

# **What Explains Popular Support for Government Surveillance in China?**

Zheng Su  
Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Xu Xu  
Stanford University

Xun Cao  
Penn State University

**Abstract:** Discussions of China's recent massive surveillance operation often present it as evidence of a path to an Orwellian state with an omnipresence of fear and discontent among its citizens. However, based on a most recent survey of a national representative sample in 2018, this paper finds that a great majority of Chinese citizens support various forms of state surveillance. CCTV surveillance receives the highest support (82.2 percent), followed by email and internet monitoring (61.1 percent). Even the most intrusive policy – collecting intelligence on everyone in the country – receives support from more than 53 percent of citizens. Further, support for surveillance is positively associated with an individual's preference for social stability, regime satisfaction, and to a lesser extent, trust in government. Unlike in western societies, information exposure and terrorism concern do not have any impact on Chinese citizens. These findings might help explain why the Chinese state can expand its surveillance capacity without much open resistance from the public.

**Keywords:** Surveillance, public opinion, political trust, security concern, China.

## Introduction

In the past decade, one significant change in the way by which a government rules a society is the use of information technologies to collect information and monitor the population. China is considered by many as a country that stands out in both the scale and the technological advancement of digital surveillance (Walton 2001; Qin et al. 2017). The rapid expansion of its surveillance capacity has led international news outlets to portray it as the birth of a dystopian surveillance state.<sup>1</sup> Journalists commonly raise the concern that a totalitarian social control is underway in China. Scholars refer to China's new surveillance state as digital totalitarianism (Xiao 2019). However, this pessimistic view is a striking contrast to the fact that China's aggressive expansion of state surveillance faces little open resistance from the public. In fact, the extent to which people in China dislike government surveillance remains largely an unanswered question.

This paper fills this gap in the literature. It demonstrates that Chinese citizens are to a large extent supportive of state surveillance – although they do oppose more intrusive surveillance policies. Using a most recent survey of a national representative sample in 2018, we

---

<sup>1</sup> “Inside China's Dystopian Dreams: A.I., Shame and Lots of Cameras,” *New York Times*, July 8, 2018: <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/08/business/china-surveillance-technology.html>; “Does China's digital police state have echoes in the West?” *Economist*, May 31, 2018: <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2018/05/31/does-chinas-digital-police-state-have-echoes-in-the-west>; “‘The new normal’: China's excessive coronavirus public monitoring could be here to stay,” *The Guardian*, March 8, 2020: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/09/the-new-normal-chinas-excessive-coronavirus-public-monitoring-could-be-here-to-stay>.

find that 82.2 percent of the public support CCTV (closed-circuit television camera) surveillance and 61.1 percent support email and internet monitoring. The most intrusive surveillance policy – collecting intelligence on everyone in the country – receives more than 53 percent of citizens’ support (Figure 1). Further, the level of support for state surveillance is positively associated with an individual’s preference for social stability, regime satisfaction, and to a lesser extent, trust in government. Unlike in many Western societies, information exposure and terrorism concern do not have any significant relationships with attitudes toward surveillance in China.

This paper makes three contributions. First, since Edward Snowden’s disclosure of global surveillance operations by the US government and its allies in 2013, scholars have extensively examined the public opinion of state surveillance in Western democracies (Reddick et al. 2015; Potoglou et al. 2017; Trüdinger and Steckermeier 2017). However, few studies focus on public opinion toward surveillance in China, the largest developing country in the world and one with a government that has long been using information technologies to safeguard social stability. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to systematically examine Chinese citizens’ attitudes toward state surveillance.

Second, we differentiate between three different types of surveillance policies and find that a citizen’s support for surveillance declines with the level of policy intrusiveness, which we define as the magnitude to which a policy invades the private sphere of a citizen. Past surveys often asked general questions on surveillance and privacy (Potoglou et al. 2017; Trüdinger and Steckermeier 2017). This survey, however, asked respondents specifically about their support for 1) CCTV surveillance, 2) email and internet monitoring, and 3) collecting intelligence on everyone in the country – these are three common surveillance instruments that rank from low to high in the level of intrusiveness. We find that CCTV surveillance receives the highest support,

followed by email and internet monitoring, while collecting intelligence on everyone received the least support: almost 22% of the respondents are firmly against this most comprehensive and intrusive surveillance policy.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, only 7% of the respondents are firmly against CCTV surveillance. This suggests that respondents understand the differences between surveillance policies. They are not shy of expressing their concerns over the more intrusive types: note this empirical finding also helps to address a common concern regarding self-censorship by survey respondents – if self-censoring is prevalent in our data, it is unlikely that respondents would be more willing to oppose intrusive rather than non-intrusive surveillance.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, this paper reveals significant differences in factors that affect surveillance support between American/European countries and China. For instance, concern for terrorism often increases support for surveillance in American and European contexts (Reddick et al. 2015; Trüdinger and Steckermeier 2017). Yet it has no effect in China. Unlike past studies that suggest that political trust in government increases one's acceptance of surveillance measures (Davis and Silver 2004; Denmark 2012; Pavone and Degli-Esposti 2012; Nakhale and Lint 2013), we find a much more nuanced effect in China: political trust is positively associated with support for CCTV surveillance, but is unrelated to email/internet monitoring and the policy of collecting intelligence on everyone in the country. It suggests that even for the most government-trusting

---

<sup>2</sup> Another 25% answered that government “probably should not have the right” to implement the policy.

<sup>3</sup> We thank one reviewer for this intuitive evidence. In robust checks, we include two measures of a respondent's survey sensitivity concern to control for self-censorship (Table 3).

citizens in China, political trust is unable to increase their acceptance of more intrusive surveillance policies.

### **Digital Surveillance in China**

China started to develop its surveillance capacity as early as 1998 when the Ministry of Public Security (MPS) initialized the Golden Shield (GS) project – an all-encompassing informatization platform designed to facilitate police operations. By 2006, the Chinese police had built a nationwide intranet infrastructure that connects all levels of public security bureaus. This GS platform combines a comprehensive population database with a security management information system, a criminal information system, an immigration administration information system, a detention, prison, and reeducation information system, and a traffic management information system. The platform incorporates various surveillance tools such as ID scanning and tracking in areas such as hotels, bus terminals, train stations, ticket centers, and airports.

In the late 2000s, Chinese police started to integrate street surveillance camera systems into the GS platform. The MPS and local public security bureaus launched a series of surveillance camera projects such as the “3111” Initiative, the “Safe Cities” project, the “Skynet” project, and the Rural “Sharp Eyes” project. By 2012, more than 660 pilot counties and districts under the “3111” Initiative had built surveillance camera systems in public spaces. In the past decade, big data and artificial intelligence have been integrated into the surveillance platform.

