A ▪ Online questionnaire

Table 1. Survey measures.

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Gender	Geben Sie bitte zunächst Ihr Geschlecht an. [Please first indicate your gender.]	(1) weiblich [female] (2) männlich [male] (3) divers [other]
Age	Wie alt sind Sie? [How old are you?]	Free text input
Education	Welchen höchsten Bildungsabschluss haben Sie? [What is your highest level of education?]	ordered categorical scale from (1) noch Schülerin / Schüler [still going to school] ... (8) Promotion [doctorate (PhD)]
Federal state	Und in welchem Bundesland wohnen Sie? Die Frage bezieht sich auf Ihren Erstwohnsitz. [And in which federal state do you reside? This question refers to your *primary residence*.]	Alphabetically ordered ordinal scale with the 16 German federal states
Definition Science	In den folgenden Fragen geht es nun um Wissenschaft und Forschung. Damit meinen wir nicht nur *naturwissenschaftliche Fächer* wie z. B. Biologie, sondern auch *Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften* wie z. B. Geschichts- oder Politikwissenschaft. Der Begriff umfasst auch *etablierte wissenschaftliche Einrichtungen*, also Universitäten und außeruniversitäre Forschungseinrichtungen wie z. B. das Robert-Koch-Institut. Gemeint sind auch *Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler*, die hauptberuflich in wissenschaftlichen Einrichtungen tätig sind, wie z. B. Prof. Dr. Christian Drosten oder Prof. Dr. Sandra Ciesek. [In the following questions, we are now referring to science and research. By this, we don't only mean *natural sciences* such as biology but also *humanities and social sciences* such as history or political science. The term also encompasses *established scientific institutions*, including universities and non-university research institutions such as the Robert Koch Institute. It also refers to *scientists* who work full-time in scientific institutions, such as Prof. Dr. Christian Drosten or Prof. Dr. Sandra Ciesek.]	-

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Professional involvement in science	Erst einmal interessiert uns Ihr persönlicher Bezug zu Wissenschaft und Forschung: [First, we are interested in your personal involvement in science and research:] Arbeiten **Sie selbst** in Wissenschaft und Forschung? [Do **you** work in science and research **yourself**?] Haben Sie **beruflich anderweitig** mit Wissenschaft und Forschung zu tun? [Do you have **any other professional** involvement with science and research?]	(1) No (2) Yes
Interest in science	**Manche Leute haben ein starkes Interesse an wissenschaftlichen Themen. Andere interessieren sich eher weniger für Wissenschaft. Wie groß ist Ihr Interesse an Themen aus Wissenschaft und Forschung?** **[Some people have a strong interest in scientific topics. Others are less interested in science. How interested are you in topics from science and research?]** Antworten Sie bitte anhand der Skala von «sehr gering» bis «sehr groß». Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Angabe abstufen. [Please respond using the scale from 'very low' to 'very high'. You can use the values in between to specify your response.]	(1) Very low … (5) Very high
Institutional trust	**Wie sehr vertrauen Sie — ganz allgemein — in die folgenden Einrichtungen und Personengruppen in Deutschland? [How much do you generally trust the following institutions and groups in Germany?]** Antworten Sie bitte anhand der Skala von «vertraue überhaupt nicht» bis «vertraue voll und ganz». Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Meinung abstufen. [Please respond using the scale from 'do not trust at all' to 'trust completely'. You can use the values in between to specify your opinion.] (a) Presse / Medien [press / media] (b) Bundesregierung [national government] (c) Gerichte [courts]	(1) Do not trust at all … (5) Trust completely

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Perceived trustworthiness of scientists	**Hier sehen Sie nun einige Gründe, warum man Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern vertrauen könnte. Bitte geben Sie für jeden Grund an, inwieweit dieser Ihrer Meinung nach zutrifft.** **[Here are some reasons why one might trust scientists. Please indicate to what extent you agree with each of these reasons.]** **Man kann Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern vertrauen, . . .** **[One can trust scientists . . .]** (a)… weil sie Expertinnen / Experten auf Ihrem Gebiet sind. […because they are experts in their field.] (b)… weil sie nach Regeln und Standards arbeiten. […because they work according to rules and standards.] (c)… weil sie im Interesse der Öffentlichkeit forschen. […because they conduct research in the public interest.]	(1) strongly disagree … (5) strongly agree
Introduction to the pandemic scenario	Wissenschaft und Forschung haben auch während der Corona-Pandemie eine besondere Rolle gespielt. Bitte stellen Sie sich nun einmal vor, in naher Zukunft gäbe es wieder ein neuartiges, unbekanntes Virus, das eine weltweite Pandemie auslöst (ähnlich wie die Corona-Pandemie). Was meinen Sie: Was würde die Wissenschaft in einer solchen Situation leisten und was nicht? Auf den folgenden Seiten sehen Sie gleich eine Reihe von Behauptungen dazu. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit diese Ihrer persönlichen Einschätzung nach zutreffen. *(Klicken Sie dazu jetzt auf "Weiter".)* [Science and research have also played a special role during the COVID-19 pandemic. Please imagine now that in the near future there would be another novel, unknown virus that triggers a worldwide pandemic (similar to the COVID-19 pandemic). What do you think: What would science achieve in such a situation and what not? On the following pages, you will see a series of statements about this. Please indicate to what extent these correspond to your personal assessment. *(Click "Continue" to proceed.)]*	-

