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**Section A1. Additional tables and figures**

Table A0: Comparing the sample to German opinion polls

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Time Period | CDU/CSU | SPD | Greens | FDP | Die Linke | AfD | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Our sample | 29.9.21–17.10.21  | 13.5 | 25.9 | 13.9 | 11.0 | 8.1 | 15.1 | 12.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allensbach | 01.10.21–14.10.21 | 21.0  | 28.0  | 15.0  | 14.0 | 5.0  | 9.5  | 7.5 |
| KANTAR (Emnid) | 13.10.21 –19.10.21 | 21  | 25 | 16  | 13  | 5  | 11  | 9  |
| KANTAR (Emnid) | 06.10.21 –12.10.21 | 19  | 26  | 17  | 14  | 5  | 10  | 9  |
| KANTAR (Emnid) | 28.09.21 –05.10.21 | 20  | 26  | 17  | 13  | 5  | 10  | 9 |
| Forsa | 12.10.21–18.10.21 | 20  | 26  | 16  | 15  | 5  | 9  | 9  |
| Forsa | 05.10.21–11.10.21 | 20  | 26  | 16  | 14  | 5  | 9  | 10  |
| Forsa | 27.09.21–04.10.21 | 20  | 26  | 16  | 14  | 5  | 9  | 10  |
| Forschungsgruppe Wahlen | 12.10.21–14.10.21 | 19  | 28  | 17  | 13  | 5  | 11  | 7  |
| Forschungsgruppe Wahlen | 28.09.21–30.09.21 | 20  | 28  | 16  | 13  | 5  | 10  | 8  |
| INSA/YouGov | 15.10.21–18.10.21 | 18.5  | 28  | 16  | 15  | 5  | 11.5  | 6  |
| INSA/YouGov | 11.10.21–15.10.21 | 19  | 28  | 16  | 13  | 4  | 11  | 9  |
| INSA/YouGov | 08.10.21–11.10.21 | 19.5  | 28.5  | 16  | 14.5  | 4  | 11.5  | 6  |
| INSA/YouGov | 04.10.21–08.10.21 | 20  | 28  | 15  | 14  | 5  | 11  | 9  |
| INSA/YouGov | 01.10.21–04.10.21 | 21  | 28  | 15.5  | 13.5  | 4.5  | 11.5  | 6  |
| INSA/YouGov | 27.09.21–01.10.21 | 21  | 28  | 16  | 12  | 5  | 11  | 9  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Polls average |  | 19.9 | 27.2 | 16.0 | 13. 7 | 4.8 | 10.4 | 8.2 |
| Sample deviation |  | -6.4 | -1.3 | -2.1 | -2.7 | +3.3 | +4.7 | +4.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A1: Descriptive statistics for respondents who passed both attention checks

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
| Female | 2315 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Age | 2180 | 47.62 | 15.20 | 18 | 79 |
| Education | 2317 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0 | 1 |
| IMCP | 2307 | 3.48 | 0.97 | 1 | 5 |
| Immigration | 2312 | 4.74 | 2.64 | 0 | 10 |
| Left-Right | 2308 | 4.82 | 1.82 | 0 | 10 |
| Right Vote | 2318 | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0 | 1 |
| Christian ID | 1146\* | 2.88 | 0.93 | 1 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Only respondents who identified as Christians were asked about the strength of their Christian identity.

Table A2: Descriptive statistics for respondents who failed at least one attention check

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
| Female | 309 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Age | 296 | 42.09 | 14.88 | 18 | 83 |
| Education | 310 | 0.21 | 0.41 | 0 | 1 |
| IMCP | 305 | 3.22 | 0.85 | 1 | 5 |
| Immigration | 307 | 4.76 | 2.15 | 1 | 10 |
| Left-Right | 305 | 4.90 | 2.02 | 1 | 10 |
| Right Vote | 308 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0 | 1 |
| Christian ID | 169\* | 3.07 | 0.82 | 1 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Only respondents who identified as Christians were asked about the strength of their Christian identity.