The Chinese government and large tech firms such as Tencent and Alibaba are experimenting with social credit systems that reward and punish citizens, companies, and organizations based on their “trustworthiness.” By 2018, 43 local governments have implemented pilot social credit systems. Although there is no nationally coordinated social credit

system so far, the government is making great efforts to put it in place soon. Amid the COVID-19 virus season, Chinese citizens are tracked and sorted into color-coded categories corresponding to their health status and level of COVID-19 risk.

Academic work on China's state surveillance is growing rapidly. For some, government allows highly sensitive posts published on social media and uses the information to gauge public opinion, predict potential protests, and monitor local corruption (Qin et al. 2017). Surveillance allows local governments to substitute targeted repression for universal cooptation (Xu 2021). While the policy background of China's surveillance state and its potential threats are discussed (Xiao 2019), some find that the social credit system in China has successfully changed citizens' behavior (Kostka and Antoine 2018). However, except for a few studies on citizens' attitudes toward the social credit system (e.g., Kostka 2019), the public opinion of state surveillance in China has not been examined. This paper uses a most recent nationwide opinion survey in China to fill this gap.

## **Theoretical Expectations**

### ***Overall support and cross-policy differences***

Most past studies on public opinion of surveillance policies have been conducted in the US and European countries. They often reveal a significant level of public concerns towards such policies. For example, Potoglou et al. (2017) find that Europeans expressed very high levels of concern about individual data protection and information security threats. However, such findings might not be generalizable to the Chinese context because of a different relationship between the state and non-state actors as well as different expectations and the tolerance level by citizens towards government intervention in citizens' private sphere.

Past research has argued that state–civil society relations differ from one country to another because of different economic, political, and socio-cultural factors. Cepel (2012), for instance, argues that civil society has gained different characteristics in different systems and countries. Indeed, several typologies have been proposed to categorize state–civil society relations across countries. For instance, Karjalainen (2000) presents a classification based on four models: a state-oriented model, a model based on the dominance of the civil society, a dual model, and a model of cooperation.<sup>6</sup> In the state-oriented model, for instance, public sector makes decisions on the funding and services on offer. Focusing on the Chinese context, Xu (2014) discusses major approaches in the study of Chinese civil society. For instance, the “corporatism” approach focuses on how the state fends off democracy by controlling non-government associations and by developing government-organized non-governmental organizations.<sup>7</sup> In the Chinese context, despite the recent rise of civil associations, civil society has been weaker than its developed country counterparts. More recently, government efforts to increase state reach even to the neighborhood level (“Jie Dao”, or 街道) further narrows the space for civil associations.

---

<sup>6</sup> Elsewhere, Young (2000) proposes three models regarding state–civil society relationship including supplementary, complementary, and adversarial relationships. For more discussion on other typologies, see Cepel (2012).

<sup>7</sup> A more recent approach studies associations neither created by the state nor officially incorporated into the state system, which Xu (2014) refers to as civil associations. The third, the normative neo-Tocquevillean approach, focuses on autonomous associations and their potential contributions to democratization: very few Chinese civil associations fit into this ideal type though (Xu 2014).

Therefore, as a function of this specific type of state-civil society relationship in contemporary China, the Chinese public has a higher expectation for the government to provide basic public goods and services including social stability. We therefore expect them to be more tolerant towards state policies that might interfere with citizens' private sphere as long as the concerned policy can bring citizens benefits such as personal safety and social stability.

Moreover, this specific state-civil society relationship is closely related to political regime type. Surveillance indeed invades individuals' privacy. However, this privacy concern may be less salient among people in authoritarian countries. One robust finding in the human rights literature is an association between democratic institutions and a greater respect for human rights, of which privacy is an important component (Poe et al. 1999; Davenport 2007; Keith et al. 2009; Conrad and Moore 2010). Citizens in autocracies often have low expectations for civil liberty. This understanding also has a long tradition in the literature on state-civil society relations (Keane 1988; Putnam 1993). Thus, in autocracies, citizens' attitudes toward state surveillance are less likely to be constrained by liberty concerns. This implies that citizens in autocracies will be more likely to support state surveillance than citizens in democracies.

Finally, in advanced democracies, legal systems are often independent and well-functioning since executive discretion is constrained by legislatures and judiciaries. By contrast, authoritarian regimes are reluctant to create well-functioning legal infrastructure because an independent legal system threatens a dictator's privileges or survival (Liu and Weingast 2020). The lack of well-developed legal systems leads to widespread incivilities, crimes, corruption, fraud, and contract enforcement problems. State surveillance helps maintain social order by monitoring citizens' wrongdoings to prevent crimes, incivilities, and fraud. With a strong desire for social order, citizens in autocracies thus support state surveillance to a large extent. Recent



opinion surveys indeed find that Chinese citizens generally support the social credit system, one recent form of surveillance practices in China (e.g., Kostka 2019). Thus, we expect:

Hypothesis 1a: Chinese citizens exhibit high levels of support for government surveillance in China.

Nevertheless, privacy concern is a robust predictor of support for surveillance in many countries. Thus, we further anticipate that Chinese citizens' attitude varies depending on the intrusiveness level of a surveillance policy. Among the three types of surveillance instruments asked in the survey, we expect an increasing degree of intrusiveness, therefore, a decreasing level of public support going from CCTV surveillance, to email and internet monitoring, and to collecting intelligence on everyone in the country.<sup>10</sup>

Hypothesis 1b: Chinese citizens' support for government surveillance declines with the intrusiveness level of a surveillance policy.

### ***Safety and social stability concerns***

Even though civil liberties are fundamental values of liberal democracies, citizens are willing to forego liberties for personal security and societal well-being when confronting major crises such as terrorist attacks, natural disasters, or global pandemics. This liberty-security tradeoff is at the center of the literature on public opinion of state coercion and surveillance (Davis and Silver

---

<sup>10</sup> Of course, the level of privacy concern also varies by individual. Unfortunately, our survey does not include a question on privacy concern, which prevents us from directly testing its effect at the individual level.

2004). Citizens in democratic countries expressed high levels of concerns about individual data protection and information security threats (Potoglou et al. 2017). Yet, scholars have found that public support for state surveillance is enhanced if surveillance measures are to be targeted at potential criminals rather than at all citizens and if a safety threat is salient (Ziller and Helbling 2021). Alsan et al. (2020) show that amid the COVID-19 crisis, people all around the world are also willing to tolerate surveillance measures for improved health conditions.

In authoritarian countries, however, the liberty-security tradeoff may not be a major rationale behind public support for state surveillance. As discussed earlier, the public in autocracies often have low expectations for civil liberties (Keane 1988; Putnam 1993). This lack of liberty concerns not only implies that citizens in autocracies will be more likely to support state surveillance, but also suggests that other factors such as social stability and personal security are more important predictors for public surveillance support. The salience of such security concerns, we argue, can also be attributed to the lack of social order inherited in autocratic systems. We have discussed that because an independent legal system threatens the dictator's privileges or survival, authoritarian regimes are reluctant to create well-functioning legal infrastructure, leading to problems such as widespread incivilities, crimes, and corruption. State surveillance monitors citizens' wrongdoings, helping the government maintain social order and personal security. Due to the lack of order and security inherited in autocratic systems, citizen thus strongly support state surveillance.

