.19	-0.02	0.18	0.00	0.38	0.62	0.28	65536
Age	2.91	-0.14	0.97	0.84	0.21	0.99	0.01	1.44	65536
Age-squared	0.83	-2.24	-0.45	0.80	0.21	0.49	0.51	1.34	65536
Wealth	0.55	-0.21	0.20	0.25	0.01	0.94	0.06	0.85	65536
Education	0.56	-0.59	0.02	0.21	0.04	0.57	0.43	0.79	65536
Male	-0.07	-0.25	-0.17	0.10	0.20	0.00	1.00	1.69	65536
Urban Resident	-0.05	-0.31	-0.15	0.13	0.02	0.00	1.00	1.17	65536
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.79	-2.40	-1.61	0.53	0.97	0.00	1.00	3.06	65536
Longitude	0.17	-1.57	-0.69	0.32	0.52	0.03	0.97	2.41	65536
Latitude	-0.60	-1.83	-1.27	0.38	0.98	0.00	1.00	3.41	65536
County Altitude	0.84	-0.86	0.26	0.35	0.08	0.76	0.24	1.23	65536

B. Chapter 7: Robustness Check

Table O7.1: Multivariate probit regression results on using Sesame Credit ratings among internet users

	Using Sesame Credit ratings
Political Concern	-0.19*
	(0.10)
Privacy Bahvaior	0.23
	(0.14)
Intensity of Using WeChat Pay or Alipay	1.91***
	(0.26)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	4.73***
	(0.87)
County Total Budget Expenditure	-3.98***
	(0.75)
County Altitude	0.14
	(0.27)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.74**
	(0.36)
Longitude	0.49
	(0.43)
Latitude	-0.69**
	(0.27)
Age	2.48**
	(1.24)
Age-squared	-4.18***
	(1.55)
Communist Party Member	0.22
	(0.14)
Education	0.98***
	(0.17)
Wealth	-0.39**
	(0.18)
Male	0.10
	(0.07)
Urban Resident	-0.11
	(0.10)
Constant	-2.00***
	(0.25)
Observations	2,905

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of internet users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O7.2: Multivariate probit regression results on using commercial credit ratings: response bias

	Using Commercial Credit Ratings
Political Concern: Yes	-0.19*
	(0.10)
Political Concern: Non-response	-0.61***
	(0.15)
Privacy Behavior	0.33**
	(0.15)
Intensity of Using WeChat Pay or Alipay	1.76***
	(0.26)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	4.51***
	(0.96)
County Total Budget Expenditure	-3.90***
	(0.81)
County Altitude	0.13
	(0.26)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.96***
	(0.35)
Longitude	0.38
	(0.42)
Latitude	-0.63**
	(0.29)
Age	2.60**
	(1.28)
Age-squared	-4.26***
	(1.58)
Communist Party Member	0.16
	(0.13)
Education	1.13***
	(0.16)
Wealth	-0.40**
	(0.19)
Male	0.14*
	(0.07)
Urban Resident	-0.05
	(0.10)
Constant	-1.94***
	(0.28)
Observations	3,071

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of internet users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O7.3: Multivariate probit regression results on using commercial credit ratings:lagged community integration of e-financial services

	(1) Using Commercial Credit Ratings
Political Concern	-0.18*
	(0.10)
Privacy Behavior	0.31**
	(0.15)
Intensity of Using WeChat Pay or Alipay	1.89***
	(0.25)
Community Integration of E-financial Services in 2016	4.06***
	(0.81)
County Total Budget Expenditure	-3.61***
	(0.72)
County Altitude	0.36
	(0.23)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.75**
	(0.34)
Longitude	0.53
	(0.42)
Latitude	-0.77***
	(0.26)
Age	2.70**
	(1.30)
Age-squared	-4.42***
	(1.60)
Communist Party Member	0.19
	(0.14)
Education	0.96***
	(0.17)
Wealth	-0.45**
	(0.18)
Male	0.10
	(0.07)
Urban Resident	-0.09
	(0.10)
Constant	-1.84***
	(0.24)
Observations	2,892

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of internet users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O7.4: Multivariate probit regression results on using commercial credit ratings: social interaction

	(1) Using Commercial Credit Ratings
Political Concern	-0.20**
	(0.10)
Privacy Behavior	0.25
	(0.15)
Intensity of Using WeChat Pay or Alipay	1.87***
	(0.25)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	4.92***
	(0.86)
Discuss Politics Online	0.15
	(0.10)
Discussing Politics Face-to-face	0.05
	(0.12)
County Total Budget Expenditure	-4.13***
	(0.74)
County Altitude	0.48**
	(0.24)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.86**
	(0.35)
Longitude	0.57
	(0.43)
Latitude	-0.73***
	(0.26)
Age	2.92**
	(1.26)
Age-squared	-4.63***
	(1.55)
Communist Party Member	0.17
	(0.15)
Education	1.00***
	(0.17)
Wealth	-0.46**
	(0.19)
Male	0.10
	(0.07)
Urban Resident	-0.08
	(0.10)
Constant	-2.07***
	(0.25)
Observations	2,892