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Trusting expectations towards science	**Wenn Sie an die Rolle der Wissenschaft in einer zukünftigen Pandemie denken: Inwieweit treffen die folgenden Behauptungen Ihrer persönlichen Einschätzung nach zu?** **[When you think about the role of science in a future pandemic: To what extent do you agree with the following statements?]** Antworten Sie bitte anhand der Skala von «trifft überhaupt nicht zu» bis «trifft voll und ganz zu». Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einschätzung abstufen. [Please respond using the scale from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. You can indicate your assessment using values in between to specify your assessment.]	
(Epistemic expectations)	(a) Die Wissenschaft wird herausfinden, wie ein neuartiges Virus Krankheiten auslöst. [Science will find out how a novel virus triggers diseases.] (b) Die Wissenschaft wird immer neue Erkenntnisse über ein zuvor unbekanntes Virus gewinnen. [Science will continually gain new insights into a previously unknown virus.] (c) Die Wissenschaft wird zutreffendes Wissen über ein neuartiges Virus sammeln. [Science will gather accurate knowledge about a novel virus.]	(1) strongly disagree … (5) strongly agree
(Guidance expectations)	(d) Wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse werden es mir erleichtern, während einer neuen Pandemie die richtigen Entscheidungen zu treffen. [Scientific insights will make it easier for me to make the right decisions during a new pandemic.] (e) Bei einer neuen Pandemie wird die Wissenschaft eine Quelle nützlicher Informationen für mich sein. [During a new pandemic, science will be a source of useful information for me.] (f) Wissenschaftliches Wissen über eine neue Pandemie wird mir in meinem Alltag helfen. [Scientific knowledge about a new pandemic will help me in my everyday life.]	

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Need for orientation	**Manche Leute hätten im Falle einer zukünftigen Pandemie großes Interesse an Informationen darüber. Andere würden sich eher weniger dafür interessieren. Wie wäre das bei Ihnen, wenn es eine neue Pandemie gäbe? [Some people would have a great interest in information about a future pandemic. Others would be less interested. What about you, if there were a new pandemic?]** Antworten Sie bitte anhand der Skala von «trifft überhaupt nicht zu» bis «trifft voll und ganz zu». Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Angaben abstufen. [Please respond using the scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. You can use values in between to specify your response.]	
	(a) Bei einer neuen Pandemie würde ich gerne sofort über aktuelle Entwicklungen informiert werden. [When there is a new pandemic, I would like to be immediately informed about current developments.] (b) Es wäre mir wichtig, stets über eine neue Pandemie auf dem Laufenden zu bleiben. [It would be important for me to always stay up-to-date on a new pandemic.] (c) Ich würde gerne unterschiedliche Sichtweisen auf eine neue Pandemie kennenlernen. [I would like to learn about different perspectives on a new pandemic.] (d) Ich würde gründlich über die Details der neuen Pandemie informiert werden wollen. [I would want to be thoroughly informed about the details of the new pandemic.] (e) Ich würde viel darüber erfahren wollen, wie andere eine neue Pandemie einschätzen. [I would like to learn a lot about how others assess a new pandemic.] (f) Es wäre interessant zu sehen, welche Meinungen es in der Gesellschaft zu einer neuen Pandemie gäbe. [It would be interesting to see the opinions that exist in society about a new pandemic.]	(1) strongly disagree … (5) strongly agree

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Online media use	**Jetzt würden wir gerne wissen, wie Sie** *im Internet* **etwas über eine neue Pandemie erfahren würden. Wenn Sie noch einmal an eine** *zukünftige Pandemie* **denken: Wie oft würden Sie sich voraussichtlich durch die folgenden Möglichkeiten darüber informieren?** **[Now we would like to know how you would learn about a new pandemic** *online*. **When you think about a** *future pandemic:* **How often would you likely inform yourself through the following options?]** **Wie oft würden Sie sich über eine neue Pandemie informieren...** **[How often would you inform yourself about a new pandemic...]**	
(Established journalistic and scientific source use)	(a) ... durch Webauftritte von wissenschaftlichen Einrichtungen oder Organisationen? [through websites of scientific institutions or organizations?] (b) ... durch Websites, Apps oder Mediatheken von Nachrichtenmedien wie Zeitungen, Magazine oder Fernsehsender? [through websites, apps, or media centers of news media?]	(1) never (2) rarely (3) occasionally (4) frequently (5) very frequently
(Telegram use)	(c) ... durch den Messenger Telegram? [through the messenger Telegram?]	
Alternative online media outlet use	**Und wie oft würden Sie voraussichtlich Angebote der folgenden Medien nutzen, um sich** *im Falle einer neuen Pandemie* **darüber zu informieren?** **[And how often would you likely use offerings from the following media to inform yourself** *in the event of a new pandemic***?]**	
	(a) Achse des Guten (b) Compact (c) Epoch Times (d) Junge Freiheit (e) Manova (f) NachDenkSeiten (g) PI News (h) Tichys Einblick	(1) never (2) rarely (3) occasionally (4) frequently (5) very frequently (-9) I don't know this medium