Table A3: Predicting passing both attention checks (OLS)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE |
| Female | 0.005 | 0.02 |
| Age | 0.004 | 0.001\*\* |
| Education | 0.067 | 0.025\*\* |
| IMCP | 0.062 | 0.014\*\* |
| Immigration | -0.01 | 0.005+ |
| Left-Right | -0.002 | 0.006 |
| Right Vote | 0.044 | 0.032 |
| Christian ID | -0.032 | 0.01\*\* |
| Constant | 0.577 | 0.074\*\* |

Table A4: Balance check of local community center scenario (means)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No mention &PoliticiansN=235 | Hand on Heart &PoliticiansN=217 | No mention &Female politiciansN=224 | Hand on Heart &Female politiciansN=246 | p-value from anF-test |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passed Attention Check | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.90 | 0.89 | 0.51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.47 | 0.53 | 0.42 | 0.54 | 0.04\* |
| Age | 45.99 | 47.15 | 47.46 | 47.18 | 0.76 |
| Education | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.26 | 0.14 |
| IMCP | 3.51 | 3.45 | 3.46 | 3.46 | 0.91 |
| Immigration | 4.91 | 4.64 | 4.86 | 4.92 | 0.60 |
| Left-Right | 4.89 | 5.03 | 4.82 | 4.73 | 0.36 |
| Right Vote | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.41 |
| Christian ID | 2.98 | 2.97 | 2.84 | 2.92 | 0.67 |

Table A5: Balance check of local school scenario (means)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No mention &PoliticiansN=185 | Hand on Heart &PoliticiansN=198 | No mention &Female politiciansN=207 | Hand on Heart &Female politiciansN=228 | p-value from anF-test |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passed Attention Check | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.89 | 0.17 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.48 | 0.53 | 0.73 |
| Age | 47.01 | 45.57 | 48.26 | 47.22 | 0.39 |
| Education | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.78 |
| IMCP | 3.49 | 3.42 | 3.47 | 3.35 | 0.43 |
| Immigration | 4.66 | 4.62 | 4.85 | 4.54 | 0.68 |
| Left-Right | 4.65 | 4.78 | 4.73 | 5.05 | 0.11 |
| Right Vote | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.63 |
| Christian ID | 3.07 | 2.95 | 2.83 | 2.88 | 0.30 |

Table A6: Balance check of local company scenario (means)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No mention &PoliticiansN=229 | Hand on Heart &PoliticiansN=242 | No mention &Female politiciansN=223 | Hand on Heart &Female politiciansN=220 | p-value from anF-test |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passed Attention Check | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.52 | 0.51 | 0.72 |
| Age | 46.25 | 47.68 | 46.71 | 46.90 | 0.80 |
| Education | 0.21 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.68 |
| IMCP | 3.34 | 3.49 | 3.47 | 3.50 | 0.29 |
| Immigration | 4.48 | 4.82 | 4.76 | 4.80 | 0.47 |
| Left-Right | 4.84 | 4.75 | 4.86 | 4.74 | 0.86 |
| Right Vote | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.75 |
| Christian ID | 2.83 | 2.97 | 2.77 | 2.85 | 0.41 |



*Figure A1: Results of Handshaking Experiments by Respondents’ Gender. Estimates in percentage who are “rather in favor” or “fully in favor” of compulsory handshaking with 95% confidence intervals. Tests for difference between “no mention” and “hand on heart” are based on two-sided t-tests. + p <.1, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01. Except for “female politicians” effects of “hand on heart” do not differ significantly across gender.*

**Section A2. Description of data collection and compliance with ethical guidelines**

Data collection was carried out in the online panel recruited and maintained by the market research company, Respondi AG. Participation in the panel is by voluntary informed consent. The company complies with guidelines ensuring data-protection in online research, among them the ESOMAR/GRBN global guidelines for online research:

<https://ana.esomar.org/documents/esomar-grbn-global-guideline-on-online-research->.

Participants receive a small fee/incentive for each study they complete.

In Germany a review of questionnaires by a human subjects committee is not required prior to fielding a study. One of the handshaking-experiments was reviewed and approved by the scientific committee of the Norwegian Citizen Panel at the University of Bergen as compliant with ethical guidelines applicable in Norway.

