

Supplementary Material for
Internet voting: the role of personality traits and trust across three parliamentary elections in Estonia

Cornelia Sindermann*, Dmitri Rozgonjuk, Mihkel Solvak[#], Anu Realo, Kristjan Vassil

Journal Name: Current Psychology

*** Corresponding author:** Cornelia Sindermann, Institute of Psychology and Education, Ulm University, Helmholtzstraße 8/1, 89081 Ulm, Germany. Tel.: 0049 (0)731 50 26554, E-mail: cornelia.sindermann@uni-ulm.de.

Corresponding author: Mihkel Solvak, Johann Skytte Institute of Political Science, University of Tartu, Lossi 36, Tartu 51003, Estonia. E-mail: mihkel.solvak@ut.ee.

Data Cleaning

Data used in the present study are derived from a bigger project for which data were collected in Estonia after each election in which internet voting was possible. Hence, data collection for the bigger project started in 2005 after the local elections. Data related to each election consist of independent samples. This means that data was (and still is) collected cross-sectionally rather than longitudinally.

Personality scores were only assessed in the surveys after some elections; these were: the 2011 national elections, 2013 local elections, 2014 European Parliament elections, 2015 national elections, and 2019 national elections. To parallelize analyses with regard to election type, we focused on data collected after national elections in 2011, 2015, and 2019. This is important because only Estonian citizens can cast a vote in national elections, while residents (with a permanent residency) can participate in local and European elections. The samples recruited after the national elections in 2011, 2015, and 2019 included a total of $N = 3,014$ individuals.

All participants provided information on age and gender. However, two ($n = 2$) individuals were excluded due to not providing valid data on their educational background. An additional $n = 25$ individuals were excluded because they did respond with “don’t know”/“refusal” to the variable on PC literacy. Moreover, $n = 503$ additional individuals were excluded because of missing data when asked about their income decile. No additional participant was excluded due to missing data related to the language spoken at home. However, $n = 451$ were excluded because of invalid data on their trust in internet voting. In addition, $n = 70$ individuals were excluded due to missing data in the personality items, and $n = 400$ were removed from the dataset due to not having voted in the respective elections (descriptive statistics of those individuals are only presented in Supplementary Table 3 for transparency).

This leads to a final sample size of $N = 1,563$ individuals: $N = 482$ ($n_{\text{males}} = 189$, $n_{\text{females}} = 293$; $M_{\text{age}} = 49.11$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 15.71$) participants recruited after the national elections in 2011, $N = 535$ ($n_{\text{males}} = 237$, $n_{\text{females}} = 298$; $M_{\text{age}} = 50.66$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 17.24$) participants recruited after the national elections in 2015, and $N = 546$ ($n_{\text{males}} = 255$, $n_{\text{females}} = 291$; $M_{\text{age}} = 49.18$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 15.66$) participants recruited after the national elections in 2019. More specific descriptive statistics of the three samples are presented in Table 1 in the Main Manuscript.

An a-priori power analysis was not implemented for this specific research endeavor. Sensitivity analysis revealed that with a sample of $N = 482$, correlations down to $|\text{.09}|$ can be detected (two-tailed, α -error probability = 0.05, power = 0.80).

Statistical Analysis – R packages used

The *dplyr* package was used for data manipulation (Wickham et al., 2021). Descriptive statistics for all variables were calculated using the *psych* package (Revelle, 2021). For Mann-Whitney *U*-tests, *t*-tests, and χ^2 -tests, the packages *car* and *gmodels* were used (Fox & Weisberg, 2019; Warnes et al., 2018). Zero-order bivariate Spearman correlations were calculated using the *Hmisc* package (Harrell & with contributions from Charles Dupont and many others, 2021). For path analysis, we used the *lavaan* package (Rosseel, 2012).