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
(Populist) partisanship	**Viele Leute neigen längere Zeit einer bestimmten Partei zu, obwohl sie auch ab und zu eine andere Partei wählen. Wie ist das bei Ihnen: Neigen Sie — ganz allgemein gesprochen — einer bestimmten Partei zu? Und wenn ja, welcher?** **[Many people tend to support a particular party for a long time, although they occasionally vote for another party. How about you: Do you generally tend to support a particular party? If so, which one?]**	(1) AfD (Alternative für Deutschland) (2) Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen (3) CDU (Christlich Demokratische Union) (4) CSU (Christlich Soziale Union) (5) Die Linke (6) FDP (Freie Demokratische Partei) (7) SPD (Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands) (8) Another party, namely: (-9) I don't lean towards any party.
Populist attitudes	**Wir möchten noch etwas mehr über Ihren Eindruck von der Politik in Deutschland erfahren. Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu?** **[We would like to learn a bit more about your impression of politics in Germany. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?]** Antworten Sie bitte anhand der Skala von «stimme überhaupt nicht zu» bis «stimme voll und ganz zu». Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Angaben abstufen. [Please respond using the scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." You can use values in between to specify your response.] (a) Das Volk, und nicht die Politiker, sollte die wichtigsten politischen Entscheidungen treffen. [The people, not the politicians, should make the most important political decisions.] (b) Viele Politiker in der Regierung sind korrupt. [Many politicians in the government are corrupt.] (c) Politiker treffen viele Entscheidungen gegen die Interessen des Volkes. [Politicians make many decisions against the interests of the people.]	(1) strongly disagree … (5) strongly agree

Construct	Question wording and items	Scale
Political ideology	**Viele Leute verwenden die Begriffe "'links" und "'rechts", wenn es darum geht, unterschiedliche politische Einstellungen zu kennzeichnen. Wenn Sie an Ihre eigenen politischen Ansichten denken: Wo würden Sie sich selbst einordnen?** **[Many people use the terms "left" and "right" when it comes to characterizing different political attitudes. When you think about your own political views: Where would you place yourself?]** Antworten Sie bitte anhand der Skala von 1 = «links» bis 10 = «rechts». Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Einstellung abstufen. [Please respond using the scale from 1 = "left" to 10 = "right". You can use values in between to specify your position.]	(1) left … (10) right
Careless response (quality check)	**Für den Erfolg dieser Studie ist es sehr wichtig, dass wir nur Antworten von Personen berücksichtigen, die den Fragebogen aufmerksam und aufrichtig ausgefüllt haben. Wenn Sie ganz ehrlich sind: Können wir Ihre Antworten guten Gewissens verwenden?** **[For the success of this study, it is very important that we only consider responses from individuals who have completed the questionnaire attentively and sincerely. If you are being completely honest: Can we use your responses in good conscience?]**	(1) yes (2) no

Note. The table shows question and item wordings of all survey measures in the original German version; English translations are provided in square brackets; The measures are arranged in the order they appeared in the online questionnaire.

B ▪ Additional information on the development of the trusting expectations towards science scale

The development of the scale for measuring trusting expectations towards science is part of a larger research project. Based on semi-structured interviews and existing scales of science-related attitudes, we initially developed 14 items to measure epistemic expectations and 19 items to measure guidance expectations. All items referred to a fictional scenario of a possible future pandemic (similar to the COVID-19 pandemic) and were formulated as future-oriented, confident positive expectations regarding the performance of science. The epistemic items reflected various facets of the expectation of generating accurate knowledge about the future pandemic (e.g., "Science will gather accurate knowledge about a novel virus."). The guidance items, on the other hand, referred to the expectation of useful support in decision-making during the future pandemic (e.g., "Scientific insights will make it easier for me to make the right decisions during a new pandemic."). For the present study, the three most suitable items for each type of expectations were selected. Therefore, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted, modeling epistemic expectations and guidance expectations as two latent factors. 27 Items with more than 5 percent missing data, too low standardized factor loadings on their respective factor (< .60), or too high cross-loadings on the other factor (> .30) were removed from the model. Since the correlation between the two latent factors of epistemic and guidance expectations was very high, the remaining six items were ultimately combined into a single scale of confident positive trusting expectations towards science for the present study.