Not every citizen shares the same level of stability and security concerns though. Some prioritize social stability and personal safety more than others so that they are more likely to support government surveillance policies. Therefore, we expect that the more a citizen is

concerned about safety issues and the more she/he prioritizes social stability, the more likely she/he will support government surveillance.

Hypothesis 2: Preferences for social stability and personal security are positively associated with support for state surveillance in dictatorships.

### ***Political and social trust***

Political trust implies the expectation by a citizen that political actors will not misuse their power, even if they are not constantly scrutinized (Gamson 1968). Some also advance the argument that the more trustworthy a citizen perceives a government, the more likely he/she is to consent to its policies (Levi 1997). Political trust is often a resource to be used by the authorities to implement binding decisions. It is found that political trust fosters popular support for anti-terrorism policies (Denemark 2012). Nakhaie and de Lint (2013) show that trust in government is among the key predictors of surveillance and security legislation in Canada and the United States. Trüdinger and Steckermeier (2017) estimate the effects of political trust and policy-specific information on the acceptance of surveillance in Germany and find that political trust was particularly important for surveillance policy evaluations. Therefore, we expect:

Hypothesis 3a: A Chinese citizen's support for government surveillance is a positive function of her/his trust in government.

Closely related to trust in government, some scholars have also linked support for surveillance to social trust. For instance, Davis (2007) shows that trusting people often are more likely to have faith in authorities' ability to ensure that things do not get out of hand. Therefore, in addition to trust in government, social trust, that is, the extent to which an individual is

trusting other people in the society, might be another factor that increases her/his acceptance of government surveillance.

Hypothesis 3b: A Chinese citizen's support for government surveillance is a positive function of her/his social trust.

### ***Information available to citizens***

Government surveillance policies are often justified as necessary means to ensure public order and safety. They are designed to keep people away from crime, violence, and terrorist attacks. However, what often is not publicized is the intrusive nature of surveillance programs. Past studies often conceptualize government surveillance as one-sided (i.e., by the government), systematic, and routine monitoring of individuals or groups for a given purpose (Jenkins 2014; Lyon 2014). Measures such as the introduction of biometric data into passports, monitoring and recording of telecommunications, and facial recognition through artificial intelligence can limit individuals' civil rights. Citizens simply do not have the time and means to control and regulate the access to their personal information.

Not every citizen is well informed and aware of the potentially detrimental effects of surveillance programs. This is the reason why we suspect that information available to citizens regarding the nature of surveillance programs affects their support for government surveillance. In general, we expect that:

Hypothesis 4: A well-informed citizen is more likely to perceive government surveillance as introducing a risk to jeopardize individual rights, therefore, less likely to support surveillance policies.

In the Chinese context though, the effect of information on surveillance support might be more complicated. This is a function of the nature of its media system, which still is at least partly controlled by the government. Traditional media such as TV, radio, and newspapers are largely owned and operated by various levels of governments. They often play a propaganda role.<sup>11</sup> For instance, the recent government effort of building a social credit system to better collect personal data and monitoring movements has been advertised by state media as means to increase social stability and honesty. Therefore, one might expect state-controlled media exposure increases support for government surveillance.

On the other hand, information on the true nature of surveillance policies – government collecting personal information to better control the society – is more likely to circulate in new media such as the Internet and other social media platforms (e.g., Weibo and WeChat) despite consistent government online censorship. Some have refuted the popular view that the Chinese government relentlessly censors or even ban social media. For instance, by analyzing 13.2 billion blog-posts on Sina-Weibo, 2009-2013, Qin et al. (2017) show that a shockingly large number of posts on highly sensitive topics were published and circulated. King et al. (2013) reveals that the government mainly deletes online posts that incite collective action while ignoring others, even those expressing grievances and involving sensitive topics. As a result, we suspect that the exposure to less government controlled new media platforms increases the knowledge of the invasive nature of surveillance, therefore, decreases citizen support.

---

<sup>11</sup> In the 1990s, government redefined the primary role of media as agenda-setting, allowing the expression of the people's voice, though priority is still given to the party (Chan 2002).

## **Data**

We use data from the China 2018 World Values Survey (WVS), a national representative survey implemented between July and October 2018 by a joint research team from a few Chinese universities. The targeted respondents are citizens 18-70 years old and who lived in mainland China for more than 6 months in the past year. The research team applied GPS/GIS assistant sampling with stratified, multi-stage probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling to get a nationally representative sample.<sup>12</sup> A sample of 3,036 respondents from 29 provinces with a valid response was obtained (61.7 percent) (see Table C-1 in online appendix for more details). Answers were collected through face-to-face interviews by well-trained graduate and undergraduate students under the guidance of field supervisors.<sup>13</sup>

### ***Dependent variables***

During the survey, we asked respondents' attitudes toward three different types of government surveillance policies:

---

<sup>12</sup> 50 among 2,855 counties were chosen as primary sampling units (PSUs) by stratified PPS sampling. Using night light data, two half-square minutes (HSM) of latitude and longitude were chosen within each PSU. Two spatial square seconds, approximately 90 by 90 meters, within each HSM were randomly chosen. Investigators randomly drew 50 dwellings in each HSM and selected respondents using the Kish Grid method.

<sup>13</sup> Online appendix, Section C has detailed information on the distribution of respondents by province (Table C-1), the breakdowns of respondents' answers to the three surveillance policy questions by geographical regions (Table C2-C4) and by Hukou type (Table C5-C7).

*“Do you think that the Chinese government should or should not have the right to:*

- 1). keep people under video surveillance in public areas?*
- 2). monitor all e-mails and any other information exchanged on the Internet?*
- 3). collect intelligence about anyone living in China without his/her knowledge?”*

The original answers to each question are “1 = Definitely should have the right, 2 = Probably should have the right, 3 = Probably should not have the right, 4 = Definitely should not have the right”. Neither neutral nor “Don’t know” answers are offered. For a better interpretation of our results, we reversed the order of the responses so that a higher number indicates a higher level of support for surveillance.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Key independent variables***

We use three variables to measure security concerns and preference for social stability. First, we asked about a respondent’s evaluation of her/his personal safety, *Feeling of security*. The answers are “Very secure, Quite secure, Not very secure, Not at all secure.” We reverse the order so that a higher value represents a stronger sense of personal safety. Second, since September 11 in 2001, terrorism has often been perceived as one of the biggest threats in many societies. Our survey asked a respondent’s concern about a potential future terrorist attack: we also reversed the

---

<sup>14</sup> We have further divided the sample into subgroups to explore whether there are differences in attitudes across different regions and between urban and rural residents. See Tables C-2 to C7 of the online appendix for frequency distributions and related discussion.

order of answers so that a higher value corresponds to a higher concern for terrorism (*Fear of terrorism*). We use an *Importance of stability* variable to identify respondents (coded as 1, and 0 otherwise) who chose “Maintain order in the nation” as the first priority above all other choices listed in the survey, including “Giving people more say in important government decisions”, “Fighting rising prices”, and “Protecting freedom of speech.”