Correlations between the Big Five and Trust in Internet Voting

Supplementary Table 1

Zero-order Spearman correlations between TIPI scales and trust in internet voting in the three samples recruited after different national elections

	2011 (<i>N</i> = 482)	2015 (<i>N</i> = 535)	2019 (<i>N</i> = 546)
Openness	$\rho = 0.15$, $p < .001$	$\rho = 0.11$, $p = .008$	$\rho = 0.06$, $p = .193$
Conscientiousness	$\rho = -0.04$, $p = .389$	$\rho = -0.01$, $p = .798$	$\rho = -0.06$, $p = .156$
Extraversion	$\rho = 0.06$, $p = .155$	$\rho = 0.08$, $p = .073$	$\rho = 0.12$, $p = .006$
Agreeableness (2-item scale score)	$\rho = 0.06$, $p = .214$	$\rho = 0.02$, $p = .631$	$\rho = 0.03$, $p = .460$
Agreeableness (1-item score)	$\rho = 0.10$, $p = .027$	$\rho = 0.11$, $p = .010$	$\rho = 0.10$, $p = .022$
Neuroticism	$\rho = -0.10$, $p = .036$	$\rho = -0.13$, $p = .003$	$\rho = -0.07$, $p = .122$

Note. The 1-item Agreeableness score is based on the reverse coded item on being critical, quarrelsome.

Differences between Internet Voters and Other Voters

Supplementary Table 2

Descriptive statistics of internet voters and other voters in the three samples recruited after different national elections

	<u>2011</u> <u>(N = 482)</u>			<u>2015</u> <u>(N = 535)</u>			<u>2019</u> <u>(N = 546)</u>		
	Other voters (n = 200)	Internet voters (n = 282)	Difference statistics	Other voters (n = 390)	Internet voters (n = 145)	Difference statistics	Other voters (n = 272)	Internet voters (n = 274)	Difference statistics
Personality									
Openness	M = 3.22, SD = 0.86	M = 3.50, SD = 0.83	t(480) = -3.57, p < .001	M = 3.37, SD = 0.83	M = 3.52, SD = 0.74	t(287.61) = -1.97, p = .050	M = 3.57, SD = 0.82	M = 3.66, SD = 0.80	t(544) = -1.23, p = .218
Conscientiousness	M = 4.51, SD = 0.60	M = 4.41, SD = 0.65	t(480) = 1.76, p = .079	M = 4.20, SD = 0.67	M = 4.22, SD = 0.64	t(533) = -0.38, p = .703	M = 4.38, SD = 0.68	M = 4.42, SD = 0.58	t(531.03) = -0.79, p = .427
Extraversion	M = 3.81, SD = 0.90	M = 3.86, SD = 0.88	t(480) = -0.60, p = .551	M = 3.68, SD = 0.88	M = 3.68, SD = 0.87	t(533) = 0.09, p = .930	M = 3.70, SD = 0.94	M = 3.92, SD = 0.78	t(524.37) = -2.88, p = .004
Agreeableness (2-item scale score)	M = 4.00, SD = 0.75	M = 3.87, SD = 0.71	t(480) = 1.93, p = .054	M = 3.83, SD = 0.66	M = 3.74, SD = 0.70	t(533) = 1.26, p = .209	M = 3.84, SD = 0.68	M = 3.95, SD = 0.64	t(541.65) = -1.96, p = .051
Agreeableness (1-item score)	M = 3.58, SD = 1.25	M = 3.46, SD = 1.16	W = 29,876, p = .252; $\chi^2(4) = 6.77$, p = .149	M = 3.47, SD = 1.06	M = 3.43, SD = 1.02	W = 29,045, p = .614; $\chi^2(4) = 1.32$, p = .859	M = 3.33, SD = 1.08	M = 3.58, SD = 1.01	W = 32,416, p = .005; $\chi^2(4) = 9.02$, p = .061
Neuroticism	M = 2.14, SD = 0.93	M = 2.14, SD = 0.92	t(480) = 0.02, p = .984	M = 2.48, SD = 0.91	M = 2.26, SD = 0.79	t(533) = 2.63, p = .009	M = 2.28, SD = 0.93	M = 2.15, SD = 0.78	t(527.43) = 1.81, p = .070
Trust in internet voting	M = 2.52, SD = 1.13	M = 3.54, SD = 0.64	W = 13,807, p < .001; $\chi^2(3) = 127.82$, p < .001	M = 2.49, SD = 1.13	M = 3.56, SD = 0.68	W = 13,142, p < .001; $\chi^2(3) = 100.86$, p < .001	M = 2.53, SD = 1.18	M = 3.62, SD = 0.63	W = 18,002, p < .001; $\chi^2(3) = 136.83$, p < .001
Age	M = 55.77, SD = 15.47	M = 44.39, SD = 14.11	t(480) = 8.38, p < .001	M = 51.87, SD = 17.46	M = 47.41, SD = 16.26	t(533) = 2.67, p = .008	M = 51.79, SD = 15.88	M = 46.59, SD = 15.02	t(544) = 3.93, p < .001