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model is run on the subpopulation of internet users. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O7.5: Robustness check: various combinations of control variables

Core Variables	Max	Min	Mean	AvgSTD	Percent Significant	Percent +	Percent -	AvgT	N. of Permutations
Political Concern	-0.07	-0.19	-0.13	0.09	0.01	0.00	1.00	1.42	4096
Privacy Behavior	0.63	0.13	0.32	0.13	0.71	1.00	0.00	2.52	4096
Intensity of Using WeChat Pay or Alipay	2.51	1.47	1.90	0.21	1.00	1.00	0.00	9.06	4096
Community Integration of E-financial Services	4.98	0.13	2.39	0.50	0.88	1.00	0.00	4.16	4096
Testing Variables	Max	Min	Mean	AvgSTD	Percent Significant	Percent +	Percent -	AvgT	N. of Permutations
County Total Budget Expenditure	-2.46	-3.80	-3.29	0.62	1.00	0.00	1.00	5.28	2048
County Altitude	0.92	-0.30	0.15	0.21	0.09	0.75	0.25	0.85	2048
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	0.25	-1.29	-0.45	0.30	0.38	0.10	0.90	1.53	2048
Longitude	1.02	-0.35	0.19	0.34	0.02	0.63	0.37	0.74	2048
Latitude	-0.35	-1.22	-0.70	0.23	0.91	0.00	1.00	3.13	2048
Age	2.53	-1.51	0.19	0.53	0.75	0.50	0.50	4.55	2048
Age-squared	-1.18	-4.02	-2.42	0.60	1.00	0.00	1.00	5.34	2048
Communist Party Member	0.30	-0.15	0.12	0.13	0.04	0.88	0.12	1.04	2048
Education	1.26	0.43	0.80	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.00	5.03	2048
Wealth	-0.24	-0.71	-0.46	0.16	0.94	0.00	1.00	2.83	2048
Male	0.14	0.04	0.10	0.07	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.48	2048
Urban Resident	0.01	-0.18	-0.09	0.09	0.00	0.01	0.99	0.91	2048

C. Chapter 8: Robustness Check

Table O8.1: Multinomial probit regression results for experience of SCS on management of SCS: four flavors

	Subpopulation estimate				Without subpopulation estimate			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.83**	0.35	0.83**	0.34	0.75***	0.48***	0.77***	0.49***
	(0.32)	(0.25)	(0.32)	(0.25)	(0.28)	(0.16)	(0.27)	(0.16)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	-2.25	4.02**	-2.18	4.04**	-0.96	2.85**	-0.98	2.81**
	(2.18)	(1.53)	(2.20)	(1.56)	(1.92)	(1.33)	(1.90)	(1.37)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.48	2.22***	-0.49	2.28***	-0.50	2.60***	-0.44	2.72***
	(0.81)	(0.57)	(0.80)	(0.57)	(0.63)	(0.39)	(0.64)	(0.39)
Political Concern	-0.68**	-1.24***	-0.69**	-1.25***	-0.34*	-0.85***	-0.33*	-0.85***
	(0.34)	(0.22)	(0.33)	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.12)	(0.19)	(0.12)
Privacy Behavior	0.28	-1.11***	0.29	-1.07***	0.54*	-1.24***	0.53*	-1.23***
	(0.39)	(0.30)	(0.38)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.19)	(0.28)	(0.19)
County Total Budget Expenditure	2.94	-3.12**	2.93	-3.10**	2.24	-2.18*	2.29	-2.13*
	(1.86)	(1.26)	(1.86)	(1.27)	(1.67)	(1.11)	(1.66)	(1.12)
Communist Party Member	-0.01	-0.24	0.01	-0.18	0.26	-0.45***	0.28	-0.41**
	(0.46)	(0.31)	(0.46)	(0.31)	(0.35)	(0.17)	(0.35)	(0.17)
Age	3.97	-7.66***	3.98	-7.11**	2.25	-7.83***	3.00	-6.67***
	(4.03)	(2.71)	(3.94)	(2.72)	(2.59)	(1.49)	(2.65)	(1.43)
Age-squared	-3.77	6.61**	-3.77	5.99*	-0.92	7.24***	-1.76	5.96***
	(4.42)	(3.07)	(4.31)	(3.08)	(2.55)	(1.55)	(2.59)	(1.45)
Wealth	2.11***	1.54***	2.13***	1.52***	1.87***	1.72***	1.90***	1.73***
	(0.56)	(0.38)	(0.55)	(0.37)	(0.53)	(0.21)	(0.53)	(0.20)
Education	-0.76	-0.20	-0.78	-0.13	-1.30***	-0.14	-1.20***	0.03
	(0.56)	(0.37)	(0.54)	(0.36)	(0.45)	(0.23)	(0.45)	(0.20)
Male	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.27	0.13	0.29**	0.14	0.31***
	(0.22)	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.18)	(0.23)	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.11)
Urban Resident	-0.16	-0.00	-0.17	-0.00	0.46**	0.35**	0.44**	0.33**
	(0.30)	(0.23)	(0.29)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.14)	(0.22)	(0.14)
Inverse Mills Ratio	-0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00***		

