

Supplementary for Managing Sustainable Use of Antibiotics

Table S1. Logistic probability model of willingness to abstain antibiotics

Model 0	B	SE	Wald's Z	Sig.	Exp(B)
Intercept	-.20	.06	12.43	.00	.82
N	1293				
-2 LL	1779.99				
Classification	54.9%				

Notes: Method=enter, Variables entered: "Are you willing to abstain from using antibiotics, if possible, even when you risk additional sick days?" The options are, 1 = no, absolutely not, 2 = no, most likely not, 3 = yes, most likely, and 4 = yes, absolutely, and is dichotomized to 1 = yes, absolutely and 0 = other. Interpersonal trust was posed as "to what extent can you say that other people can be trusted?" Where 0 = one cannot trust other people and 10 = you can trust other people. Source: The national SOM survey 2016

Table S2. Logistic probability model of willingness to abstain antibiotics after interpersonal trust, antibiotics use, self-estimated health, worry about increased resistance, level of education, institutional trust, gender, and age

Model 1	B	SE	Wald's Z	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Exp (B)	95% CI Upper
Interpersonal trust	.10	.03	15.65	.00	1.05	1.11	1.16
Intercept	-.87	.18	23.37	.00		.42	
N	1293						
-2 LL	1763.94						
Nagelkerke's R ²	.016						
Model Chi ²	16.05***						
Hosmer & Lemeshow	8.25						
Classification	57.3%						

Notes: Method=enter, Variables entered: "Are you willing to abstain from using antibiotics, if possible, even when you risk additional sick days?" The options are, 1 = no, absolutely not, 2 = no, most likely not, 3 = yes, most likely, and 4 = yes, absolutely, and is dichotomized to 1 = yes, absolutely and 0 = other. Interpersonal trust was posed as "to what extent can you say that other people can be trusted?" Where 0 = one cannot trust other people and 10 = you can trust other people. Source: The national SOM survey 2016

Table S3. Logistic probability model of willingness to abstain antibiotics after interpersonal trust, antibiotics use, self-estimated health, worry about increased resistance

Model 2	B	SE	Wald's Z	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Exp(B)	95% CI Upper
Interpersonal trust	.08	.03	7.99	.01	1.02	1.08	1.14
Antibiotics use (1)			9.99	.02			
2-5 times (2)	.39	.38	1.06	.30	.70	1.48	3.14
Once (3)	.18	.35	.27	.60	.61	1.20	2.38
Never (4)	.59	.33	3.09	.08	.94	1.80	3.45
Worry low (1)			65.62	.00			
Worry (2)	-.03	.57	.00	.96	.32	.97	2.95
Worry (3)	.66	.54	1.50	.22	.68	1.93	5.51
Worry high (4)	1.39	.53	6.81	.01	1.41	4.02	11.44
Health (well)	.36	.14	6.3	.01	1.08	1.43	1.90
Intercept	-2.41	.66	13.49	.00		.09	
N	1293						
-2 LL	1674.07						
Nagelkerke's R ²	.105						
Model Chi ²	105.92***						
Hosmer & Lemeshow	13.61*						
Classification	62.1%						

Notes: Method=enter, Variables entered: "Are you willing to abstain from using antibiotics, if possible, even when you risk additional sick days?" The options are, 1 = no, absolutely not, 2 = no, most likely not, 3 = yes, most likely, and 4 = yes, absolutely, and is dichotomized to 1 = yes, absolutely and 0 = other. Interpersonal trust was posed as "to what extent can you say that other people can be trusted?" Where 0 = one cannot trust other people and 10 = you can trust other people. Source: The national SOM survey 2016

Table S4. Logistic probability model of willingness to abstain antibiotics after interpersonal trust, antibiotics use, self-estimated health, worry about increased resistance, level of education and institutional trust.

Model 3	B	SE	Wald's Z	Sig	95% CI Lower	Exp(B)	95% CI Upper
Interpersonal trust	.06	.03	4.52	.03	1.01	1.06	1.12
Antibiotics use (1)			8.73	.03			
2-5 times (2)	.30	.39	.60	.44	.63	1.35	2.88
Once (3)	.12	.35	.12	.73	.57	1.13	2.56
Never (4)	.51	.34	2.29	.13	.86	1.66	3.23
Worry low (1)			63.03	.00			
Worry (2)	-.08	.57	.02	.88	.30	.92	2.82
Worry (3)	.58	.54	1.15	.29	.62	1.78	5.15
Worry high (4)	1.32	.54	6.00	.01	1.30	3.74	10.73
Health (well)	.29	.15	3.78	.05	1.00	1.33	1.77
Education low (1)			18.58	.00			
Education (2)	.63	.22	7.93	.01	1.21	1.87	2.89
Education (3)	.88	.23	15.31	.00	1.55	2.42	3.77
Education high (4)	.88	.22	15.65	.00	1.55	2.39	3.69
Institutional trust (1)			.60	.90			
Institutional trust (2)	-.01	.35	.00	.98	.50	.99	1.97
Institutional trust (3)	.04	.34	.01	.91	.53	1.04	2.03
Institutional trust (4)	.15	.37	.15	.69	.56	1.16	2.38
Intercept	-2.85	.73	15.23	.00		.06	
Cases	1293						
-2 LL	1653.84						
Nagelkerke's R ²	.124						
Model Chi ²	126.14***						
Hosmer & Lemeshow	6.18						
Classification	63.9%						