**Section A3. OLS Regression results in tabular form**

Table A7: OLS Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Full Sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=797) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.438 | 0.031\*\* | 0.538 | 0.07\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.079 | 0.045+ | -0.054 | 0.047 |
| Female Politicians | 0.325 | 0.045\*\* | 0.337 | 0.047\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.164 | 0.063\*\* | -0.194 | 0.066\*\* |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.056 | 0.034+ |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.002 | 0.001 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.038 | 0.042 |
| b) Local School (N=717) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.519 | 0.036\*\* | 0.684 | 0.077\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.105 | 0.05\* | -0.094 | 0.052+ |
| Female Teachers | 0.182 | 0.049\*\* | 0.199 | 0.051\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers | -0.091 | 0.069 | -0.123 | 0.071+ |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.026 | 0.036 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.003 | 0.001\* |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.125 | 0.045\*\* |
| c) Local Company (N=802) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.594 | 0.032\*\* | 0.693 | 0.069\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.185 | 0.044\*\* | -0.181 | 0.045\*\* |
| Female HR Managers | 0.151 | 0.045\*\* | 0.159 | 0.046\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers | -0.028 | 0.064 | -0.032 | 0.065 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.065 | 0.033+ |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.001 | 0.001 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.024 | 0.041 |

Table A8: OLS Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Passed Attention Check.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=797) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.441\*\* | 0.034 | 0.539\*\* | 0.077 |
| Hand on Heart | -0.085+ | 0.049 | -0.058 | 0.051 |
| Female Politicians | 0.331\*\* | 0.048 | 0.341\*\* | 0.05 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.156\* | 0.068 | -0.173\* | 0.07 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.075\* | 0.036 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.001 | 0.001 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.061 | 0.045 |
| b) Local School (N=717) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.503\*\* | 0.037 | 0.607\*\* | 0.084 |
| Hand on Heart | -0.133\* | 0.053 | -0.118\* | 0.054 |
| Female Teachers | 0.215\*\* | 0.052 | 0.235\*\* | 0.054 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers | -0.088 | 0.073 | -0.123 | 0.075 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.028 | 0.038 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.001 | 0.001 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.118\*\* | 0.048 |
| c) Local Company (N=802) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.598\*\* | 0.034 | 0.65\*\* | 0.076 |
| Hand on Heart | -0.23\*\* | 0.047 | -0.223\*\* | 0.049 |
| Female HR Managers | 0.142\*\* | 0.048 | 0.157\*\* | 0.049 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers | 0.034 | 0.068 | 0.019 | 0.07 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.047 | 0.036 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.001 | 0.001 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.022 | 0.044 |

**Section A4. Logistic regression results in tabular form**

Table A9: Logit Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Full Sample.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=913) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.8 | 0.539 | 1.15 | 0.619+ |
| Hand on Heart | 0.966 | 0.787 | 1.018 | 0.798 |
| Female Politicians | -0.217 | 0.784 | -0.035 | 0.806 |
| IMCP | -0.296 | 0.15\* | -0.28 | 0.154+ |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 0.089 | 1.101 | -0.225 | 1.136 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | -0.403 | 0.224+ | -0.387 | 0.228+ |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.47 | 0.221\* | 0.443 | 0.228+ |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | -0.217 | 0.312 | -0.172 | 0.322 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.157 | 0.152 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.008 | 0.005 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.062 | 0.192 |
| b) Local School (N=808) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 3.023 | 0.672\*\* | 4.058 | 0.807\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -1.255 | 0.881 | -1.519 | 0.938 |
| Female Politicians | -1.254 | 0.908 | -1.46 | 0.964 |
| IMCP | -0.845 | 0.185\*\* | -0.935 | 0.201\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 2.324 | 1.216+ | 2.331 | 1.273+ |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | 0.206 | 0.248 | 0.282 | 0.262 |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.585 | 0.248\* | 0.658 | 0.262\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | -0.784 | 0.341\* | -0.809 | 0.355\* |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.042 | 0.162 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.014 | 0.006\* |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.203 | 0.206 |
| c) Local Company (N=902) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 1.789 | 0.514\*\* | 2.47 | 0.624\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | 0.445 | 0.749 | 0.517 | 0.784 |
| Female Politicians | 0.343 | 0.82 | 0.07 | 0.841 |
| IMCP | -0.418 | 0.145\*\* | -0.467 | 0.151\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -1.325 | 1.123 | -1.205 | 1.159 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | -0.339 | 0.211 | -0.361 | 0.22 |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.122 | 0.225 | 0.21 | 0.231 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.315 | 0.31 | 0.275 | 0.321 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.183 | 0.151 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.009 | 0.005+ |
| Education | -- | -- | 0.094 | 0.19 |