Trust in government (*Trust in administration*) is based on a question asking how much confidence one has in government administrative organizations. The answers are: None (1), Not very much (2), Some (3), and A great deal (4). There are other questions regarding trust in other branches of the government – *Trust in court* and *Trust in police* – we test their effects in robustness checks. In addition, we construct an overall trust index (*Trust in government*) based on trusts in administration, in court, and in police:<sup>15</sup> the results, reported in Table B-1 of the online appendix, are very similar to those when we separately test the effects associated with trust in administration (Table 1) and in court and in police (Table 3).

To measure *Social trust*, we use the question that asked respondents whether they think most people can be trusted: this is a dichotomous answer (1 = Yes; 0 = No). Answers to all trust questions are ordered with higher values representing higher levels of trust.

Regarding information exposure, we first construct an *Information index* to measure a respondent’s overall information exposure. For each of the seven information sources –

---

<sup>15</sup> We conducted principal component analysis on *Trust in administration*, *Trust in court*, and *Trust in police* and identified a very strong first factor with an eigenvalue of 2.23, explaining 74.4% of the total variation in the three variables. We use this first factor as the *Trust in government* variable.



newspapers, television, radio, mobile phone, e-mails, Internet, and social media, the survey asked respondents whether they use it to obtain information daily, weekly, monthly, less than monthly, or never. After reordering these variables with higher values indicating higher frequencies, we conducted a principal component analysis. The result identifies a very strong first factor/component with an eigenvalue of 2.73 and explaining 39% of the total variation in the data.<sup>16</sup> This strong first factor suits our purpose, which is to create one indicator to capture overall information exposure.<sup>17</sup> We standardized it to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, with higher values indicating more exposure.<sup>18</sup>

For robustness checks, we add three more information variables. First, *Information and chatting* is a comprehensive index of information exposure based on the aforementioned seven news sources *plus* a new source of “talking with friends or colleagues,” following the same procedure used to create the *Information index*.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, among the seven information

---

<sup>16</sup> The factor loadings matrix shows that all seven information sources have strong loadings on the first factor/component. The second and third factor has an eigenvalue of 1.28 (18% of the total variation) and 1.02 (15%).

<sup>17</sup> We apply a regression-based approach to get the first predicted factor score of the latent variable.

<sup>18</sup> This variable attains a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of 0.72: Cronbach's  $\alpha$  measure's reliability of multiple-question Likert scales in surveys. A value above 0.7 suggests that a set of variables well measures a single, one-dimensional latent aspect of the respondents.

<sup>20</sup> A strong first factor was identified, with an eigenvalue of 3.09 and explained 39% of the total variation; the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  is 0.76.

sources, newspaper, television, and radio are tightly controlled by the government and serve a propaganda role. We combine them to generate a measure of *Propaganda exposure* index, also following the same procedure as in the *Information index*.<sup>21</sup> Mobile phone, e-mails, Internet, and social media fit into the category that's less government-controlled: we create a *New media exposure* index based on these information sources.<sup>22</sup>

### ***Control variables***

We control for *Party membership*, indicating Chinese Communist Party membership. We consider satisfaction with the political system using a 1 to 10 scale (least to most satisfied) as *Regime satisfaction* might lead to acceptance of policies (Chen 2004; Tang, 2016). A person's *Political interest* is included because those who care more about politics might spend more time obtaining policy-related information, thus having a better understanding of surveillance policies.<sup>23</sup> The second category of control variables are demographic and socioeconomic, including age, gender, education level, self-reported family income, and urban household registration (*hukou*). Often, well-educated, high-income, and urban dwellers are associated with higher levels of privacy concerns and are therefore less likely to support government surveillance.

---

<sup>21</sup> The eigenvalue of the first factor is 1.47, 49% variance explained; the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  is 0.47.

<sup>22</sup> It has a high one-dimensionality (eigenvalue of 2.51, 63% explained variance) and a reliability of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of 0.80.

<sup>23</sup> For a simple interpretation of the result, we coded the original four-point scale into a dichotomous variable: interested in politics (1) or not (0). This coding decision does not affect our results. The results using four-point scale are almost identical (Table B-4, online appendix).

Lastly, to address survey respondents' potential self-censorship (Robinson and Tannenberg 2019), in robust checks, we include two measures of a respondent's sensitivity concern about the survey. *Concern about survey* is not a survey question answered by a respondent, but a three-scale item rated by the investigator at the end of the interview, regarding whether the investigator is "Not at all concerned (about respondent's potential self-censorship), A bit concerned, and A lot concerned." In a face-to-face survey where a potential leakage of personal data may occur, an investigator's judgement is based on his/her observation of a respondent's reactions. This judgement is, of course, subjective. Therefore, we also include a second measure: this *Self-censorship index* calculates the difference in the nonresponse rate of sensitive questions and that of non-sensitive questions for each respondent (Shen and Truex forthcoming). The fact that a respondent answered a smaller proportion of sensitive questions than non-sensitive questions suggests that he/she is more careful and reluctant to reveal true preferences.<sup>24</sup>

## **Empirical Findings**

### ***Support across policy types***

Aggregated (using survey weights) answers with the relative percentages of response options are in Figure 1.<sup>25</sup> We see high levels of overall support for surveillance. If we consider answering

---

<sup>24</sup> Questionnaire and coding rules are in Table A1; descriptive and correlation statistics are in Table A2 and Table A3, online appendix.

<sup>25</sup> We also calculate the percentages without using survey weights: they are almost identical to the weighted ones (Figure A1, online appendix).

“definitely should” or “probably should have the right” as being supportive, 82.2% of respondents agree with CCTV surveillance and 61.1% with email and internet monitoring. Even the most intrusive type of surveillance, “Collect intelligence about anyone living in China without their knowledge”, were supported by 53.2% of the respondents.

[Figure 1]

However, Chinese citizens respond differently to surveillance policies as a function of levels of intrusiveness. Respondents were quite supportive of CCTV surveillance: 42.95 percent said the government “definitely should” do so. If CCTV surveillance is a necessary means to fight crimes, monitoring emails and any other information exchanged on the Internet, on the other hand, grants government the power that might go too far in restricting civil liberties. Accordingly, the percentage of strong supporters (“definitely should have the right”) of email and internet monitoring goes down to 23.8 percent. Meanwhile, the proportions of people who are skeptical (“probably should not”) or strongly opposing (“definitely should not”) increase to 24.06 and 14.87 percent.