	Subpopulation estimate				Without subpopulation estimate			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
	(0.00)	(0.00)			(0.00)	(0.00)		
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	1.71*	-1.92***	1.73*	-1.86***	2.63***	-1.41***	2.60***	-1.42***
	(0.97)	(0.68)	(0.98)	(0.68)	(0.92)	(0.45)	(0.93)	(0.44)
Longitude	-0.72	-1.99***	-0.71	-1.97***	0.04	-1.98***	0.05	-1.97***
	(0.84)	(0.62)	(0.84)	(0.62)	(0.84)	(0.45)	(0.85)	(0.45)
Latitude	-0.52	2.25***	-0.51	2.25***	-1.37***	2.21***	-1.37***	2.20***
	(0.54)	(0.51)	(0.54)	(0.52)	(0.48)	(0.36)	(0.48)	(0.36)
County Altitude	-0.15	-0.28	-0.13	-0.27	1.81**	0.41	1.86**	0.45
	(0.80)	(0.64)	(0.79)	(0.64)	(0.72)	(0.54)	(0.71)	(0.54)
Constant	-2.14***	2.27***	-2.16***	2.10***	-3.24***	1.37***	-3.39***	1.12***
	(0.77)	(0.55)	(0.74)	(0.55)	(0.69)	(0.32)	(0.63)	(0.32)
Observations	3,082		3,084		480		482	

Notes: Companies refer to company involvement. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. Models 1 and 2 run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. Models 1 and 3 control for selection effects. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.2: Multivariate probit regression results on management of SCS: response bias

	Dependent Variable	
	Company Involvement	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.97***	0.20
	(0.29)	(0.24)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	-3.01	3.71**
	(2.20)	(1.51)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.30	1.98***
	(0.76)	(0.56)
Political Fear: Yes	0.20	0.08
	(0.31)	(0.23)
Political Fear: Non-response	0.18	-1.11***
	(0.28)	(0.30)
Political Concern: Yes	-0.78**	-1.34***
	(0.35)	(0.22)
Political Concern: Non-response	-0.63	-1.75***
	(0.45)	(0.31)
Privacy Behavior	0.16	-1.20***
	(0.39)	(0.30)
County Total Budget Expenditure	3.58*	-2.66**
	(1.87)	(1.25)
Communist Party Member	0.09	-0.26
	(0.40)	(0.29)
Age	4.04	-10.13***
	(3.87)	(2.64)
Age-squared	-3.48	8.87***
	(4.14)	(2.96)
Wealth	2.12***	1.21***
	(0.55)	(0.39)
Education	-1.00*	-0.32
	(0.53)	(0.39)
Male	0.14	0.29
	(0.23)	(0.18)
Urban Resident	-0.04	0.03
	(0.30)	(0.24)
Inverse Mills Ratio	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	1.80*	-1.71**
	(0.99)	(0.67)
Longitude	-0.88	-2.84***
	(0.83)	(0.66)
Latitude	-0.41	2.54***
	(0.53)	(0.53)
County Altitude	-0.42	-0.97
	(0.84)	(0.73)
Constant	-2.34***	3.37***
	(0.80)	(0.53)
Observations	3,115	

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. The model is run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.3: Multivariate probit regression results on management of SCS: different codings of the dependent variable

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.66*	0.37	0.82**	0.34
	(0.34)	(0.25)	(0.32)	(0.24)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	-3.15	3.84**	-2.43	3.81**
	(2.28)	(1.49)	(2.19)	(1.53)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.43	2.18***	-0.56	2.17***
	(0.82)	(0.57)	(0.81)	(0.57)
Political Concern	-0.88***	-1.23***	-0.68**	-1.25***
	(0.33)	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.22)
Privacy Behavior	0.33	-1.10***	0.33	-1.06***
	(0.39)	(0.30)	(0.39)	(0.29)
County Total Budget Expenditure	2.47	-2.82**	3.14*	-2.89**
	(1.93)	(1.20)	(1.86)	(1.26)
Communist Party Member	-0.45	-0.16	-0.00	-0.23
	(0.49)	(0.32)	(0.46)	(0.30)
Age	4.69	-7.14***	3.81	-7.72***
	(4.63)	(2.69)	(4.00)	(2.68)
Age-squared	-5.54	6.09**	-3.55	6.74**
	(5.31)	(3.05)	(4.39)	(3.05)
Wealth	1.50**	1.50***	2.10***	1.52***
	(0.58)	(0.38)	(0.56)	(0.38)
Education	-0.58	-0.18	-0.78	-0.21
	(0.64)	(0.36)	(0.55)	(0.37)
Male	0.01	0.27	0.09	0.27
	(0.24)	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.18)
Urban Resident	0.06	-0.02	-0.14	0.04
	(0.29)	(0.23)	(0.29)	(0.23)
Inverse Mills Ratio	0.01	0.00	-0.00	0.00
	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	2.04*	-1.95***	1.70*	-1.91***
	(1.05)	(0.69)	(0.97)	(0.69)
Longitude	-1.33	-1.94***	-0.84	-2.11***
	(0.91)	(0.61)	(0.83)	(0.59)
Latitude	-0.11	2.21***	-0.44	2.30***
	(0.60)	(0.52)	(0.52)	(0.51)
County Altitude	-0.73	-0.28	-0.18	-0.30
	(0.85)	(0.64)	(0.80)	(0.64)
Constant	-1.74**	2.24***	-2.13***	2.26***
	(0.87)	(0.55)	(0.76)	(0.55)
Observations	3,073		3,084	