Note:  +p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table A10: Logit Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Full Sample.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=910) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.443 | 0.298 | 1.18 | 0.451\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | 0.268 | 0.429 | 0.145 | 0.452 |
| Female Politicians | 0.865 | 0.456+ | 0.646 | 0.483 |
| Immigration Attitudes | -0.139 | 0.055\* | -0.194 | 0.06\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.078 | 0.642 | 0.004 | 0.675 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | -0.154 | 0.085+ | -0.11 | 0.089 |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.114 | 0.083 | 0.177 | 0.088\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | -0.103 | 0.121 | -0.15 | 0.127 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.22 | 0.155 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.009 | 0.005+ |
| Education | -- | -- | 0.094 | 0.198 |
| b) Local School (N=813) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 1.338 | 0.338\*\* | 2.25 | 0.491\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.734 | 0.445+ | -0.741 | 0.483 |
| Female Politicians | 0.298 | 0.489 | 0.296 | 0.527 |
| Immigration Attitudes | -0.273 | 0.063\*\* | -0.308 | 0.07\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 0.567 | 0.646 | 0.351 | 0.688 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | 0.058 | 0.085 | 0.064 | 0.092 |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.12 | 0.087 | 0.136 | 0.094 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | -0.225 | 0.12+ | -0.2 | 0.127 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.187 | 0.162 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.013 | 0.006\* |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.175 | 0.205 |
| c) Local Company (N=908) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 1.35 | 0.312\*\* | 1.771 | 0.427\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.616 | 0.426 | -0.345 | 0.444 |
| Female Politicians | 0.358 | 0.474 | 0.365 | 0.484 |
| Immigration Attitudes | -0.214 | 0.059\*\* | -0.205 | 0.06\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.35 | 0.63 | -0.527 | 0.651 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | -0.023 | 0.081 | -0.08 | 0.084 |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.082 | 0.086 | 0.088 | 0.088 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.025 | 0.116 | 0.058 | 0.12 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.27 | 0.15+ |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.008 | 0.005 |
| Education | -- | -- | 0.141 | 0.19 |

Note:  +p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table A11: Logit Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Full Sample.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=913) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -1.082 | 0.388\*\* | -0.666 | 0.494 |
| Hand on Heart | -1.155 | 0.62+ | -1.191 | 0.655+ |
| Female Politicians | 2.208 | 0.603\*\* | 2.303 | 0.643\*\* |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 0.172 | 0.074\* | 0.166 | 0.077\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -1.191 | 0.869 | -1.397 | 0.934 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.146 | 0.114 | 0.174 | 0.121 |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | -0.156 | 0.116 | -0.159 | 0.123 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.119 | 0.166 | 0.128 | 0.178 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.219 | 0.153 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.007 | 0.005 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.077 | 0.191 |
| b) Local School (N=808) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -0.102 | 0.426 | 0.534 | 0.533 |
| Hand on Heart | -0.725 | 0.600 | -0.85 | 0.625 |
| Female Politicians | 0.44 | 0.608 | 0.474 | 0.633 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 0.039 | 0.086 | 0.041 | 0.089 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.907 | 0.850 | -0.56 | 0.883 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.058 | 0.119 | 0.093 | 0.124 |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.073 | 0.123 | 0.083 | 0.128 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | -0.055 | 0.183 | -0.008 | 0.174 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.095 | 0.155 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.011 | 0.006\* |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.463 | 0.195\* |
| c) Local Company (N=906) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -0.006 | 0.363 | 0.467 | 0.469 |
| Hand on Heart | -1.557 | 0.555\*\* | -1.602 | 0.567\*\* |
| Female Politicians | 0.527 | 0.546 | 0.55 | 0.554 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 0.074 | 0.07 | 0.063 | 0.072 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 0.516 | 0.782 | 0.642 | 0.801 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.174 | 0.108 | 0.185 | 0.11+ |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.04 | 0.107 | 0.045 | 0.109 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | -0.006 | 0.363 | -0.186 | 0.157 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.281 | 0.148+ |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.006 | 0.005 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.019 | 0.184 |