Even less popular is “collecting intelligence about anyone that live in China without their knowledge.” For this policy, we observe a good amount of public concern: only 20.38 percent of the respondents are strongly supportive, 32.85 percent probably supportive, while 25.34 percent skeptical, and 21.43 percent strongly opposing this policy. This pattern of declining support as a function of intrusiveness of a policy suggests that the respondents were carefully thinking about the nature of each surveillance policy.

### ***Main regression results***

We estimate ordered logit regressions, with provincial fixed effects included in all models (Table 1).<sup>26</sup> For each dependent variable, we present three model specifications. The first two report estimates from ordered logit models without survey weights, using robust standard error and clustered standard error (at the provincial level). The third model specification reports results from an ordered logit model using survey weights.<sup>27</sup>

*Explaining Support for CCTV Surveillance:* In the first three columns in Table 1, the coefficient estimates of support for CCTV are consistent, even though the statistical significance levels of some vary. The standard errors are larger when clustering at the provincial level or when survey weights are applied. In the following, we focus our discussion using results from the weighted model (Model 3) even though all three models yield similar results. Here, the coefficient for trust in government is 0.252, significant at the 0.01 level, indicating a positive and statistically significant association with supporting CCTV. The odds ratios of 1.29 suggest that the odds of being above a given category of supporting CCTV increases by 29 percent for a one-unit increase in respondent's trust in the government, holding all other variables constant.<sup>30</sup> By contrast, the coefficient of social trust is not statistically significant.

---

<sup>26</sup> To control unobservable/unmeasured provincial characteristics.

<sup>27</sup> Survey weight is calculated based on household size, age, gender, education, and population distribution from the 1% National Population Sample Survey in 2015. Liu 2015.

<sup>30</sup> An odds ratio in ordinal logistic regression is the change in the odds (of being above versus being at or below that category) for a one-unit increase from any value of a variable. It equals the

For information available to the respondent (*Information index*), the mean coefficient estimate is 0.002 and does not attain statistical significance. Variables that measure a respondent's security concerns seem to have different effects. On the one hand, the coefficient of subjective security (*Feeling of security*) is 0.168 and significant almost at the 0.1 level ( $t=1.66$ ,  $p=0.103$ ; OR=1.24), suggesting that those who feel more secure tend to be more supportive for CCTV surveillance. On the other hand, worry about terrorist attacks (*Fear of terrorism*), although having a positive coefficient, does not have a statistically significant effect. The coefficient of *Importance of stability* is 0.229 and significant at the 0.01 level, indicating that those assign more importance to maintaining social stability (against other priorities) tend to be more supportive of CCTV surveillance.

Among control variables, regime satisfaction deserves special attention. Its coefficient is 0.074, significant at the 0.01 level, suggesting a positive association with supporting CCTV surveillance. According to Easton (1975), regime satisfaction often leads to diffuse support that is more durable and independent of policy outputs and performance. A higher regime satisfaction represents an attachment to the political objects and decreases social resistance, making it easier for government to implement less-favorable policies.

The coefficients of party membership and political interest are significant in the unweighted models (model 1 and 2) but do not attain statistical significance in the weighted model (model 3). Finally, most of the demographic and socioeconomic controls, such as age, gender, education, and urban hukou do not have any effect as suggested by the weighted model;

---

exponentiated logit coefficient.

the only exception is household income. Its negative coefficient, significant at the 0.01 level, suggests that wealthier people are less supportive of CCTV.

*Explaining Support for email and Internet Monitoring:* The models on support for e-mail and Internet monitoring (column 4-6 in Table 1) yield different results. Among the key independent variables, only a preference for social stability (*Importance of stability*) is found to be associated with a higher support for Internet monitoring. The coefficient is 0.367, significant at the 0.01 level. An odds ratio of 1.44 suggests that a one-unit increase in *Importance of stability* will lead to a 44 percent increase in the odds of being supportive. While remaining positive, the effect of trust in government (*Trust in administration*) on support for Internet monitoring is not significant. Social trust also does not have a significant effect. Furthermore, the coefficients of information index and those of security concerns for personal safety (*Feeling of security*) and terrorist attacks (*Fear of terrorism*) are also not statistically different from zero.

Regarding the effects of control variables, while regime satisfaction (a coefficient of 0.12, significant at the 0.01 level) remains to be a strong predictor, people with higher family income tend to be less supportive (a coefficient of -0.07 at the 0.1 level). Other variables do not have statistically significant coefficients. The effects of political interest are significant in the unweighted models but not in the weighted model.

*Explaining Support for Intelligence Collecting:* The results from unweighted and weighted models (Model 7 to 9) are almost identical; we focus our discussion using the latter. First, we find that neither trust in government nor social trust affects support for intelligence collection. Nor does *Information index*. The factors that matter are two variables that measure respondent's

security concerns: with a one-unit increase in subjective security (*Feeling of security*, a coefficient of 0.23, significant at the 0.05 level; OR=1.26) and in preference for stability (*Importance of stability*, a coefficient of 0.27, significant at the 0.05 level; OR=1.31), a respondent is 26 and 31 percent more likely to support intelligence collection.

Regime satisfaction and political interests are both associated with higher support for collecting intelligence; party membership, however, is not. Age, gender, income, and urban hukou do not matter, either. Education attains statistical significance with a coefficient of -0.28 ( $p<0.05$ , OR=0.89) for high-school education and a -0.26 ( $p<0.1$ ; OR=0.86) for college graduates, suggesting that compared to those who did not receive formal education or who attended only primary schools, the odds of being supportive of intelligence collecting decrease by 11 percent if the respondent attended high school and by 14 percent if the respondent attended college.

[Table 1]

### ***Robustness checks***

First, we test whether the exposure to less government-controlled new media platforms might have a different influence from traditional media such as newspapers, TVs, and radio. We replace the overall *Information index* variable with one measure for *New media exposure*, one for *Propaganda exposure*, and one for all seven available information sources plus whether a respondent receives information via chatting with friends and colleagues (*Information and chatting*). Empirical results are in Table 2. Using these new measures of information exposure does not affect regression estimates for other key independent variables. Information, whether



measured by exposure to new media, to propaganda, or all media sources plus chatting with friends and colleagues, does not have a significant effect on popular support for surveillance.

[Table 2]

Moreover, in Table 3, we present results using alternative measures of trust in government and results after adding variables that measure a respondent's social desirability concerns. In Column 1 to 6, we use *Trust in court* and *Trust in police* as alternative measures for trust in government. Their coefficients are only statistically significant for CCTV: this is consistent with *Trust in administration* in Table 1. In Column 7 to 9 and 10 to 12, we include the respondent's concern about the survey—rated by the investigator after the interview—and the self-censorship index, as controls for self-censoring/social desirability bias. Respondent's desirability bias concern (*Concern about survey*) has a negative coefficient but only attain statistical significance in support for CCTV. The self-censorship index (model 10 to 12) does not have a significant effect.