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. Both models are run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. Model 1 drops the nine respondents who chose private companies as the most trusted organizations. Model 2 included the two respondents who indicated that the SCS should not be implemented and coded them as no response. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.4: Multivariate probit regression results on management of SCS: different codings of the dependent variable (continued)

	Model 3			Model 4	
	Companies	Local Governments	Central Government	Companies	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.82**	-0.46	0.50*	0.83**	0.35
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.25)	(0.32)	(0.25)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	-2.23	3.87	3.29**	-2.87	3.19**
	(2.17)	(3.08)	(1.55)	(2.17)	(1.59)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.44	-0.17	2.58***	0.29	3.08***
	(0.80)	(1.04)	(0.55)	(0.88)	(0.66)
Political Concern	-0.66*	-1.41***	-1.16***	-0.61*	-1.14***
	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.23)	(0.34)	(0.22)
Privacy Behavior	0.30	-0.61	-1.10***	0.37	-1.00***
	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.32)	(0.40)	(0.31)
County Total Budget Expenditure	2.97	-4.90***	-2.53**	3.31*	-2.63**
	(1.82)	(1.74)	(1.23)	(1.82)	(1.31)
Communist Party Member	-0.04	-0.27	-0.23	-0.03	-0.27
	(0.46)	(0.49)	(0.30)	(0.46)	(0.32)
Age	3.91	-5.64	-7.50***	4.46	-7.04**
	(3.92)	(3.39)	(2.72)	(4.05)	(2.76)
Age-squared	-3.66	3.78	6.71**	-4.46	5.76*
	(4.30)	(3.84)	(3.04)	(4.44)	(3.12)
Wealth	2.13***	0.80	1.67***	1.87***	1.26***
	(0.56)	(0.63)	(0.39)	(0.54)	(0.38)
Education	-0.76	-0.00	-0.18	-0.71	-0.17
	(0.55)	(0.60)	(0.37)	(0.56)	(0.37)
Male	0.09	0.05	0.31*	-0.06	0.13
	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.23)	(0.19)
Urban Resident	-0.18	0.52	-0.09	-0.07	0.09
	(0.29)	(0.42)	(0.23)	(0.30)	(0.23)
Inverse Mills Ratio	-0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	1.70*	-2.88**	-1.59**	1.59	-2.02***
	(0.95)	(1.13)	(0.69)	(0.97)	(0.69)
Longitude	-0.77	-2.14*	-1.75***	-1.00	-2.31***
	(0.84)	(1.20)	(0.60)	(0.82)	(0.63)

	Model 3			Model 4	
	Companies	Local Governments	Central Government	Companies	Governments
Latitude	-0.56	3.13***	1.88***	-0.49	2.27***
	(0.54)	(0.80)	(0.51)	(0.52)	(0.50)
County Altitude	-0.09	-2.53	0.19	-0.41	-0.61
	(0.77)	(2.12)	(0.67)	(0.81)	(0.64)
Constant	-2.13***	1.69*	1.73***	-1.96**	2.50***
	(0.77)	(0.86)	(0.57)	(0.77)	(0.55)
Observations		3,082		3,079	

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. Both models are run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. Model 3 separates the governments option into central and local governments. Model 4 drops the three respondents who refused to answer the question. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.5: Multivariate probit regression results on management of SCS: lagged community integration of e-financial services

	Dependent Variable	
	Company involvement	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.80**	0.32
	(0.32)	(0.25)
Community Integration of E-financial Services in 2016	-1.35	4.52***
	(2.01)	(1.36)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.52	2.27***
	(0.81)	(0.57)
Political Concern	-0.69**	-1.25***
	(0.34)	(0.21)
Privacy Behavior	0.27	-1.08***
	(0.38)	(0.30)
County Total Budget Expenditure	2.29	-3.57***
	(1.78)	(1.18)
Communist Party Member	-0.04	-0.30
	(0.46)	(0.30)
Age	4.27	-7.50***
	(4.00)	(2.67)
Age-squared	-4.16	6.35**
	(4.38)	(3.03)
Wealth	2.14***	1.52***
	(0.56)	(0.38)
Education	-0.71	-0.21
	(0.55)	(0.37)
Male	0.07	0.26
	(0.23)	(0.18)
Urban Resident	-0.16	0.02
	(0.29)	(0.22)
Inverse Mills Ratio	-0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	1.52	-2.06***
	(0.96)	(0.67)
Longitude	-0.68	-1.97***
	(0.83)	(0.61)
Latitude	-0.46	2.26***
	(0.54)	(0.51)
County Altitude	-0.16	-0.32
	(0.78)	(0.64)
Constant	-2.21***	2.38***
	(0.75)	(0.55)
Observations	3,078	