To validate this scale, we conducted another confirmatory factor analysis with the trusting expectations and trustworthiness perceptions items loading on two separate latent factors (see Table 2). The model showed an excellent global fit to the data. All standardized factor loadings were greater than .60, the construct reliabilities (CR) of both factors exceeded .70, and the average variances extracted (AVE) clearly exceed .50 indicating a sufficient convergent validity of the individual parameters. Although the two latent factors trusting expectations and trustworthiness perceptions were highly correlated, the lower limit of the 90% CI was lower than .80, causing only minor discriminant validity concerns. Moreover, a model with all indicators loading on only one latent factor fit the data significantly worse, also speaking for sufficient discriminant validity of the two factors. We are thus confident that our measurement of trusting expectations towards science is valid and distinct from the measurement of perceived trustworthiness of scientists.

Table 2. Factor loadings and model fit of the 2-factorial measurement model with perceived trustworthiness of scientists and trusting expectations towards science as latent factors.

Latent factor	Item	B	SE	λ	AVE	CR
Trusting expectations towards science					.633	.906
	Science will find out how a novel virus triggers diseases.	1.000	-	.699		
	Science will continually gain new insights into a previously unknown virus.	0.933	.049	.672		
	Science will gather accurate knowledge about a novel virus.	0.953	.050	.719		
	Scientific findings will help me make the right decisions during a new pandemic.	1.388	.062	.855		
	In the case of a new pandemic, science will be a source of useful information for me.	1.475	.063	.861		
	Scientific knowledge about a new pandemic will help me in my everyday life.	1.455	.064	.851		
Perceived trustworthiness of scientists					.601	.819
	You can trust scientists because they are experts in their field.	1.000	-	.815		
	You can trust scientists because they work according to rules and standards.	0.974	.035	.797		
	You can trust scientists because they conduct research in the interest of the public.	1.001	.043	.723		

Model Fit Indices	χ^2	df	p	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
	89.648	26	.000	.979	.985	.047	.023

Note. Results from confirmatory factor analysis (MLR estimator); N = 1,128; The unstandardized factor loading for one indicator of each latent variable is set to 1.0 and no standard errors are estimated for these reference variables; B = unstandardized factor loadings; SE = standard error; λ = standardized factor loadings; AVE = average variance extracted; CR = construct reliability; df: degrees of freedom; TLI: Tucker-Lewis index; CFI: comparative fit index; RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation; SRMR: standardized root mean square residual.

C ▪ Statistics

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for all continuous scale items.

Scale	IC	Items	Valid N	Mean	SD	Median	Skew	Kurtosis
Trusting expectations towards science	ω = .90	Science will find out how a novel virus triggers diseases.	1193	3.89	0.90	4.00	-.89	.93
		Science will continually gain new insights into a previously unknown virus.	1214	4.05	0.85	4.00	-.90	1.11
		Science will gather accurate knowledge about a novel virus.	1208	4.18	0.82	4.00	-1.03	1.41
		Scientific insights will make it easier for me to make the right decisions during a new pandemic.	1201	3.78	1.02	4.00	-.88	.60
		During a new pandemic, science will be a source of useful information for me.	1214	3.88	1.08	4.00	-.95	.40
		Scientific knowledge about a new pandemic will help me in my everyday life.	1204	3.69	1.07	4.00	-.78	.14
Need for orientation	ω = .85	When there is a new pandemic, I would like to be immediately informed about current developments.	1219	4.24	.95	4.00	-1.46	2.12
		It would be important for me to always stay up-to-date on a new pandemic.	1214	4.22	.96	4.00	-1.36	1.62
		I would like to learn about different perspectives on a new pandemic.	1214	3.95	.98	4.00	-.85	.45
		I would want to be thoroughly informed about the details of the new pandemic.	1220	4.31	.89	5.00	-1.49	2.35
		I would like to learn a lot about how others assess a new pandemic.	1214	3.65	1.10	4.00	-.63	-.20
		It would be interesting to see the existing opinions in society about a new pandemic.	1210	3.76	1.09	4.00	-.74	.02
Perceived trustworthiness of scientists	ω = .83	One can trust scientists because they are experts in their field.	1221	4.09	.85	4.00	-.87	.83
		One can trust scientists because they work according to rules and standards.	1209	3.90	.86	4.00	-.68	.59
		One can trust scientists because they conduct research in the public interest.	1209	3.62	.96	4.00	-.48	.02
Populist attitudes	ω = .82	The people, not the politicians, should make the most important political decisions.	1206	3.48	1.22	3.00	-.30	-.89
		Many politicians in the government are corrupt.	1159	3.32	1.23	3.00	-.12	-1.05
		Politicians make many decisions against the interests of the people.	1210	3.81	1.12	4.00	-.54	-.66
Established online source use	ρ = .63	Use of websites of scientific institutions or organizations	1209	3.06	1.27	3.00	-.26	-.99
		Use of websites, apps, or media centers of news media	1218	3.58	1.25	4.00	-.69	-.45
Institutional trust	ω = .80	Trust in news media	1222	2.73	1.03	3.00	-.13	-.60
		Trust in national government	1219	2.59	1.17	3.00	.07	-1.06
		Trust in courts	1219	3.55	1.01	4.00	-.59	.06

Note. All items were measured on a scale from 1 to 5; IC = internal consistency of the scale; ω: McDonald's Omega; ρ: Spearman-Brown coefficient; Valid N: number of valid cases for the variable; SD: standard deviation.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for all continuous variables and indices.