[Table 3]

Finally, we have controlled for regime satisfaction in all models; yet one might ask whether this variable is conceptually overlapped with trust in government: these two variables is indeed correlated at 0.26 (Table A3, online appendix). We think a citizen can be satisfied with government performances even when he/she is skeptical of the government as a political institution. Therefore, as an additional robustness check, we re-ran models in Table 1 without the

regime satisfaction variable: results are reported in Table B-2 of the online appendix: the effects of other variables hardly change; the coefficient signs for the trust in administration variable do not change, but now those for Email/Internet monitoring and intelligence collecting also become statistically significant, likely picking up the effect previously associated with regime satisfaction.<sup>31</sup>

### **Conclusion**

Drawing on a most recent survey data from a national representative sample in 2018, this paper shows that Chinese citizens largely support state surveillance and their support for a surveillance policy varies as a function of its level of intrusiveness. We further test whether key determinants of popular surveillance support suggested by studies conducted in other countries – trust in government, information exposure, and security concerns – affect surveillance support in China. The results are mixed. Variables of security concerns matter much more than those of trust and information exposure, suggesting that security concerns are an important reason why the public largely embrace state surveillance in China.

Interestingly, we find that popular support for surveillance is mainly explained by a preference for social stability instead of concerns for terrorism. It is understandable that those who prioritize social stability are more willing to sacrifice privacy. Regarding the lack of effect of terrorism concerns, this might be explained by the fact that for most Chinese citizens, terrorist attacks are unlikely to occur in their cities. The latest large-scale event categorized by the

---

<sup>31</sup> Also, in our online appendix, we present a table without including the control variables (Table B-3).

Chinese government as terrorist attack is the July 5<sup>th</sup> Event in 2009 in Xinjiang, almost ten years before our survey. As a result of numerous government security measures implemented after the July 5<sup>th</sup> Event, the level of violence in Xinjiang has decreased dramatically. Another reason why this event does not have a large psychological impact on Chinese citizens is that Xinjiang is on the western frontier of China, a place often considered far away from the China Proper.

Moreover, we find that trust in government only increases people's support for CCTV surveillance, not for Internet monitoring or collecting intelligence. One possible explanation has to do with people's perception regarding the difference between public and private spaces. It is easier for people to tolerate loss in privacy in public space. This is especially the case when one trusts that the authority will not abuse information collected via CCTV. Regarding Email and Internet surveillance, it is not a government's job to monitor or intervene in people's private activities. Accordingly, people's trust in government does not affect their support for Internet surveillance. Similarly, since obtaining private information and intelligence without consent is not perceived as government duty, trusting government has nothing to do with one's support of this most intrusive policy.

Finally, information exposure does not affect people's support for surveillance policies. However, based on our data, we cannot claim that information does not matter. It is difficult to gauge a respondent's knowledge of surveillance policies by only measuring his/her exposure to different media sources. Different types of media might use different framings on surveillance policies: it is possible that the more information sources a respondent has access to, the more he/she is subjective to different framings about surveillance. In our robustness checks, we differentiate state-controlled media (*Propaganda exposure*) from new media platforms (*New media exposure*): our assumption is that for the former, the coverage of government surveillance

is more likely to be dominated by state propaganda; for the latter, there might be other voices revealing the invasive nature of surveillance. However, we still cannot find any significant information exposure effect. Future research should take a closer look at the contents of different media sources regarding their interpretation of government surveillance programs.

Another limitation is that as an observational study using survey data, this study is not able to provide strong empirical evidence for causal relationships between the variables. This shortcoming might be overcome in future studies with experimental designs. We also believe that comparative studies of popular support in other countries may be fruitful to guide public policies and government activities. While more research is certainly needed to better understand popular support for surveillance policies in China, we hope this article has provided a solid foundation for this new and exciting area of research.

## References

- Alsan Marcella, Luca Bragheri, Sarah Eichmeyer, Minjeong Kim, Stefanie Stantcheva, and David Yang. 2020. Civil Liberties in Times of Crisis. Working paper: [http://davidyyang.com/pdfs/civilliberty\\_draft.pdf](http://davidyyang.com/pdfs/civilliberty_draft.pdf), last accessed May 18, 2021.
- Cepel, Zuhail Unalp. 2012. An Analysis of State–Civil Society Relations in Finland: A Case of Joensuu. *Voluntas* 23: 328–349.
- Chan, Alex. 2002. “From Propaganda to Hegemony: Jiaodian Fangtan and China's Media Policy.” *Journal of Contemporary China* 11(30): 35-51.
- Chen, Jie. 2004. *Popular Political Support in Urban China*. Stanford University Press.
- Conrad, Courtenay, and Will H. Moore. 2010. “What stops the torture?” *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2): 459-476.
- Davenport, Christian. 2007. *State Repression and the Domestic Democratic Peace*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, D. W. 2007. *Negative Liberty: Public Opinion and the Terrorist Attacks on America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Davis, D. W., & Silver, B. D. 2004. “Civil liberties vs. security: Public opinion in the context of the terrorist attacks on America”. *American Journal of Political Science* 48(1): 28–46.
- Denemark, D. 2012. “Trust, efficacy and opposition to anti-terrorism police power: Australia in comparative perspective.” *Australian Journal of Political Science* 47(1): 91–113.
- Du, Xinwei. 2013. *Design and Implementation of Taiyuan Comprehensive Information Platform for a Bureau of Police* (in Chinese). Master’s thesis. University of Electronic Science and Technology of China: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10614-1013330231.htm>, accessed December 5, 2020.

- Easton, David. 1975. "A re-assessment of the concept of political support." *British Journal of Political Science* 5(4): 435-457.
- King, Gary, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E. Roberts. 2013. "How censorship in China allows government criticism but silences collective expression." *American Political Science Review* 107(02):326-343.
- Jenkins, R. 2014. "Identity, surveillance and modernity: Sorting out who's who." In Kirstie Ball (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. London: Routledge, 159-166.
- Karjalainen, J. 2000. Unofficial aid as a shaper of relations between the third sector and the state. In M. Siisiainen, P. Kinnunen, & E. Hietanen (Eds.), *The third sector in Finland. Review to research of the Finnish third sector* (pp. 152-161). Rovaniemi: The Finnish Federation for Social Welfare and Health, University of Lapland.
- Keith, Linda Camp, C. Neal Tate, and Steven C. Poe. 2009. "Is the law a mere parchment barrier to human rights abuse?" *Journal of Politics* 71(2): 644-660.
- Keane, John. 1988. *Civil society and the state: New European perspectives*. London: Verso.
- Kostka, Genia. 2019. "China's social credit systems and public opinion: Explaining high levels of approval." *New Media & Society* 21(7): 1565-1593.
- Kostka, Genia, and Lukas Antoine. 2020. "Fostering Model Citizenship: Behavioral Responses to China's Emerging Social Credit Systems." *Policy & Internet* 12, no. 3: 256-289.
- Liu, Lizhi, and Barry R. Weingast. 2020. Law, Chinese Style: Solving the Authoritarian's Legal Dilemma through the Private Provision of Law. *Working Paper*.
- Liu, Xing. 2015. *Applied Ordinal Logistic Regression Using Stata: From Single-Level to Multilevel Modeling*. Sage Publications.