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. The model is run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.6: Bootstrapping of the Main Model: Deleting One PSU at a Time (Two-Column Format)

Left Column			Right Column		
S	**Com (SE)**	**Gov (SE)**	**S**	**Com (SE)**	**Gov (SE)**
1	-2.25 (2.18)	3.97** (1.56)	39	-2.95 (2.27)	2.96* (1.62)
2	-2.47 (2.12)	3.54** (1.55)	40	-2.80 (2.13)	3.62** (1.52)
3	-2.29 (2.17)	3.88** (1.54)	41	-3.53 (2.14)	3.49** (1.52)
4	-1.74 (2.16)	4.33*** (1.55)	42	-2.45 (2.15)	4.00** (1.53)
5	-2.23 (2.20)	3.81** (1.50)	43	-2.35 (2.20)	4.06*** (1.50)
6	-2.20 (2.16)	4.10*** (1.53)	44	-1.93 (2.30)	3.98** (1.54)
7	-2.58 (2.16)	3.49** (1.46)	45	2.14 (3.60)	7.92*** (2.98)
8	-2.17 (2.19)	4.08*** (1.53)	46	-2.35 (2.16)	4.17*** (1.54)
9	-2.17 (2.16)	4.22*** (1.53)	47	-2.57 (2.09)	3.54** (1.50)
10	-2.19 (2.21)	4.16*** (1.55)	48	-2.03 (2.30)	4.50*** (1.52)
11	-1.74 (2.18)	4.29*** (1.53)	49	-2.82 (2.32)	4.40*** (1.54)
12	-2.39 (2.20)	3.85** (1.58)	50	-2.38 (2.19)	4.10*** (1.53)
13	-2.23 (2.18)	3.89** (1.52)	51	-2.25 (2.17)	4.08*** (1.53)
14	-1.83 (2.17)	4.68*** (1.48)	52	-2.31 (2.19)	3.90** (1.53)
15	-2.56 (2.29)	3.39** (1.58)	53	-2.22 (2.18)	4.06*** (1.53)
16	-2.33 (2.20)	3.47** (1.55)	54	-2.89 (2.19)	3.93** (1.50)
17	-1.84 (2.25)	4.68*** (1.54)	55	-2.20 (2.19)	4.25*** (1.53)
18	-2.66 (2.65)	5.62*** (2.01)	56	-2.34 (2.19)	4.10*** (1.53)
19	-2.17 (2.17)	4.18*** (1.54)	57	-2.37 (2.15)	3.71** (1.49)
20	-2.39 (2.27)	3.90** (1.53)	58	-2.67 (2.21)	4.00** (1.53)
21	-1.62 (2.32)	3.78** (1.58)	59	-2.07 (2.18)	4.27*** (1.51)
22	-2.24 (2.16)	3.98** (1.52)	60	-1.84 (2.28)	4.13*** (1.50)
23	-2.32 (2.21)	3.82** (1.51)	61	-2.75 (2.22)	4.10*** (1.52)
24	-2.42 (2.20)	3.99** (1.52)	62	-2.26 (2.18)	3.92** (1.52)
25	-2.56 (2.17)	3.71** (1.54)	63	-2.34 (2.19)	3.55** (1.60)
26	-2.21 (2.18)	4.03** (1.57)	64	-1.90 (2.21)	4.40*** (1.48)
27	-2.16 (2.18)	4.11*** (1.53)	65	-0.98 (2.10)	4.25*** (1.52)
28	-2.04 (2.19)	4.27*** (1.51)	66	-2.27 (2.18)	4.13*** (1.51)
29	-2.05 (2.20)	4.28*** (1.50)	67	-2.45 (2.14)	4.10*** (1.52)
30	-0.58 (2.09)	3.55** (1.77)	68	-2.66 (2.19)	3.95** (1.55)
31	-2.96 (2.20)	4.08*** (1.53)	69	-2.23 (2.19)	4.06*** (1.52)
32	-2.02 (2.20)	4.18*** (1.53)	70	-2.31 (2.14)	4.18*** (1.52)
33	-2.42 (2.18)	4.48*** (1.50)	71	-2.12 (2.18)	3.98** (1.52)
34	-2.09 (2.20)	4.22*** (1.56)	72	-2.24 (2.20)	3.91** (1.53)
35	-1.67 (2.20)	4.20*** (1.53)	73	-2.20 (2.19)	4.06*** (1.51)
36	-2.77 (2.18)	3.95** (1.51)	74	-2.32 (2.18)	3.93** (1.50)
37	-2.10 (2.19)	4.10*** (1.53)	75	-2.20 (2.14)	3.88** (1.51)
38	-2.33 (2.20)	4.22*** (1.54)			

Notes: Com = Company Involvement; Gov = Governments. The table shows the coefficient of *Community Integration of E-finance services* with robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All models are run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.7: Robustness check: various combinations of control variables