Variable	Valid N	Mean	SD	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Age	1,223	51.01	15.70	55.00	18.00	80.00	62.00	-.38	-1.10
Interest in science	1,223	3.34	0.95	3.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	-.36	.08
Perceived trustworthiness of scientists	1,221	3.87	0.77	4.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	-.75	.94
Political ideology	1,222	5.12	1.64	5.00	1.00	10.00	9.00	.21	.73
Populist attitudes	1,219	3.54	1.02	3.67	1.00	5.00	4.00	-.28	-.79
Institutional trust	1,223	2.96	0.90	3.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	-.24	-.56
Trusting expectations towards science	1,223	3.90	0.79	4.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	-1.01	1.15
Need for orientation	1,223	4.02	0.75	4.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	-1.02	1.48
Established online source use	1,220	3.32	1.08	3.50	1.00	5.00	4.00	-.54	-.42

Note. Valid N: number of valid cases for the variable; SD: standard deviation.

Table 5. Frequencies for the dichotomized items of the alternative online media outlet use scale.

Alternative media outlet	Value labels	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Valid N
Achse des Guten	not used	1105	90.35	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	118	9.65	
Compact	not used	999	81.68	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	224	18.32	
Epoch Times	not used	1078	88.14	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	145	11.86	
Junge Freiheit	not used	1106	90.43	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	117	9.57	
Manova	not used	1111	90.84	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	112	9.16	
NachDenkSeiten	not used	1064	87.00	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	159	13.00	
PI News	not used	1092	89.29	1,223
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	131	10.71	
Tichys Einblick	not used	1085	88.79	1,222
	used rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently	137	11.21	

Note. Valid N: number of valid cases for the variable.

Table 6. Frequencies for all categorical model variables.

Variable	Value labels	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Valid N
Gender	male	600	49.06	1,223
	female	623	50.94	
Education	low	427	34.91	1,223
	medium	488	39.90	
	high	308	25.18	
Residency	West Germany	1042	85.20	1,223
	East Germany	181	14.80	
Involvement with science	no occupational involvement	1089	89.26	1,220
	occupational involvement	131	10.74	
Populist partisanship	no (populist) partisanship	1042	87.27	1,194
	AfD partisanship	152	12.73	
Telegram use	no Telegram user	895	73.91	1,211
	Telegram user	316	26.09	
Alternative media outlet use	no use of alternative media outlets	908	74.24	1,223
	use of at least one alternative media outlet	315	25.76	

Note. Valid N: number of valid cases for the variable.

Table 7. Linear regressions of the DV trusting expectations towards science on control variables and perceived trustworthiness of scientists.

	DV: Trusting expectations towards science			
	Model 1			
Predictors	β	SE	95% CI	p
(Intercept)	0.00	0.02	-0.04 – 0.04	0.375
Gender (female)	0.02	0.02	-0.02 – 0.06	0.316
Age	-0.03	0.03	-0.08 – 0.02	0.292
Education (low)	-0.01	0.03	-0.07 – 0.06	0.838
Education (med)	-0.02	0.03	-0.08 – 0.04	0.511
Residency (east)	0.03	0.02	-0.01 – 0.06	0.147
Involvement	-0.00	0.02	-0.05 – 0.04	0.881
Interest	0.06	0.02	0.02 – 0.10	**0.007**
Ideology	-0.01	0.02	-0.05 – 0.03	0.537
Pop. partisanship	-0.11	0.03	-0.16 – -0.06	**< 0.001**
Pop. attitudes	-0.12	0.02	-0.17 – -0.07	**< 0.001**
Institutional trust	0.07	0.03	0.01 – 0.14	**0.018**
Need for orientation	0.26	0.03	0.21 – 0.31	**< 0.001**
Trustworthiness of scientists	0.45	0.03	0.39 – 0.51	**< 0.001**
Model fit	R^2 = .60***			

Note. This table shows the linear regression model 1 including control variables and the focal predictor (perceived trustworthiness of scientists); N = 1,175; β = standardized regression weights; SE = heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC3); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of the regression weights; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001; bold values: p < .05.

Table 8. Linear regressions of the DV established online source use on control variables and trusting expectations towards science.