Notes: Method=enter, Variables entered: "Are you willing to abstain from using antibiotics, if possible, even when you risk additional sick days?" The options are, 1 = no, absolutely not, 2 = no, most likely not, 3 = yes, most likely, and 4 = yes, absolutely, and is dichotomized to 1 = yes, absolutely and 0 = other. Interpersonal trust was posed as "to what extent can you say that other people can be trusted?" Where 0 = one cannot trust other people and 10 = you can trust other people. Source: The national SOM survey 2016

Table S5. Logistic probability model of willingness to abstain antibiotics after interpersonal trust, antibiotics use, self-estimated health, worry about increased resistance, level of education, institutional trust, gender and age

Model 4	B	SE	Wald's Z	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Exp(B)	95% CI Upper
Interpersonal trust	.07	.03	5.68	.02	.01	1.07	1.13
Antibiotics use (1)			7.98	.05			
2-5 times (2)	.31	.39	.63	.43	.64	1.36	2.92
Once (3)	.06	.36	.03	.87	.53	1.06	2.12
Never (4)	.45	.34	1.72	.19	.80	1.56	3.04
Worry low (1)			69.19	.00			
Worry (2)	.01	.58	.00	.99	.33	1.01	3.11
Worry (3)	.69	.55	1.58	.21	.68	1.99	5.80
Worry high (4)	1.48	.55	7.40	.01	1.51	4.40	12.81
Health (well)	.25	.15	2.73	.10	.96	1.28	1.71
Education low (1)			9.45	.02			
Education (2)	.42	.23	3.33	.07	.97	1.53	2.41
Education (3)	.67	.24	7.93	.01	1.23	1.95	3.10
Education high (4)	.62	.23	7.07	.01	1.18	1.86	2.95
Institutional trust (1)			1.07	.78			
Institutional trust (2)	.00	.35	.00	1.00	.50	1.00	2.00
Institutional trust (3)	.10	.35	.08	.78	.56	1.10	2.17
Institutional trust (4)	.21	.37	.32	.57	.59	1.24	2.57
Gender (f)	-.06	.12	.27	.61	.74	.94	1.19
Age (1)			12.69	.01			
30-49 years (2)	.13	.21	.40	.53	.76	1.14	1.73
50-64 years (3)	-.05	.21	.05	.82	.63	.95	1.43
65-85 years (4)	-.45	.22	4.25	.04	.41	.64	.98
Intercept	-2.67	.76	12.20	.00		.07	
N	1293						
-2 LL	1640.79						
Nagelkerke's R ²	.137						
Model Chi ²	139.20***						
Hosmer & Lemeshow	4.36						
Classification	63.9%						

Notes: Method=enter, Variables entered: "Are you willing to abstain from using antibiotics, if possible, even when you risk additional sick days?" The options are, 1 = no, absolutely not, 2 = no, most likely not, 3 = yes, most likely, and 4 = yes, absolutely, and is dichotomized to 1 = yes, absolutely and 0 = other. Interpersonal trust was posed as "to what extent can you say that other people can be trusted?" Where 0 = one cannot trust other people and 10 = you can trust other people. Source: The national SOM survey 2016

Randomization checks

Table S6. Descriptive statistics of sex by experiment groups

Sex

Group	N	Mean	Std. dev	Std. err	95 % CI lower	95 % CI Upper
80 % cooperate	878	.36	.48	.02	.33	.39
20 % cooperate	938	.36	.48	.02	.33	.39
Information	864	.36	.48	.02	.33	.39
Control	879	.38	.49	.02	.34	.41
Total	3559	.36	.48	.01	.35	.38

Source: The Citizen Panel 26 2017

Table S7. ANOVA of sex by experiment groups

Sex

Group	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	.22	3	.07	.32	.81
Within groups	822.75	3555	.23		
Total	822.97	3558			

Source: The Citizen Panel 26 2017

Table S8. Descriptive statistics of year of birth by experiment groups

Year of birth

Group	N	Mean	Std. dev	Std. err	95 % CI lower	95 % CI Upper
80 % cooperate	880	1963.64	14.85	.50	1962.66	1964.62
20 % cooperate	944	1962.95	14.75	.48	1962.00	1963.89
Information	871	1963.35	14.80	.50	1962.37	1964.34
Control	886	1964.53	14.12	.47	1963.60	1965.46
Total	3581	1963.61	14.64	.25	1963.13	1964.09

Source: The Citizen Panel 26 2017

Table S9. ANOVA of year of birth by experiment groups

Year of birth

Group	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	1220.82	3	406.94	1.90	.13
Within groups	765758.01	3577	214.08		
Total	766978.82	3580			

Source: The Citizen Panel 26 2017

Table S10. Descriptive statistics of level of education by experiment groups

Level of education

Group	N	Mean	Std. dev	Std. err	95 % CI lower	95 % CI Upper
80 % cooperate	886	7	1.79	.06	6.89	7.12
20 % cooperate	953	6.95	1.87	.06	6.83	7.07
Information	876	6.9	1.90	.06	6.78	7.03
Control	889	7.02	1.81	.06	6.90	7.14
Total	3604	6.97	1.84	.03	6.91	7.03

Source: The Citizen Panel 26 2017

Table S11. ANOVA of level of education by experiment groups

Level of education

Group	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	7.54	3	2.51	.74	.53
Within groups	12250.04	3600	3.40		
Total	12257.58	3603			

Source: The Citizen Panel 26 2017