	Max	Min	Mean	Average S.D.	Percent significant	Percent +	Percent -	Average T	N. of Permutations
No Response vs. Governments (Baseline = No Response)									
Core variables									
Using Social Credit System	0.60	0.11	0.37	0.17	0.63	1.00	0.00	2.31	256
Community Integration of E-financial Services	3.38	1.96	2.77	1.32	0.76	1.00	0.00	2.10	256
Traditional Media Consumption	2.95	2.22	2.57	0.37	1.00	1.00	0.00	7.03	256
Political Concern	-0.77	-0.88	-0.83	0.12	1.00	0.00	1.00	7.01	256
Privacy Behavior	-0.48	-1.29	-0.98	0.16	1.00	0.00	1.00	6.04	256
County Total Budget Expenditure	-0.90	-2.56	-1.89	1.05	0.38	0.00	1.00	1.81	256
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-0.63	-1.58	-1.15	0.41	0.97	0.00	1.00	2.82	256
Longitude	-1.29	-2.29	-1.82	0.43	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.25	256
Latitude	2.32	1.18	1.75	0.33	1.00	1.00	0.00	5.28	256
County Altitude	0.90	-0.56	0.16	0.52	0.00	0.53	0.47	0.84	256
Testing variables									
Inverse Mills Ratio	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.91	1.00	0.00	4.92	128
Communist Party Member	-0.16	-0.50	-0.34	0.17	0.47	0.00	1.00	1.98	128
Age	-0.81	-8.42	-3.71	0.82	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.34	128
Age-squared	7.95	-1.36	2.32	0.87	1.00	0.50	0.50	3.46	128
Wealth	1.84	1.50	1.66	0.20	1.00	1.00	0.00	8.37	128
Education	1.00	-0.44	0.27	0.23	0.27	0.82	0.18	1.44	128
Male	0.41	0.18	0.30	0.12	0.89	1.00	0.00	2.57	128
Urban Resident	0.44	0.24	0.34	0.14	0.93	1.00	0.00	2.49	128
Company Involvement vs. Governments (Baseline = Company Involvement)									
Core variables									
Using Social Credit System	0.19	-0.59	-0.25	0.32	0.00	0.20	0.80	0.88	256
Community Integration of E-financial Services	4.63	2.25	3.79	1.80	0.74	1.00	0.00	2.11	256
Traditional Media Consumption	3.43	1.71	2.52	0.55	1.00	1.00	0.00	4.57	256
Political Concern	-0.26	-0.54	-0.41	0.22	0.38	0.00	1.00	1.86	256
Privacy Behavior	-0.68	-1.79	-1.40	0.28	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.91	256
County Total Budget Expenditure	-3.06	-5.04	-4.24	1.52	0.98	0.00	1.00	2.80	256
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	-2.74	-4.32	-3.66	0.81	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.51	256
Longitude	-1.26	-2.46	-1.85	0.75	0.89	0.00	1.00	2.49	256
Latitude	3.77	2.42	3.11	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	7.68	256

	Max	Min	Mean	Average S.D.	Percent significant	Percent +	Percent -	Average T	N. of Permutations
County Altitude	-0.59	-2.18	-1.41	0.52	0.74	0.00	1.00	2.78	256
Testing variables									
Inverse Mills Ratio	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.74	0.26	1.04	128
Communist Party Member	-0.26	-1.04	-0.63	0.33	0.47	0.00	1.00	1.92	128
Age	-2.10	-12.41	-6.28	1.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	5.37	128
Age-squared	10.42	-2.97	2.83	1.46	1.00	0.50	0.50	4.99	128
Wealth	0.13	-0.65	-0.34	0.46	0.00	0.06	0.94	0.74	128
Education	2.29	0.13	1.16	0.49	0.63	1.00	0.00	2.41	128
Male	0.37	0.02	0.20	0.23	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.87	128
Urban Resident	0.17	-0.26	-0.03	0.22	0.00	0.38	0.63	0.41	128

Notes: We used the computational statistics approach suggested by Neumayer and Plümper (2017) and the checkrob module in STATA(Barslund, 2018) to rule out Type 1 and Type 2 errors due to subjective or inadequate sets of control variables. Although we are able to use survey design-based estimation with checkrob, it does not allow sub-population analyses that take the full sample into account in the calculation of the standard errors (Williams, 2024). Thus, we may have somewhat biased standard errors, though it is the only practical way to conduct an exhaustive test of all permutations of control variables. While statistical significance is somewhat questionable, coefficient estimates help validate our choice of controls. All possible permutations of testing variables are computed in order to confirm the robustness of core independent variables. Results remain robust.