	DV: Established online source use							
	Model 2a				Model 2b			
Predictors	β	SE	95% CI	p	β	SE	95% CI	p
(Intercept)	-0.00	0.02	-0.05 – 0.05	0.343	-0.00	0.02	-0.04 – 0.04	0.146
Gender (female)	0.00	0.02	-0.05 – 0.05	0.927	-0.00	0.02	-0.05 – 0.05	0.949
Age	0.00	0.03	-0.06 – 0.06	0.949	0.01	0.03	-0.05 – 0.07	0.763
Education (low)	-0.05	0.04	-0.13 – 0.03	0.242	-0.04	0.04	-0.12 – 0.03	0.271
Education (med)	0.01	0.04	-0.06 – 0.08	0.803	0.01	0.03	-0.05 – 0.08	0.680
Residency (east)	0.01	0.02	-0.04 – 0.06	0.666	0.00	0.02	-0.04 – 0.05	0.880
Involvement	0.03	0.02	-0.02 – 0.07	0.208	0.03	0.02	-0.02 – 0.07	0.211
Interest	0.13	0.03	0.08 – 0.19	**< 0.001**	0.11	0.03	0.06 – 0.17	**< 0.001**
Ideology	-0.02	0.03	-0.07 – 0.03	0.329	-0.02	0.03	-0.07 – 0.03	0.370
Pop. partisanship	-0.07	0.03	-0.12 – -0.01	**0.025**	-0.04	0.03	-0.09 – 0.02	0.199
Pop. attitudes	-0.04	0.03	-0.11 – 0.02	0.142	-0.01	0.03	-0.07 – 0.05	0.651
Institutional trust	0.11	0.04	0.04 – 0.19	**0.002**	0.09	0.04	0.02 – 0.16	**0.010**
Telegram use	0.11	0.02	0.06 – 0.15	**< 0.001**	0.13	0.02	0.08 – 0.17	**< 0.001**
Alt. media use	0.06	0.02	0.01 – 0.10	**0.016**	0.07	0.02	0.02 – 0.11	**0.002**
Need for orientation	0.35	0.03	0.30 – 0.41	**< 0.001**	0.28	0.03	0.22 – 0.34	**< 0.001**
Trustworthiness of scientists	0.14	0.03	0.07 – 0.20	**< 0.001**	0.01	0.04	-0.06 – 0.08	0.738
Trusting expectations t. science	-	-	-	-	0.28	0.04	0.21 – 0.35	**< 0.001**
Model fit	R^2 = .39***				R^2 = .42***			

Note. This table shows the linear regression models 2a and 2b including control variables and the focal predictor (trusting expectations towards science); N = 1,175; β = standardized regression weights; SE = heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC3); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of the regression weights; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001; bold values: p < .05.

Table 9. Binary logistic regression of the DV Telegram use on control variables and trusting expectations towards science.

	DV: Telegram use							
	Model 3a				Model 3b			
Predictors	OR	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p
(Intercept)	0.36	0.07	0.24 – 0.54	**< 0.001**	0.36	0.08	0.24 – 0.54	**< 0.001**
Gender (female)	0.70	0.10	0.53 – 0.94	**0.016**	0.72	0.11	0.53 – 0.96	**0.025**
Age	1.00	0.01	0.99 – 1.01	0.892	1.00	0.01	0.99 – 1.01	0.748
Education (low)	0.88	0.23	0.54 – 1.46	0.630	0.88	0.23	0.53 – 1.46	0.614
Education (med)	1.12	0.25	0.72 – 1.74	0.619	1.07	0.25	0.69 – 1.68	0.754
Residency (east)	0.76	0.16	0.50 – 1.13	0.190	0.79	0.17	0.52 – 1.18	0.259
Involvement	1.50	0.36	0.93 – 2.40	0.094	1.47	0.36	0.90 – 2.37	0.120
Interest	1.16	0.10	0.98 – 1.38	0.086	1.18	0.10	0.99 – 1.41	0.053
Ideology	1.06	0.05	0.97 – 1.16	0.260	1.05	0.05	0.96 – 1.16	0.289
Pop. partisanship	1.45	0.34	0.93 – 2.25	0.110	1.23	0.30	0.78 – 1.93	0.391
Pop. attitudes	1.43	0.14	1.19 – 1.73	**< 0.001**	1.35	0.14	1.12 – 1.64	**0.003**
Institutional trust	1.08	0.13	0.86 – 1.36	0.520	1.12	0.14	0.89 – 1.41	0.352
Est. online source use	1.57	0.13	1.32 – 1.87	**< 0.001**	1.78	0.16	1.49 – 2.15	**< 0.001**
Need for orientation	0.95	0.11	0.76 – 1.19	0.658	1.12	0.13	0.88 – 1.42	0.351
Trustworthiness of scientists	0.80	0.09	0.64 – 1.01	0.058	1.11	0.15	0.86 – 1.44	0.444
Trusting expectations t. science	-	-	-	-	0.47	0.07	0.35 – 0.62	**< 0.001**
Model fit	Nagelkerke's R^2 = .11***				Nagelkerke's R^2 = .14***			

Note. This table shows the binary logistic regression models 3a and 3b including control variables and the focal predictor (trusting expectations towards science); N = 1,175; OR = Odds ratio; SE = heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC3); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of the regression weights; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001; bold values: p < .05.