Note:  +p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table A12: Logit Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Passed Attention Check.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=795) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.974 | 0.581+ | 1.348 | 0.677\* |
| Hand on Heart | 1.807 | 0.905\* | 1.931 | 0.919\* |
| Female Politicians | -0.3 | 0.843 | -0.076 | 0.867 |
| IMCP | -0.342 | 0.159\* | -0.315 | 0.163+ |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.282 | 1.241 | -0.537 | 1.285 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | -0.659 | 0.258\* | -0.662 | 0.261\* |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.496 | 0.234\* | 0.457 | 0.241+ |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | -0.082 | 0.348 | -0.036 | 0.36 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.263 | 0.167 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.008 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.133 | 0.21 |
| b) Local School (N=714) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 2.969 | 0.687\*\* | 3.764 | 0.837\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -1.222 | 0.912 | -1.463 | 0.972 |
| Female Politicians | -0.879 | 0.985 | -1.008 | 1.046 |
| IMCP | -0.843 | 0.189\*\* | -0.922 | 0.206\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 2.399 | 1.321+ | 2.333 | 1.385+ |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | 0.157 | 0.258 | 0.231 | 0.274 |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.519 | 0.267+ | 0.575 | 0.282\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | -0.792 | 0.368\* | -0.801 | 0.384\* |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.035 | 0.176 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.01 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.205 | 0.224 |
| c) Local Company (N=796) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 2.135 | 0.555\*\* | 2.702 | 0.685\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | 0.27 | 0.81 | 0.337 | 0.85 |
| Female Politicians | 0.776 | 0.924 | 0.535 | 0.954 |
| IMCP | -0.507 | 0.154\*\* | -0.566 | 0.162\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -1.487 | 1.245 | -1.334 | 1.29 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | -0.348 | 0.228 | -0.364 | 0.238 |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | -0.007 | 0.248 | 0.078 | 0.256 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.433 | 0.339 | 0.371 | 0.353 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.119 | 0.164 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.007 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | 0.167 | 0.208 |

Note:  +p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table A13: Logit Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Passed the Attention Check

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=792) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.677 | 0.324\* | 1.419 | 0.495\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | 0.415 | 0.479 | 0.374 | 0.503 |
| Female Politicians | 0.873 | 0.496+ | 0.684 | 0.522 |
| Immigration Attitudes | -0.187 | 0.06\*\* | -0.232 | 0.065\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.356 | 0.702 | -0.271 | 0.737 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | -0.204 | 0.096\* | -0.179 | 0.101+ |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.12 | 0.088 | 0.178 | 0.094+ |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | -0.024 | 0.132 | -0.057 | 0.139 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.353 | 0.171\* |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.009 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | 0.053 | 0.217 |
| b) Local School (N=717) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 1.402 | 0.349\*\* | 2.064 | 0.525\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.855 | 0.462+ | -0.864 | 0.504+ |
| Female Politicians | 0.287 | 0.522 | 0.327 | 0.569 |
| Immigration Attitudes | -0.299 | 0.066\*\* | -0.337 | 0.073\*\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 0.797 | 0.69 | 0.513 | 0.74 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | 0.049 | 0.09 | 0.058 | 0.098 |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.152 | 0.093 | 0.163 | 0.1 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | -0.263 | 0.129\* | -0.229 | 0.137+ |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.186 | 0.177 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.008 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.147 | 0.225 |
| c) Local Company (N=800) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 1.572 | 0.339\*\* | 1.788 | 0.47\*\* |
| Hand on Heart | -0.801 | 0.461+ | -0.523 | 0.479 |
| Female Politicians | 0.291 | 0.51 | 0.304 | 0.522 |
| Immigration Attitudes | -0.254 | 0.063\*\* | -0.247 | 0.064+ |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 0.001 | 0.681 | -0.156 | 0.706 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | -0.031 | 0.088 | -0.084 | 0.092 |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.087 | 0.092 | 0.096 | 0.094 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.013 | 0.125 | 0.032 | 0.13 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.193 | 0.163 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.004 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | 0.216 | 0.208 |