Table O8.8: Multinomial probit regression results for experience of SCS on management of SCS: excluding unique communities

	Model 1 Excluding ethnic minorities		Model 2 Excluding rich provinces		Model 3 Excluding company headquarter provinces	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.66**	0.22	0.93**	0.52*	1.05***	0.50*
	(0.31)	(0.28)	(0.37)	(0.29)	(0.34)	(0.26)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	-2.15	4.24***	3.32	8.07**	4.27	8.63**
	(2.33)	(1.42)	(4.50)	(4.02)	(4.09)	(3.87)
Traditional Media Consumption	0.03	2.19***	-0.91	2.74***	-0.47	2.25***
	(0.87)	(0.63)	(0.99)	(0.59)	(0.90)	(0.62)
Political Concern	-0.64*	-1.22***	-0.74**	-1.30***	-0.90**	-1.26***
	(0.37)	(0.23)	(0.36)	(0.22)	(0.38)	(0.23)
Privacy Behavior	0.54	-1.33***	-0.01	-1.05***	0.13	-1.17***
	(0.42)	(0.32)	(0.47)	(0.37)	(0.45)	(0.37)
County Total Budget Expenditure	3.13	-3.07**	4.54	-2.25	2.03	-2.72*
	(1.99)	(1.17)	(3.62)	(1.73)	(2.01)	(1.43)
Communist Party Member	0.43	-0.45	-0.58	-0.47	-0.08	-0.38
	(0.47)	(0.36)	(0.58)	(0.34)	(0.49)	(0.32)
Age	6.52	-7.67***	-0.67	-7.70***	-0.55	-8.58***
	(4.62)	(2.56)	(4.51)	(2.71)	(4.49)	(2.64)
Age-squared	-6.44	6.76**	1.34	6.61**	0.74	7.77**
	(5.07)	(2.89)	(4.91)	(3.13)	(4.98)	(3.05)
Wealth	2.42***	1.47***	2.17***	1.61***	2.05***	1.40***
	(0.64)	(0.42)	(0.72)	(0.43)	(0.62)	(0.41)
Education	-0.89	0.14	-0.33	0.45	-0.61	0.40
	(0.61)	(0.40)	(0.64)	(0.41)	(0.69)	(0.38)
Male	-0.08	-0.06	0.10	0.35	0.15	0.30
	(0.24)	(0.18)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.23)	(0.20)
Urban Resident	-0.28	-0.16	0.18	0.01	0.10	-0.05
	(0.32)	(0.25)	(0.31)	(0.23)	(0.30)	(0.23)
Inverse Mills Ratio	-0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.03)	(0.00)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	1.63	-1.90***	1.73	-2.92***	1.53	-2.49***
	(1.00)	(0.64)	(1.11)	(0.87)	(1.04)	(0.85)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
Longitude	-1.18	-1.77**	-1.61	-2.46**	-1.29	-2.53***
	(0.96)	(0.74)	(1.02)	(1.00)	(0.99)	(0.80)
Latitude	-0.02	2.23***	-0.84	2.73***	-0.65	2.59***
	(0.61)	(0.61)	(0.70)	(0.91)	(0.60)	(0.81)
County Altitude	-1.45	-0.02	-0.32	-0.04	-0.42	-0.23
	(1.42)	(1.40)	(0.92)	(0.84)	(0.94)	(0.78)
Constant	-2.37**	2.37***	-2.60**	1.35*	-2.45**	1.54**
	(0.90)	(0.67)	(0.98)	(0.69)	(0.98)	(0.67)
Observations	2,589		2,549		2,800	

Notes: Companies refer to company involvement. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. All models run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.9: Multinomial probit regression results for experience of SCS on management of SCS: excluding extreme values on the DV

	Model 1 Excluding lowest support for companies		Model 2 Excluding highest support for governments	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
Using social credit system	0.74	-0.41	1.00***	0.34
	(0.45)	(0.33)	(0.34)	(0.26)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	-1.55	5.00***	-3.95*	3.14**
	(2.00)	(1.14)	(2.07)	(1.38)
Traditional Media Consumption	-3.60***	-0.12	-0.13	2.00***
	(1.05)	(0.78)	(0.85)	(0.51)
Political Concern	-0.46	-1.18***	-0.75**	-1.15***
	(0.42)	(0.31)	(0.34)	(0.21)
Privacy Behavior	0.54	-0.95**	0.35	-1.12***
	(0.49)	(0.36)	(0.39)	(0.29)
County Total Budget Expenditure	1.94	-4.11***	4.10**	-2.57**
	(1.71)	(1.13)	(1.77)	(1.14)
Communist Party Member	0.06	-0.20	0.14	-0.28
	(0.37)	(0.29)	(0.45)	(0.32)
Age	0.57	-14.11***	5.92	-6.06**
	(4.87)	(3.28)	(4.24)	(2.56)
Age-squared	-0.81	12.91***	-5.93	4.95*
	(5.39)	(3.59)	(4.75)	(2.89)
Wealth	2.36***	1.89***	2.46***	1.78***
	(0.50)	(0.38)	(0.58)	(0.36)
Education	-3.16***	-2.56***	-1.09**	-0.19
	(0.81)	(0.67)	(0.54)	(0.42)
Male	0.55**	0.54***	0.16	0.39**
	(0.27)	(0.19)	(0.23)	(0.18)
Urban Resident	-0.62	-0.21	-0.09	-0.10
	(0.44)	(0.40)	(0.28)	(0.20)
Inverse Mills Ratio	0.01	0.02*	-0.00	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	0.19	-0.88	1.69	-1.11*
	(1.00)	(0.57)	(1.02)	(0.62)
Longitude	-0.49	-1.39*	-0.75	-1.40**
	(1.06)	(0.77)	(0.87)	(0.60)
Latitude	1.29	1.71***	-0.53	1.70***
	(0.79)	(0.52)	(0.51)	(0.50)
County Altitude	0.70	-0.30	-0.36	-0.50
	(0.68)	(0.52)	(0.76)	(0.57)
Constant	1.14	4.95***	-2.31**	1.58***
	(1.18)	(0.71)	(0.92)	(0.54)
Observations	1,382		2,372	