Gender	F: 142 (71%) M: 58 (29%)	F: 151 (54%) M: 131 (47%)	$\chi^2(1) = 14.23,$ $p < .001$	F: 227 (58%) M: 163 (42%)	F: 71 (49%) M: 74 (51%)	$\chi^2(1) = 3.29,$ $p = .070$	F: 135 (50%) M: 137 (50%)	F: 156 (57%) M: 118 (43%)	$\chi^2(1) = 2.64,$ $p = .104$
Language spoken at home	O: 30 (15%) E: 170 (85%)	O: 16 (6%) E: 266 (94%)	$\chi^2(1) = 10.73,$ $p = .001$	O: 82 (21%) E: 308 (79%)	O: 13 (9%) E: 132 (91%)	$\chi^2(1) = 9.72,$ $p = .002$	O: 49 (18%) E: 223 (82%)	O: 20 (7%) E: 254 (93%)	$\chi^2(1) = 13.24,$ $p < .001$
Education	I: 8 (4%) II: 46 (23%) III: 87 (44%) IV: 59 (30%)	I: 11 (4%) II: 37 (13%) III: 61 (22%) IV: 173 (61%)	$\chi^2(3) = 49.52,$ $p < .001$	I: 52 (13%) II: 85 (22%) III: 131 (34%) IV: 122 (31%)	I: 13 (9%) II: 30 (21%) III: 34 (23%) IV: 68 (47%)	$\chi^2(3) = 12.50,$ $p = .006$	I: 14 (5%) II: 165 (61%) III: 5 (2%) IV: 88 (32%)	I: 6 (2%) II: 109 (40%) III: 3 (1%) IV: 156 (57%)	$\chi^2(3) = 34.09,$ $p < .001$
Income deciles	$M = 2.85,$ $SD = 2.90$	$M = 5.65,$ $SD = 3.44$	$W = 15,996,$ $p < .001$	$M = 5.15,$ $SD = 2.75$	$M = 6.13,$ $SD = 2.85$	$W = 22,670,$ $p < .001$	$M = 5.13,$ $SD = 2.75$	$M = 6.28,$ $SD = 2.44$	$W = 28,452,$ $p < .001$
PC literacy	$M = 2.80,$ $SD = 1.14$	$M = 3.73,$ $SD = 0.99$	$W = 15,528,$ $p < .001;$ $\chi^2(4) = 81.36,$ $p < .001$	$M = 3.11,$ $SD = 1.19$	$M = 3.81,$ $SD = 0.86$	$W = 18,596,$ $p < .001;$ $\chi^2(4) = 46.89,$ $p < .001$	$M = 3.52,$ $SD = 1.11$	$M = 4.18,$ $SD = 0.82$	$W = 24,764,$ $p < .001;$ $\chi^2(4) = 56.65,$ $p < .001$

Note. Gender: F = Female, M = Male; Language: O = Others, E = Estonian; Education: I = Elementary/basic, II = Secondary education, III = Vocational secondary education, IV = Higher. If percentages do not add up to 100%, this is due to rounding. The 1-item Agreeableness score is based on the reverse coded item on being critical, quarrelsome.

Supplementary Table 3

Descriptive statistics of non-voters in the three samples recruited after different national elections