Note:  +p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table A14: Logit Results: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]. Passed the Attention Check

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Est. | SE | Est. | SE |
| a) Local Community Center (N=793) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -1.213 | 0.423\*\* | -0.724 | 0.537 |
| Hand on Heart | -1.243 | 0.699+ | -1.365 | 0.741+ |
| Female Politicians | 2.389 | 0.655\*\* | 2.545 | 0.704\*\* |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 0.199 | 0.08\* | 0.192 | 0.084\* |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -1.282 | 0.959 | -1.294 | 1.032 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.154 | 0.128 | 0.199 | 0.136 |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | -0.186 | 0.126 | -0.203 | 0.134 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.149 | 0.182 | 0.133 | 0.195 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.338 | 0.166\* |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.007 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.144 | 0.208 |
| b) Local School (N=714) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -0.273 | 0.437 | 0.167 | 0.56 |
| Hand on Heart | -1.202 | 0.672+ | -1.31 | 0.704+ |
| Female Politicians | 0.343 | 0.638 | 0.351 | 0.666 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 0.064 | 0.088 | 0.07 | 0.09 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | -0.173 | 0.931 | 0.245 | 0.971 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.122 | 0.13 | 0.155 | 0.136 |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.127 | 0.131 | 0.147 | 0.137 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | -0.055 | 0.183 | -0.17 | 0.191 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.117 | 0.168 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.007 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.456 | 0.212\* |
| c) Local Company (N=799) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.003 | 0.397 | 0.29 | 0.515 |
| Hand on Heart | -1.786 | 0.622\*\* | -1.865 | 0.637\*\* |
| Female Politicians | 0.348 | 0.588 | 0.404 | 0.598 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 0.081 | 0.078 | 0.071 | 0.081 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 0.945 | 0.858 | 1.129 | 0.882 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.181 | 0.122 | 0.202 | 0.125 |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 0.067 | 0.118 | 0.072 | 0.121 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | -0.189 | 0.171 | -0.243 | 0.176 |
| Female | -- | -- | -0.209 | 0.159 |
| Age | -- | -- | -0.003 | 0.006 |
| Education | -- | -- | -0.027 | 0.198 |

Note:  +p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

**Section A5. Replications**

Table A15: Replication of Handshaking Experiment Where Muslim Women Refuse to Shake Hands with Men: Should be Asked to Shake Hands [%]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No Mention | Hand on Heart |
| Muslim females refused to shake male guests’ hands | 44.9(N=461) | 35.2\*\*(N=452) |
| Muslim males refused to shake female guests’ hands | 64.7(N=453) | 47.0\*\*(N=462) |

\*\* t-test ‘No Mention’ vs. ‘Hand on Heart’ p <.0



*Figure A2: Replication of the Handshaking Experiment using a probability sample from Norway . Estimates in percentage who are “rather in favor” or “fully in favor” of compulsory handshaking with 95% confidence intervals. Tests for difference between “no mention” and “hand on heart” are based on two-sided t-tests. \*\* p<.01. The results replicate.*

**Section A6. Testing the ‘parallel regression’ assumption**

Table A16: Brant test of null hypothesis that the ‘parallel regression’ assumption holds.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | $χ$2 | df | p |
| a) Local Community Center |  |  |  |
| Model | 48.45 | 14 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart | 2.4 | 2 | 0.3 |
| Female Politicians | 0.6 | 2 | 0.74 |
| IMCP | 6.22 | 2 | 0.04 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 4.47 | 2 | 0.11 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | 1.34 | 2 | 0.51 |
| Female Politicians x IMCP | 0.12 | 2 | 0.94 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x IMCP | 2.54 | 2 | 0.28 |
|  |  |  |  |
| b) Local School |  |  |  |
| Model | 20.09 | 14 | 0.13 |
| Hand on Heart | 4.97 | 2 | 0.08 |
| Female Teachers | 1.89 | 2 | 0.39 |
| IMCP | 5.45 | 2 | 0.07 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers | 1.82 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | 6.1 | 2 | 0.05 |
| Female Teachers x IMCP | 3.16 | 2 | 0.21 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers x IMCP | 3.69 | 2 | 0.16 |
|  |  |  |  |
| c) Local Company |  |  |  |
| Model | 18.18 | 14 | 0.2 |
| Hand on Heart | 5.05 | 2 | 0.08 |
| Female HR Managers | 2.75 | 2 | 0.25 |
| IMCP | 3.84 | 2 | 0.15 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers | 3.93 | 2 | 0.14 |
| Hand on Heart x IMCP | 3.44 | 2 | 0.18 |
| Female HR Managers x IMCP | 2.17 | 2 | 0.34 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers x IMCP | 3.33 | 2 | 0.19 |