Table 10. Binary logistic regression of the DV alternative online media outlet use on control variables and trusting expectations towards science.

	DV: Alternative online media outlet use							
	Model 3c				Model 3d			
Predictors	OR	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p
(Intercept)	0.42	0.09	0.28 – 0.63	**< 0.001**	0.43	0.09	0.28 – 0.64	**< 0.001**
Gender (female)	0.80	0.12	0.60 – 1.07	0.138	0.81	0.12	0.61 – 1.09	0.176
Age	1.00	0.01	0.99 – 1.02	0.447	1.00	0.01	0.99 – 1.02	0.528
Education (low)	0.53	0.14	0.32 – 0.87	**0.014**	0.52	0.14	0.31 – 0.86	**0.014**
Education (med)	0.89	0.20	0.58 – 1.37	0.609	0.87	0.19	0.56 – 1.34	0.517
Residency (east)	0.80	0.16	0.54 – 1.18	0.269	0.83	0.17	0.55 – 1.22	0.349
Involvement	1.45	0.34	0.91 – 2.29	0.118	1.43	0.34	0.89 – 2.27	0.135
Interest	1.47	0.13	1.23 – 1.77	**< 0.001**	1.49	0.14	1.25 – 1.80	**< 0.001**
Ideology	1.07	0.05	0.98 – 1.17	0.144	1.07	0.05	0.98 – 1.17	0.158
Pop. partisanship	1.91	0.44	1.22 – 2.96	**0.005**	1.69	0.39	1.08 – 2.65	**0.024**
Pop. attitudes	1.27	0.12	1.05 – 1.53	**0.016**	1.21	0.12	1.00 – 1.46	0.056
Institutional trust	1.08	0.13	0.86 – 1.36	0.534	1.10	0.13	0.87 – 1.39	0.422
Est. online source use	1.37	0.11	1.16 – 1.62	**< 0.001**	1.49	0.13	1.25 – 1.79	**< 0.001**
Need for orientation	1.01	0.11	0.80 – 1.27	0.941	1.13	0.13	0.89 – 1.43	0.289
Trustworthiness of scientists	0.80	0.09	0.63 – 1.01	**0.050**	1.01	0.13	0.78 – 1.31	0.951
Trusting expectations t. science	-	-	-	-	0.58	0.08	0.44 – 0.77	**< 0.001**
Model fit	Nagelkerke's R^2 = .13***				Nagelkerke's R^2 = .15***			

Note. This table shows the binary logistic regression models 3c and 3d including control variables and the focal predictor (trusting expectations towards science); N = 1,175; OR = Odds ratio; SE = heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC3); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of the regression weights; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001; bold values: p < .05.

Table 11. (Linear and logistic) regressions of established online source use, Telegram use, and alternative online media outlet use on trusting expectations towards science.

Dependent variables	**Established online source use (4a)**				**Telegram use (4b)**				**Alternative online media outlet use (4c)**			
Predictors	β	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p
(Intercept)	-0.01	0.03	-0.06 – 0.04	0.799	0.36	0.08	0.24 – 0.55	**< 0.001**	0.43	0.09	0.29 – 0.64	**< 0.001**
Gender (female)	-0.00	0.02	-0.05 – 0.05	0.941	0.72	0.11	0.53 – 0.96	**0.025**	0.81	0.12	0.61 – 1.09	0.176
Age	0.01	0.03	-0.05 – 0.07	0.762	1.00	0.01	0.99 – 1.01	0.748	1.00	0.01	0.99 – 1.02	0.530
Education (low)	-0.05	0.04	-0.12 – 0.03	0.254	0.88	0.23	0.53 – 1.46	0.616	0.52	0.14	0.31 – 0.87	**0.015**
Education (med)	0.01	0.03	-0.05 – 0.08	0.689	1.07	0.25	0.69 – 1.68	0.753	0.87	0.19	0.56 – 1.34	0.522
Residency (east)	0.00	0.02	-0.04 – 0.05	0.900	0.79	0.17	0.52 – 1.18	0.260	0.83	0.17	0.55 – 1.23	0.356
Involvement	0.03	0.02	-0.02 – 0.07	0.209	1.47	0.36	0.90 – 2.37	0.120	1.42	0.34	0.89 – 2.27	0.137
Interest	0.11	0.03	0.06 – 0.17	**< 0.001**	1.18	0.10	0.99 – 1.41	0.054	1.50	0.14	1.25 – 1.80	**< 0.001**
Ideology	-0.02	0.03	-0.07 – 0.03	0.377	1.05	0.05	0.96 – 1.16	0.290	1.07	0.05	0.98 – 1.17	0.159
Pop. partisanship	-0.04	0.03	-0.09 – 0.02	0.197	1.23	0.30	0.78 – 1.93	0.391	1.69	0.40	1.08 – 2.65	**0.024**
Pop. attitudes	-0.01	0.03	-0.07 – 0.05	0.638	1.35	0.14	1.12 – 1.64	**0.003**	1.21	0.12	1.00 – 1.46	0.056
Institutional trust	0.09	0.04	0.02 – 0.16	**0.010**	1.12	0.14	0.89 – 1.41	0.352	1.10	0.13	0.87 – 1.39	0.423