	2011 (<i>n</i> = 191)	2015 (<i>n</i> = 101)	2019 (<i>n</i> = 108)
Personality			
Openness	<i>M</i> = 3.38, <i>SD</i> = 0.98	<i>M</i> = 3.35, <i>SD</i> = 0.90	<i>M</i> = 3.63, <i>SD</i> = 0.86
Conscientiousness	<i>M</i> = 4.32, <i>SD</i> = 0.73	<i>M</i> = 4.02, <i>SD</i> = 0.75	<i>M</i> = 4.47, <i>SD</i> = 0.65
Extraversion	<i>M</i> = 3.67, <i>SD</i> = 1.03	<i>M</i> = 3.62, <i>SD</i> = 0.82	<i>M</i> = 3.65, <i>SD</i> = 0.98
Agreeableness (2-item scale score)	<i>M</i> = 3.84, <i>SD</i> = 0.82	<i>M</i> = 3.64, <i>SD</i> = 0.70	<i>M</i> = 3.69, <i>SD</i> = 0.71
Agreeableness (1-item score)	<i>M</i> = 3.32, <i>SD</i> = 1.27	<i>M</i> = 3.18, <i>SD</i> = 1.07	<i>M</i> = 3.16, <i>SD</i> = 1.03
Neuroticism	<i>M</i> = 2.34, <i>SD</i> = 1.00	<i>M</i> = 2.55, <i>SD</i> = 0.90	<i>M</i> = 2.21, <i>SD</i> = 0.97
Trust in internet voting	<i>M</i> = 2.68, <i>SD</i> = 1.09	<i>M</i> = 2.51, <i>SD</i> = 1.08	<i>M</i> = 2.69, <i>SD</i> = 1.09
Age	<i>M</i> = 45.53, <i>SD</i> = 17.12	<i>M</i> = 41.97, <i>SD</i> = 17.58	<i>M</i> = 40.50, <i>SD</i> = 15.73
Gender	F: 97 (51%) M: 94 (49%)	F: 50 (50%) M: 51 (51%)	F: 53 (49%) M: 55 (51%)
Language	O: 39 (20%) E: 152 (80%)	O: 18 (18%) E: 83 (82%)	O: 26 (24%) E: 82 (76%)
Education	I: 26 (14%) II: 46 (24%) III: 78 (41%) IV: 41 (22%)	I: 26 (26%) II: 25 (25%) III: 34 (34%) IV: 16 (16%)	I: 13 (12%) II: 70 (65%) III: 1 (0.1%) IV: 24 (22%)
Income deciles	<i>M</i> = 3.88, <i>SD</i> = 3.19	<i>M</i> = 4.95, <i>SD</i> = 2.99	<i>M</i> = 5.73, <i>SD</i> = 2.78
PC literacy	<i>M</i> = 3.05, <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 3.32, <i>SD</i> = 1.22	<i>M</i> = 3.74, <i>SD</i> = 1.12

Note. Gender: F = Female, M = Male; Language: O = Others, E = Estonian; Education: I = Elementary/basic, II = Secondary education, III = Vocational secondary education, IV = Higher. If percentages do not add up to 100%, this is due to rounding. The 1-item Agreeableness score is based on the reverse coded item on being critical, quarrelsome.

Path Analysis

Supplementary Table 4

Statistics of path analysis in the sample recruited after the 2011 national elections

Regressions:		Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others							
Openness	(c1)	0.076	0.091	0.840	.401	0.076	0.050
Conscientiousness	(c2)	-0.054	0.100	-0.536	.592	-0.054	-0.026
Extraversion	(c3)	-0.097	0.080	-1.221	.222	-0.097	-0.066
Agreeableness (1-item score)	(c4)	-0.107	0.059	-1.792	.073	-0.107	-0.098
Neuroticism	(c5)	0.063	0.065	0.978	.328	0.063	0.045
Trust in internet voting	(b1)	0.517	0.057	9.002	< .001	0.517	0.401
Age	(c6)	-0.019	0.006	-3.429	.001	-0.019	-0.231
Gender	(c7)	0.305	0.139	2.191	.028	0.305	0.114
Language spoken at home	(c8)	0.623	0.243	2.567	.010	0.623	0.140
Education	(c9)	0.201	0.076	2.652	.008	0.201	0.134
Income deciles	(c10)	0.100	0.021	4.810	.000	0.100	0.268
PC Literacy	(c11)	0.182	0.082	2.210	.027	0.182	0.159
Trust in internet voting							
Openness	(a1)	0.063	0.080	0.782	.434	0.063	0.053
Conscientiousness	(a2)	-0.137	0.092	-1.482	.138	-0.137	-0.085
Extraversion	(a3)	-0.083	0.069	-1.204	.228	-0.083	-0.073
Agreeableness (1-item score)	(a4)	0.104	0.049	2.107	.035	0.104	0.123
Neuroticism	(a5)	-0.098	0.060	-1.636	.102	-0.098	-0.089

Intercepts:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	0.000				0.000	0.000
Trust in internet voting	0.000				0.000	0.000
Thresholds:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others t1	0.281	0.786	0.358	.720	0.281	0.215
Trust in internet voting t1	-1.271	0.676	-1.880	.060	-1.271	-1.251
Trust in internet voting t2	-0.726	0.671	-1.082	.279	-0.726	-0.715
Trust in internet voting t3	0.287	0.669	0.428	.668	0.287	0.282
Variances:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	0.733				0.733	0.427
Trust in internet voting	1.000				1.000	0.969
Scales y*:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	1.000				1.000	1.000
Trust in internet voting	1.000				1.000	1.000
Defined Parameters: Indirect and total effects:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Indirect: Openness	0.032	0.042	0.780	.435	0.032	0.021
Indirect: Conscientiousness	-0.071	0.048	-1.458	.145	-0.071	-0.034
Indirect: Extraversion	-0.043	0.036	-1.198	.231	-0.043	-0.029

