

**Supplemental Material for
'Does (Non-)Localness Affect MPs' Levels of Responsiveness:
Evidence from a UK Field Experiment'**

<i>Appendix A: Emails and Constituent Names</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Appendix B: Ethical Considerations</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Appendix C: The Final Sample</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Appendix D: Descriptive Statistics</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Appendix E: Regression Tables</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Appendix F: Robustness Checks</i>	<i>13</i>

Appendix A: Emails and Constituent Names

<p><i>Dear [Title] [MP's surname],</i></p> <p><i>My name is [constituent's name] and I've recently moved to the constituency you represent. I'm working as a [cleaner / lawyer] and I'm worried about the consequences of the Covid-19 crisis. I work for a large company and I personally feel safe for now. But I'm worried about the longer term. I see the crisis affects people all around me who are losing jobs or experiencing pay cuts. And many other problems are being neglected because everything is about corona now.</i></p> <p><i>[As a [party name] supporter / statement left out for control group,] I'd like to know what are you and [party name] are going to do to get us through this crisis in the best possible way.</i></p> <p><i>I am looking forward to your response.</i></p> <p><i>Best wishes,</i></p> <p><i>[Constituent's name]</i></p>	<p><i>Dear [Title] [MP's surname],</i></p> <p><i>I am [constituent's name]. Recently, I've moved to your constituency. I'm emailing you because I am concerned about the impact of the corona crisis. I am working as a [cleaner / lawyer] and I see a lot of people around me who are suffering as a result of the crisis, losing their jobs or facing pay cuts. As I work for a big firm, I am safe for now. But I am worried about the future. I feel anxious not only because of corona specifically, but also because all the other problems don't get much attention because of corona.</i></p> <p><i>I would like to ask you [,as a [party name] supporter / statement left out for control group,] how you and [party name] are planning to guide us through these difficult times.</i></p> <p><i>I am looking forward to your answer.</i></p> <p><i>Kind regards,</i></p> <p><i>[Constituent's name]</i></p>
--	---

Table A1: Email samples

Gender	Ethnicity	Names
Female	Majority	Jessica Smith
		Jessica Jones
		Emma Smith
		Emma Jones
Male	Majority	Thomas Smith
		Thomas Jones
		Paul Smith
		Paul Jones
Female	Minority	Yasmin Khan
		Yasmin Hassan
		Maryam Khan
		Maryam Hassan
Male	Minority	Mohammad Khan
		Mohammad Hassan
		Ali Khan
		Ali Hassan

Table A2. Names of fictitious constituents in the field experiment

Appendix B: Ethical Considerations

Our study, which has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee of our institution, addressed ethical concerns that are commonly raised in audit experiments. To minimise the burden placed on legislators, we sent short, concise and authentic emails to make it easy for them (or their staff) to answer. We did not target any specific MP or party to prevent any backlash against them. Audit experiments involve some use of deception as the legislators are unaware that they are part of a study (Bischof et al, 2021; Desposato, 2016). The extant literature argues that the informed consent is not required since no or minimal harm is done to participants and the benefits of conducting these studies of scientific and social importance outweigh the costs (Zitell et al, 2021). We mitigated the use of deception by sending a debrief form to all MPs (as it was required by our Ethics Committee), informing them about the nature of the experiment and giving them the opportunity to opt out from the study. This debrief form led to 161 of the 650 MPs opting out from the analysis and requested their data to be withdrawn as a result (see more about the reaction to the debrief in Campbell and Bolet, 2021). While our final sample is reduced¹, we can still use it for analysis since we do not detect any attrition bias, as shown in Appendix C.

Since MPs are legally allowed to respond to their constituents only, a majority of the replies we received from MPs asked for contact details. Despite obtaining the ethics approval to include postcodes, we decided against this idea for the following reasons:

- While adding a postcode may have increased our response rate, it may have also influenced our treatment effects. Having a postcode conveys another important information to the MPs that could affect the way he or she responds. The MPs (or staffers) might recognise the postcodes and be more inclined to reply to a constituent that lives in a marginal area within his or her constituency.
- Adding another cue to the MPs in the UK experiment would have harmed the international comparison. It would have been difficult to differentiate results from the experiments in Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands than in the UK where we add an additional information on the senders.

¹ We have observations from 487 MPs in our final sample. Two more MPs could not be contacted by email.

- Providing a postcode only gives partial information of address. MPs often request the full address and contact number. So, including a postcode would not have fully resolved the issue as some MPs (or staffers) would have still requested the full address.
- There was a risk of losing the authenticity of the emails by adding the postcode. Since the UK postcodes are very specific, we needed to ensure that the selected postcodes were residential, highly populated and in low- to middle-income parts of the constituencies. While we could have generated some postcodes based on information on local levels of deprivation, we would have never been certain that our postcodes were credible enough for cleaners and lawyers to live there.
- Following on this point, we could not have guaranteed the randomness of the postcodes' selection as it is impossible to make the information on postcodes constant in our analysis despite our best efforts. Some MPs would have received information on constituents who live more or less affluent areas than the average, and this could have affected our treatment effects. This means that there was a reasonable risk that including the postcode could have interacted with our other independent variables.
- There was a risk of exposure with our experiment since adding a postcode without disclosing the full address is an odd move that might raise suspicion among MPs, especially as MPs will receive two emails. MPs (or staffers) could have also traced back constituents with their electoral register and realised that such constituent didn't actually live there. Some MP's automatic emails openly said that their office uses data from the open electoral register for referencing and filing purposes.