Table A17: Brant test of null hypothesis that the ‘parallel regression’ assumption holds.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | $χ$2 | df | p |
| a) Local Community Center |  |  |  |
| Model | 55.11 | 14 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart | 2.8 | 2 | 0.25 |
| Female Politicians | 5.15 | 2 | 0.08 |
| Immigration Attitudes | 4.17 | 2 | 0.12 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 5.26 | 2 | 0.07 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | 0.97 | 2 | 0.62 |
| Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 0.71 | 2 | 0.7 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Immigration Attitudes | 1.61 | 2 | 0.45 |
|  |  |  |  |
| b) Local School |  |  |  |
| Model | 24.89 | 14 | 0.04 |
| Hand on Heart | 3.1 | 2 | 0.21 |
| Female Teachers | 2.79 | 2 | 0.25 |
| Immigration Attitudes | 6.89 | 2 | 0.03 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers | 0.09 | 2 | 0.95 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | 5.66 | 2 | 0.06 |
| Female Teachers x Immigration Attitudes | 2.92 | 2 | 0.23 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers x Immigration Attitudes | 2.39 | 2 | 0.3 |
|  |  |  |  |
| c) Local Company |  |  |  |
| Model | 45.83 | 14 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart | 11.18 | 2 | 0 |
| Female HR Managers | 1.29 | 2 | 0.52 |
| Immigration Attitudes | 11.47 | 2 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers | 3.82 | 2 | 0.15 |
| Hand on Heart x Immigration Attitudes | 9.62 | 2 | 0.01 |
| Female HR Managers x Immigration Attitudes | 0.11 | 2 | 0.95 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers x Immigration Attitudes | 2.55 | 2 | 0.28 |

Table A18: Brant test of null hypothesis that the ‘parallel regression’ assumption holds.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | $χ$2 | df | p |
| a) Local Community Center |  |  |  |
| Model | 44.42 | 14 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart | 2.57 | 2 | 0.28 |
| Female Politicians | 5.95 | 2 | 0.05 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 3.91 | 2 | 0.14 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians | 1.24 | 2 | 0.54 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 5.5 | 2 | 0.06 |
| Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 3.83 | 2 | 0.15 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Politicians x Left-Right-Ideology | 1.01 | 2 | 0.6 |
|  |  |  |  |
| b) Local School |  |  |  |
| Model | 45.13 | 14 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart | 14.08 | 2 | 0 |
| Female Teachers | 4.73 | 2 | 0.09 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 2.34 | 2 | 0.31 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers | 11.82 | 2 | 0 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 16.03 | 2 | 0 |
| Female Teachers x Left-Right-Ideology | 1.25 | 2 | 0.54 |
| Hand on Heart x Female Teachers x Left-Right-Ideology | 9.05 | 2 | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |
| c) Local Company |  |  |  |
| Model | 19.79 | 14 | 0.14 |
| Hand on Heart | 4.95 | 2 | 0.08 |
| Female HR Managers | 2.02 | 2 | 0.36 |
| Left-Right-Ideology | 7.63 | 2 | 0.02 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers | 3.3 | 2 | 0.19 |
| Hand on Heart x Left-Right-Ideology | 3.49 | 2 | 0.17 |
| Female HR Managers x Left-Right-Ideology | 1.61 | 2 | 0.45 |
| Hand on Heart x Female HR Managers x Left-Right-Ideology | 1.61 | 2 | 0.45 |