Indirect: Agreeableness (1-item score)	0.054	0.026	2.056	.040	0.054	0.049
Indirect: Neuroticism	-0.051	0.031	-1.608	.108	-0.051	-0.036
Total: Openness	0.109	0.090	1.208	.227	0.109	0.071
Total: Conscientiousness	-0.124	0.105	-1.184	.236	-0.124	-0.060
Total: Extraversion	-0.140	0.085	-1.644	.100	-0.140	-0.096
Total: Agreeableness (1-item score)	-0.053	0.063	-0.842	.400	-0.053	-0.049
Total: Neuroticism	0.013	0.071	0.178	.859	0.013	0.009

Note. Std.lv: standardized parameter value; latent variables are standardized. Std.all: standardized parameter value; both latent and observed variables are standardized. The 1-item Agreeableness score is based on the reverse coded item on being critical, quarrelsome.

Supplementary Table 5

Statistics of the path analysis in the sample recruited after the 2015 national elections

Regressions:		Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others							
Openness	(c1)	0.008	0.077	0.099	.921	0.008	0.005
Conscientiousness	(c2)	-0.007	0.094	-0.073	.942	-0.007	-0.004
Extraversion	(c3)	-0.068	0.077	-0.877	.380	-0.068	-0.052
Agreeableness (1-item score)	(c4)	-0.092	0.059	-1.553	.120	-0.092	-0.085
Neuroticism	(c5)	-0.096	0.075	-1.278	.201	-0.096	-0.074
Trust in internet voting	(b1)	0.583	0.053	10.987	< .001	0.583	0.517
Age	(c6)	0.006	0.005	1.172	.241	0.006	0.085
Gender	(c7)	0.145	0.130	1.113	.266	0.145	0.063
Language spoken at home	(c8)	0.596	0.184	3.240	.001	0.596	0.200
Education	(c9)	0.067	0.067	1.005	.315	0.067	0.060
Income deciles	(c10)	0.034	0.024	1.441	.149	0.034	0.085
PC Literacy	(c11)	0.375	0.083	4.517	< .001	0.375	0.379
Trust in internet voting							
Openness	(a1)	0.039	0.064	0.604	.546	0.039	0.031
Conscientiousness	(a2)	-0.036	0.080	-0.447	.655	-0.036	-0.024
Extraversion	(a3)	0.039	0.062	0.633	.527	0.039	0.034
Agreeableness (1-item score)	(a4)	0.069	0.049	1.407	.159	0.069	0.072
Neuroticism	(a5)	-0.094	0.060	-1.564	.118	-0.094	-0.082
Intercepts:							

	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>-value	<i>p</i>	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	0.000				0.000	0.000
Trust in internet voting	0.000				0.000	0.000
Thresholds:						
	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>-value	<i>p</i>	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others t1	2.433	0.731	3.330	.001	2.433	2.137
Trust in internet voting t1	0.185	0.530	0.349	.727	0.185	0.183
Trust in internet voting t2	0.671	0.528	1.270	.204	0.671	0.665
Trust in internet voting t3	1.513	0.528	2.864	.004	1.513	1.499
Variances:						
	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>-value	<i>p</i>	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	0.660				0.660	0.509
Trust in internet voting	1.000				1.000	0.982
Scales y*:						
	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>-value	<i>p</i>	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	1.000				1.000	1.000
Trust in internet voting	1.000				1.000	1.000
Defined Parameters: Indirect and total effects:						
	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>-value	<i>p</i>	Std.lv	Std.all
Indirect: Openness	0.022	0.037	0.603	.547	0.022	0.016
Indirect: Conscientiousness	-0.021	0.047	-0.447	.655	-0.021	-0.012
Indirect: Extraversion	0.023	0.036	0.633	.527	0.023	0.018
Indirect: Agreeableness (1-item score)	0.040	0.029	1.399	.162	0.040	0.037