Dependent variables	**Established online source use (4a)**				**Telegram use (4b)**				**Alternative online media outlet use (4c)**			
Predictors	β	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p
Est. online source use	-	-	-	-	1.78	0.16	1.49 – 2.15	**< 0.001**	1.49	0.13	1.25 – 1.79	**< 0.001**
Telegram use	0.13	0.02	0.08 – 0.17	**< 0.001**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alt. media use	0.07	0.02	0.02 – 0.11	**0.002**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trustworthiness of scientists	0.01	0.04	-0.06 – 0.08	0.750	1.11	0.15	0.86 – 1.45	0.443	1.01	0.13	0.78 – 1.31	0.941
Need for orientation	0.28	0.03	0.22 – 0.35	**< 0.001**	1.12	0.14	0.87 – 1.44	0.379	1.11	0.13	0.87 – 1.43	0.375
Trusting expectations t. science	0.29	0.04	0.22 – 0.36	**< 0.001**	0.47	0.07	0.35 – 0.62	**< 0.001**	0.58	0.08	0.44 – 0.76	**< 0.001**
Trusting expectations × NFO	0.01	0.02	-0.02 – 0.05	0.497	1.00	0.08	0.84 – 1.18	0.972	0.97	0.08	0.81 – 1.16	0.721
Model fit	R^2 = .42***				Nagelkerke's R^2 = .14***				Nagelkerke's R^2 = .15***			

Note. This table shows the (linear and logistic) regression models 4a, 4b, and 4c including control variables, focal predictor (trusting expectations towards science) and the interaction term between trusting expectations and need for orientation; N = 1,175; β = standardized regression weights; OR = odds ratio; SE = heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC3); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of the regression weights; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001; bold values: p < .05.

Table 12. Sensitivity analysis: Binary logistic regression of the DV alternative online media outlet use after under-sampling the non-user category.

	DV: Alternative online media outlet use							
	Model 5a				**Model 5b**			
Predictors	OR	SE	95% CI	p	OR	SE	95% CI	p
(Intercept)	0.69	0.16	0.43 – 1.08	0.109	0.69	0.16	0.43 – 1.09	0.117
Gender (female)	0.96	0.17	0.68 – 1.34	0.801	0.96	0.17	0.68 – 1.34	0.809
Age	0.99	0.01	0.98 – 1.01	0.446	0.99	0.01	0.98 – 1.01	0.440
Education (low)	0.70	0.21	0.40 – 1.24	0.237	0.71	0.21	0.40 – 1.26	0.252
Education (med)	1.17	0.30	0.71 – 1.94	0.551	1.17	0.30	0.71 – 1.94	0.542
Residency (east)	0.90	0.21	0.56 – 1.44	0.647	0.90	0.21	0.56 – 1.44	0.650
Involvement	1.31	0.38	0.76 – 2.27	0.346	1.31	0.38	0.76 – 2.27	0.345
Interest	1.43	0.15	1.17 – 1.76	**0.001**	1.43	0.15	1.17 – 1.76	**< 0.001**
Ideology	1.08	0.06	0.97 – 1.19	0.167	1.08	0.06	0.97 – 1.19	0.169
Pop. partisanship	1.69	0.46	1.00 – 2.87	0.058	1.68	0.47	0.99 – 2.87	0.060
Pop. attitudes	1.20	0.14	0.97 – 1.49	0.110	1.20	0.14	0.97 – 1.49	0.107
Institutional trust	1.03	0.14	0.79 – 1.34	0.840	1.03	0.14	0.79 – 1.33	0.844
Est. online source use	1.70	0.17	1.39 – 2.09	**< 0.001**	1.70	0.17	1.39 – 2.09	**< 0.001**
Need for orientation	1.10	0.15	0.84 – 1.44	0.513	0.91	0.14	0.67 – 1.22	0.518
Trustworthiness of scientists	0.90	0.14	0.67 – 1.22	0.506	1.07	0.16	0.80 – 1.44	0.637
Trusting expectations t. science	0.67	0.11	0.48 – 0.92	**0.020**	0.67	0.12	0.48 – 0.92	**0.020**
Trusting expectations × NFO	-	-	-	-	0.96	0.10	0.78 – 1.17	0.702
Model fit	Nagelkerke's R^2 = .17***				Nagelkerke's R^2 = .17***			

Note. This table shows the binary logistic regression models including the DV alternative online media outlet use after removing participants who indicated not to be familiar with any of the alternative online media outlets; N = 715; OR = odds ratio; SE = heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC3); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of the regression weights; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001; bold values: p < .05.