- Lyon, D. 2014. "Surveillance, Snowden, and big data: Capacities, consequences, critique." *Big Data & Society*, 1(2), 1–13.
- Nakhaie, R., & de Lint, W. 2013. "Trust and support for surveillance policies in Canadian and American opinion." *International Criminal Justice Review*, 23(2), 149–169.
- Pavone, V., and Degli Esposti, S. 2012. "Public assessment of new surveillance-oriented security technologies: Beyond the trade-off between privacy and security." *Public Understanding of Science*, 21(5), 556–572.
- Pavlou, Paul A. 2011. "State of the information privacy literature: Where are we now and where should we go?" *MIS Quarterly* 35(4): 977-88.
- Poe, Steven, Neal Tate, and Linda Camp Keith. 1999. "Repression of the human right to personal integrity revisited: A global cross-national study covering the years 1976–1993." *International Studies Quarterly* 43 (2): 291–313.
- Potoglou, Dimitris, Fay Dunkerley, Sunil Patil, and Neil Robinson. 2017. "Public preferences for internet surveillance, data retention and privacy enhancing services: Evidence from a pan-European study." *Computers in Human Behavior* 75: 811-825.
- Putnam, Robert D., and Robert Leonardi. 1993 *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton university press.
- Qin, Bei, David Strömberg, and Yanhui Wu. 2017. Why does China allow freer social media? Protests versus surveillance and propaganda. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31 (1): 117-40.
- Reddick, Christopher G., Akemi Takeoka Chatfield, and Patricia A. Jaramillo. 2015. "Public opinion on National Security Agency surveillance programs: A multi-method approach." *Government Information Quarterly* 32: 129–141.

- Robinson, Darrel and Marcus Tannenbergh. 2019. "Self-Censorship in authoritarian states: Response bias in measures of popular support in China." *Research & Politics* 6(3): 1-9.
- Shen, Jie. 2017. Reflections on Strengthening the Management of Key Personnel under big data background (in Chinese). *Journal of GANSU Police Vocational College*. 15 (No.1):19–23.
- Shen, X. and R. Truex. Forthcoming. In search of self-censorship. *British Journal of Political Science*.
- Tang, Wenfang. 2016. *Populist Authoritarianism: Chinese Political Culture and Regime Sustainability*. Oxford University Press.
- Trager, Robert, and Lynn Vavreck. 2011. The political costs of crisis bargaining: Presidential rhetoric and the role of party. *American Political Science Review* 55(3): 526–545.
- Trüdinger, Eva-Maria and Leonie C. Steckermeier. 2017. "Trusting and controlling? Political trust, information and acceptance of surveillance policies: The case of Germany." *Government Information Quarterly* 34: 421–433.
- Walton, Greg. 2001. *China's Golden Shield: Corporations and the Development of Surveillance Technology in the People's Republic of China*. Rights & Democracy.
- Xiao, Qiang. 2019. The road to digital unfreedom: President Xi's surveillance state. *Journal of Democracy* 30 (1): 53-67.
- Xu, Bin. 2004. Consensus Crisis and Civil Society: The Sichuan Earthquake Response and State–Society Relations. *The China Journal*, 71: 91-108.
- Xu, Xu. 2021. To Repress or to Co-opt? Authoritarian Control in the Age of Digital Surveillance. *American Journal of Political Science* 65, no. 2: 309-325.
- Young, D. R. 2000. Alternative models of government–nonprofit sector relations: Theoretical and international perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 149–172.





**Figure 1. Support for surveillance, using survey weights.**



**Table 1: Main Results from ordered logit models.**

	(1) CCTV	(2) CCTV	(3) CCTV	(4) Email/Internet monitoring	(5) Email/Internet monitoring	(6) Email/Internet monitoring	(7) Intelligence collecting	(8) Intelligence collecting	(9) Intelligence collecting
Trust in administration	0.202*** (0.061)	0.202*** (0.065)	0.252*** (0.079)	0.060 (0.058)	0.060 (0.080)	0.115 (0.073)	0.079 (0.058)	0.079 (0.076)	0.107 (0.074)
Social trust	-0.101 (0.080)	-0.101 (0.087)	-0.124 (0.104)	-0.002 (0.077)	-0.002 (0.067)	0.022 (0.089)	-0.089 (0.075)	-0.089 (0.092)	-0.054 (0.084)
Information index	0.014 (0.050)	0.014 (0.063)	0.002 (0.060)	-0.021 (0.048)	-0.021 (0.055)	0.018 (0.058)	0.014 (0.047)	0.014 (0.057)	0.042 (0.061)
Feeling of security	0.196*** (0.073)	0.196** (0.078)	0.168* (0.101)	0.117 (0.072)	0.117 (0.108)	0.148 (0.100)	0.177** (0.070)	0.177* (0.098)	0.231** (0.109)
Fear of terrorism	0.031 (0.042)	0.031 (0.050)	0.047 (0.063)	-0.044 (0.041)	-0.044 (0.046)	-0.024 (0.057)	-0.015 (0.041)	-0.015 (0.050)	0.018 (0.051)
Importance of stability	0.236*** (0.074)	0.236 (0.157)	0.229* (0.114)	0.337*** (0.072)	0.337** (0.162)	0.367*** (0.130)	0.288*** (0.072)	0.288* (0.160)	0.267** (0.121)
Party membership	-0.185* (0.102)	-0.185* (0.099)	-0.152 (0.122)	0.008 (0.095)	0.008 (0.103)	0.141 (0.113)	0.010 (0.094)	0.010 (0.111)	-0.052 (0.121)
Regime satisfaction	0.074*** (0.021)	0.074*** (0.026)	0.074*** (0.027)	0.132*** (0.019)	0.132*** (0.020)	0.117*** (0.021)	0.071*** (0.020)	0.071*** (0.023)	0.050* (0.025)
Political interest	0.130* (0.076)	0.130* (0.078)	0.058 (0.083)	0.168** (0.073)	0.168*** (0.062)	0.108 (0.075)	0.178** (0.072)	0.178** (0.078)	0.172** (0.078)
Age	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.006)	-0.003 (0.005)	0.007** (0.003)	0.007 (0.005)	0.007 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.003)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.004)
Gender (male=1)	0.071 (0.075)	0.071 (0.071)	0.020 (0.080)	0.035 (0.074)	0.035 (0.092)	0.014 (0.095)	0.059 (0.073)	0.059 (0.074)	0.046 (0.081)
High school	-0.178* (0.108)	-0.178* (0.103)	-0.140 (0.106)	-0.053 (0.103)	-0.053 (0.090)	-0.115 (0.111)	-0.287*** (0.101)	-0.287*** (0.107)	-0.283** (0.106)
College and above	-0.164 (0.153)	-0.164 (0.138)	-0.236 (0.170)	-0.032 (0.141)	-0.032 (0.154)	-0.156 (0.162)	-0.196 (0.142)	-0.196 (0.176)	-0.257* (0.151)
Household income	-0.075*** (0.022)	-0.075** (0.029)	-0.074** (0.034)	-0.062*** (0.022)	-0.062 (0.039)	-0.074* (0.039)	-0.036* (0.022)	-0.036 (0.040)	-0.047 (0.038)
Urban hukou	0.054 (0.090)	0.054 (0.100)	0.121 (0.109)	-0.007 (0.087)	-0.007 (0.085)	0.021 (0.109)	0.002 (0.088)	0.002 (0.130)	0.066 (0.148)
Provincial Fixed effects	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Robust standard errors	√			√			√		
Cluster stand. Er. (prov.)		√			√			√	
Using survey weights			√			√			√
Obs.	2822	2822	2822	2813	2813	2813	2814	2814	2814
Model Fit	170.71***	162.95***	2.14**	208.82***	248.05***	6.88***	143.11***	295.33***	2.47**