Indirect: Neuroticism	-0.055	0.035	-1.546	.122	-0.055	-0.042
Total: Openness	0.030	0.086	0.347	.728	0.030	0.021
Total: Conscientiousness	-0.028	0.103	-0.269	.788	-0.028	-0.016
Total: Extraversion	-0.045	0.084	-0.536	.592	-0.045	-0.035
Total: Agreeableness (1-item score)	-0.052	0.065	-0.794	.427	-0.052	-0.047
Total: Neuroticism	-0.151	0.076	-1.979	.048	-0.151	-0.117

Note. Std.lv: standardized parameter value; latent variables are standardized. Std.all: standardized parameter value; both latent and observed variables are standardized. The 1-item Agreeableness score is based on the reverse coded item on being critical, quarrelsome.

Supplementary Table 6

Statistics of the path analysis in the sample recruited after the 2019 national elections

Regressions:		Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others							
Openness	(c1)	-0.062	0.076	-0.814	.416	-0.062	-0.043
Conscientiousness	(c2)	0.033	0.095	0.353	.724	0.033	0.018
Extraversion	(c3)	0.007	0.073	0.091	.927	0.007	0.005
Agreeableness (1-item score)	(c4)	0.063	0.057	1.104	.270	0.063	0.057
Neuroticism	(c5)	-0.033	0.067	-0.490	.624	-0.033	-0.024
Trust in internet voting	(b1)	0.550	0.053	10.297	< .001	0.550	0.474
Age	(c6)	0.001	0.005	0.255	.799	0.001	0.017
Gender	(c7)	-0.184	0.120	-1.538	.124	-0.184	-0.079
Language spoken at home	(c8)	0.702	0.185	3.798	< .001	0.702	0.200
Education	(c9)	0.173	0.061	2.814	.005	0.173	0.153
Income deciles	(c10)	0.049	0.025	1.966	.049	0.049	0.113
PC Literacy	(c11)	0.369	0.088	4.203	< .001	0.369	0.324
Trust in internet voting							
Openness	(a1)	-0.052	0.067	-0.771	.441	-0.052	-0.041
Conscientiousness	(a2)	-0.095	0.083	-1.136	.256	-0.095	-0.059
Extraversion	(a3)	0.016	0.063	0.255	.799	0.016	0.014
Agreeableness (1-item score)	(a4)	0.090	0.052	1.708	.088	0.090	0.094
Neuroticism	(a5)	-0.053	0.061	-0.861	.389	-0.053	-0.045

Intercepts:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	0.000				0.000	0.000
Trust in internet voting	0.000				0.000	0.000
Thresholds:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others t1	2.695	0.755	3.568	< .001	2.695	2.306
Trust in internet voting t1	0.877	0.633	1.385	.166	0.877	0.871
Trust in internet voting t2	1.440	0.636	2.263	.024	1.440	1.430
Trust in internet voting t3	2.160	0.638	3.386	.001	2.160	2.144
Variances:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	0.697				0.697	0.510
Trust in internet voting	1.000				1.000	0.986
Scales y*:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Internet voting vs others	1.000				1.000	1.000
Trust in internet voting	1.000				1.000	1.000
Defined Parameters: Indirect and total effects:						
	Estimate	SE	z-value	p	Std.lv	Std.all
Indirect: Openness	-0.028	0.037	-0.769	.442	-0.028	-0.020
Indirect: Conscientiousness	-0.052	0.046	-1.133	.257	-0.052	-0.028
Indirect: Extraversion	0.009	0.035	0.255	.799	0.009	0.007

Indirect: Agreeableness (1-item score)	0.049	0.029	1.692	.091	0.049	0.044
Indirect: Neuroticism	-0.029	0.034	-0.858	.391	-0.029	-0.021
Total: Openness	-0.090	0.084	-1.075	.282	-0.090	-0.062
Total: Conscientiousness	-0.019	0.100	-0.187	.852	-0.019	-0.010
Total: Extraversion	0.016	0.078	0.199	.842	0.016	0.011
Total: Agreeableness (1-item score)	0.112	0.059	1.902	.057	0.112	0.101
Total: Neuroticism	-0.062	0.069	-0.896	.370	-0.062	-0.045

Note. Std.lv: standardized parameter value; latent variables are standardized. Std.all: standardized parameter value; both latent and observed variables are standardized. The 1-item Agreeableness score is based on the reverse coded item on being critical, quarrelsome.