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. Both models are run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table O8.10: Multinomial probit regression results for experience of SCS on management of SCS: excluding extreme values on the IV

	Model 1 Excluding IVs More Than One Standard Deviation from the Mean		Model 2 Excluding Top and Bottom 5% of IV Values		Model 3 Excluding Top and Bottom 10% of IV Values	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
Using Social Credit System	0.92***	0.43	0.96**	0.40	1.29**	0.01
	(0.34)	(0.26)	(0.37)	(0.26)	(0.63)	(0.29)
Community Integration of E-financial Services	4.24	7.73**	4.63	8.25**	6.04	13.03***
	(3.98)	(3.38)	(4.09)	(3.36)	(4.72)	(3.70)
Traditional Media Consumption	-0.30	2.55***	-0.56	2.71***	-1.57	2.64***
	(0.82)	(0.55)	(0.84)	(0.54)	(1.01)	(0.59)
Political Concern	-0.81**	-1.33***	-0.83**	-1.35***	-0.64*	-1.50***
	(0.35)	(0.22)	(0.35)	(0.23)	(0.37)	(0.26)
Privacy Behavior	0.44	-1.16***	0.56	-1.14***	0.82*	-1.01***
	(0.39)	(0.31)	(0.38)	(0.31)	(0.45)	(0.31)
County Total Budget Expenditure	2.88	-2.51*	4.11	-3.40*	3.85	-2.29
	(1.97)	(1.30)	(2.50)	(1.89)	(2.86)	(1.49)
Communist Party Member	-0.14	-0.34	-0.46	-0.39	-1.40**	-0.20
	(0.47)	(0.30)	(0.51)	(0.30)	(0.59)	(0.28)
Age	0.93	-8.19***	0.70	-7.83***	-3.59	-8.15***
	(3.99)	(2.58)	(3.89)	(2.59)	(3.72)	(2.69)
Age-squared	-0.56	7.05**	-0.08	6.37**	4.31	6.07*
	(4.40)	(3.02)	(4.26)	(3.02)	(4.04)	(3.08)
Wealth	1.87***	1.28***	1.93***	1.25***	3.04***	1.50***
	(0.55)	(0.39)	(0.57)	(0.40)	(0.67)	(0.38)
Education	-0.69	-0.25	-0.75	-0.41	-1.61**	-0.74*
	(0.57)	(0.37)	(0.57)	(0.36)	(0.65)	(0.43)
Male	0.11	0.26	0.09	0.24	-0.05	0.29
	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.23)	(0.18)	(0.24)	(0.20)
Urban Resident	-0.17	-0.07	-0.14	-0.01	0.46	-0.10
	(0.29)	(0.22)	(0.29)	(0.22)	(0.33)	(0.26)
Inverse Mills Ratio	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Internet Penetration (in the Community)	1.15	-2.29***	1.08	-2.25***	0.59	-2.44***

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments	Companies	Governments
	(1.00)	(0.78)	(1.00)	(0.77)	(1.16)	(0.79)
Longitude	-1.02	-2.29***	-1.01	-2.34***	-0.28	-2.32***
	(0.90)	(0.64)	(0.92)	(0.65)	(1.33)	(0.77)
Latitude	-0.22	2.52***	-0.25	2.59***	-0.30	2.44***
	(0.53)	(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.55)	(0.58)	(0.57)
County Altitude	0.09	-0.07	0.22	-0.24	0.57	-0.28
	(0.88)	(0.77)	(0.90)	(0.77)	(1.03)	(0.73)
Constant	-2.66***	2.09***	-2.80***	2.15***	-3.30***	2.19***
	(0.85)	(0.63)	(0.88)	(0.64)	(1.19)	(0.66)
Observations	2,959		2,792		2,464	

Notes: Companies refer to company involvement. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Data are weighted by sampling weights and stratification using svy command. All variables are recoded to run from 0 to 1. All models run on the subpopulation of respondents who are aware of the social credit system. The asterisks ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

References

Barslund, M. (2018). Checkrob: Stata module to perform robustness check of alternative specifications [Accessed May 2025]. https://econpapers.repec.org/software/bocbocode/s456837.htm

Neumayer, E., & Plümper, T. (2017). *Robustness tests for quantitative research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, R. (2024). Analyzing complex survey data: Some key issues to be aware of [Accessed May 2025]. https://www3.nd.edu/~rwilliam/xsoc73994/SvyCautionsX.pdf