Note: Model fit reports the log likelihood chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  value) of the unweighted model and adjusted Wald test ( $F$ -value) for all variables of the weighted model. Standard errors in parenthesis; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

**Table 2: Results with alternative measures of information exposure, ordered logit models with survey weights.**

	(1) CCTV	(2) Email/Internet monitoring	(3) Intelligence collecting	(4) CCTV	(5) Email/Internet monitoring	(6) Intelligence collecting	(7) CCTV	(8) Email/Internet monitoring	(9) Intelligence collecting
Trust in administration	0.251*** (0.079)	0.115 (0.073)	0.108 (0.073)	0.250*** (0.079)	0.114 (0.072)	0.110 (0.073)	0.240*** (0.078)	0.112 (0.072)	0.103 (0.072)
Social trust	-0.124 (0.103)	0.023 (0.088)	-0.056 (0.084)	-0.126 (0.104)	0.024 (0.089)	-0.055 (0.084)	-0.118 (0.101)	0.023 (0.089)	-0.054 (0.084)
Information & chatting	0.027 (0.059)	0.053 (0.059)	0.084 (0.058)						
New media exposure				-0.010 (0.065)	0.013 (0.062)	0.054 (0.064)			
Propaganda exposure							0.005 (0.057)	0.063 (0.053)	0.024 (0.052)
Feeling of security	0.166* (0.101)	0.145 (0.099)	0.228** (0.109)	0.170* (0.101)	0.153 (0.100)	0.234** (0.109)	0.178* (0.099)	0.141 (0.100)	0.229** (0.109)
Fear of terrorism	0.047 (0.063)	-0.023 (0.058)	0.018 (0.050)	0.046 (0.062)	-0.026 (0.058)	0.015 (0.050)	0.046 (0.063)	-0.032 (0.057)	0.015 (0.050)
Importance of stability	0.228* (0.113)	0.367*** (0.129)	0.266** (0.120)	0.226* (0.114)	0.362*** (0.130)	0.261** (0.121)	0.222* (0.113)	0.357*** (0.128)	0.261** (0.120)
Control variables	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Provincial Fixed Effect	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Obs.	2819	2810	2811	2834	2825	2826	2845	2835	2836
Model Fit	2.15**	6.91***	2.32**	2.12**	6.82***	2.47**	2.27**	7.02***	2.98***

Note: Control variables included but not reported because of space limit. Standard errors in parenthesis. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**Table 3: Results with alternative measures for trust in government and social desirability/concern, ordered logit models with survey weights.**

	(1) CCTV	(2) Email/ Internet monitoring	(3) Intelligence collecting	(4) CCTV	(5) Email/ Internet monitoring	(6) Intelligence collecting	(7) CCTV	(8) Email/ Internet monitoring	(9) Intelligence collecting	(10) CCTV	(11) Email/ Internet monitoring	(12) Intelligence collecting
Trust in court	0.153* (0.084)	0.098 (0.066)	0.047 (0.070)									
Trust in police				0.140* (0.081)	0.093 (0.065)	-0.026 (0.072)						
Trust in administration							0.254*** (0.078)	0.103 (0.072)	0.095 (0.069)	0.252*** (0.079)	0.114 (0.074)	0.107 (0.073)
Social trust	-0.114 (0.105)	0.029 (0.088)	-0.046 (0.083)	-0.107 (0.105)	0.037 (0.087)	-0.027 (0.081)	-0.105 (0.106)	0.078 (0.086)	-0.007 (0.086)	0.252*** (0.086)	0.114 (0.089)	0.107 (0.084)
Information index	0.008 (0.058)	0.014 (0.058)	0.037 (0.061)	0.005 (0.058)	0.014 (0.057)	0.034 (0.061)	0.027 (0.058)	0.025 (0.056)	0.050 (0.064)	0.002 (0.060)	0.016 (0.058)	0.042 (0.061)
Feeling of security	0.179* (0.101)	0.148 (0.101)	0.233** (0.110)	0.168* (0.099)	0.141 (0.099)	0.241** (0.109)	0.165* (0.096)	0.113 (0.092)	0.202** (0.105)	0.168 (0.101)	0.145 (0.099)	0.230** (0.109)
Fear of terrorism	0.053 (0.062)	-0.022 (0.057)	0.021 (0.051)	0.053 (0.062)	-0.025 (0.058)	0.024 (0.051)	-0.009 (0.052)	-0.077 (0.111)	0.009 (0.045)	0.047 (0.063)	-0.025 (0.058)	0.018 (0.051)
Importance of stability	0.226* (0.115)	0.356*** (0.130)	0.257** (0.121)	0.217* (0.116)	0.348** (0.132)	0.254** (0.122)	0.192* (0.106)	0.347*** (0.124)	0.245** (0.114)	0.229* (0.114)	0.366*** (0.130)	0.266** (0.121)
Concern about survey							-0.194** (0.090)	-0.074 (0.113)	-0.186 (0.122)			
Self-censorship index										0.103 (1.255)	-1.028 (1.148)	-0.458 (1.623)
Control variables	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Provincial Fixed Effect	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Obs.	2821	2814	2811	2825	2817	2815	2806	2797	2799	2822	2813	2814
Model Fit	2.05**	6.87***	2.49**	1.87*	7.82***	2.50**	2.51**	7.23***	2.67**	2.03**	6.62***	2.29**

Note: Control variables included but not reported because of space limit. Standard errors in parenthesis. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.