Given all these reasons, we concluded that the risks of including postcodes outweigh the benefits.

Appendix C: The Final Sample

161 MPs, which corresponds to 24.85% of all MPs, asked for their data to be deleted. This led to a drop of observations from 1,296 to 974 observations (we double the number of observations as MPs received two emails). This means that we retained 75.15% of MPs' observations. This loss can be a source of concern about the possibility of bias as it's greater than 20% (Schulz and Grimes, 2002).

Unfortunately, we are not permitted to use the full data from the experiment to assess whether response rates may be affected by dropouts. We can however examine the baseline characteristics of MPs who were lost and the characteristics of those remaining to assess whether our analysis may be affected by attrition bias. Attrition can introduce bias if the characteristics of withdrawn MPs differ from those of the remaining sample. We report baseline characteristics for these two categories, as well as the characteristics of the full sample in Table C1. The MPs characteristics include their gender, ethnicity, education, size of their electorate and vote share in the 2019 General Elections. The last column also includes the t-value and its corresponding significance level between the remaining sample and the dropouts for each characteristic. We also include cross-tabulations and chi-square analyses for two categorical variables, party and region. These analyses are reported in Tables C2 and C3 respectively. We find no difference in means between these two samples for all characteristics (except for region), which suggests that our remaining sample is well balanced and can be used for analysis. We are confident that we have mitigated concerns regarding attrition bias and internal invalidity.

Variable	Full Sample			Remaining Sample			Dropouts			t_value
	Obs	Mean	SD	Obs	Mean	SD	Obs	Mean	SD	
Male	648	1.660	.474	487	1.667	.472	161	1.649	.482	.640
White Ethnicity	648	1.900	.301	487	1.899	.301	161	1.901	.300	-0.045
High Education	625	2.483	1.958	474	2.492	1.960	161	2.457	1.959	0.189
Electorate Size	648	73175.29	9029.088	487	73180.47	2.527	161	3.584	8069.485	0.025
Vote Share	648	53.969	9.382	487	54.283	9332.407	161	73159.61	10.483	1.483

*p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table C1: Baseline Characteristics

Variable	Full Sample	Remaining Sample	Dropouts	Chi-Square
Conservative MPs	363	267	96	5.25
Labour MPs	203	150	53	
Other MPs	82	70	12	
Total	648	487	161	

*p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table C2: Cross-Tabulation between Samples and Party and Chi-Square Analysis

Variable	Full Sample	Remaining Sample	Dropouts	Chi-Square
East	58	46	12	20.086*
East Midlands	46	36	10	
London	73	57	16	
North East	29	22	7	
North West	75	50	25	
Northern Ireland	18	18	0	
Scotland	59	46	13	
South East	83	67	16	
South West	55	35	20	
Wales	40	30	10	
West Midlands	58	37	21	
Yorkshire and The Humber	54	43	11	
Total	648	487	161	

*p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table C3: Cross-Tabulation between Samples and Region and Chi-Square Analysis

Using the remaining sample, we still observe variation in the response levels, with 73.92% of MPs responding to the emails. 26.08% of MPs who responded provided a genuine reply whereas 72.92% of MPs requested an address (see detailed information on response rate in Table D1). The high response rate of MPs asking for a response was expected because we did not include any postcode and MPs commonly respond to their constituents only. We choose the response rate of MPs who genuinely responded as our main dependent variable in the comparative analysis to be consistent with the measure used in the other countries. We can therefore run several analyses using the remaining sample.

Appendix D: Descriptive Statistics

	Observations	Mean	SD	Min	Max
MPs' Response Rate	974	.7392197	.4392858	0	1
MPs' Response Rate (Ordinal Variable)	974	.9507187	.6858086	0	2
(Log) Distance	944	4.007001	1.965511	-1.6947	9.847699
(Log) Distance - Haversine Formula	944	4.005042	1.965695	-1.695154	9.848229
Non-Local MPs (>50km)	974	.5462012	.4981166	0	1
Non-Local MPs (>75km)	974	.4661191	.499107	0	1
No Regional Identification	954	.4696017	.4993369	0	1
Co-Partisan Cue	974	.4948665	.5002305	0	1
Female Cue	974	.4979466	.5002527	0	1
Ethnic Minority Cue	974	.4938398	.5002189	0	1
Working Class Cue	974	.5020534	.5002527	0	1
MPs' Gender	974	.3326489	.471404	0	1
MPs' Ethnic Group	974	.100616	.3009741	0	1
MPs' Education	948	.8628692	.344167	0	1
Former MP	974	1.802875	.3980321	1	2
MPs' Party Identification	974	.5954825	.7272554	0	2
Wave	974	1.5	.5002569	1	2
Version of the email	974	1.5	.5002569	1	2
Name of the constituents	974	8.61499	4.630057	1	16
Electoral Marginality	974	74.84605	15.65476	27.29622	99.88771
Electorate Share	974	73180.47	9327.61	21106	113021
Size of the Constituency	974	39824.84	94154.5	738.04	1232700

Table D1: Summary Statistics

	(Log) Distance	Non-Local MPs (>50km)	Non-Local MPs (>75km)	No regional identification
(Log) Distance	1.0000			
Non-Local MPs (>50km)	0.7860	1.0000		
Non-Local MPs (>75km)	0.7793	0.8467	1.0000	
No regional identification	0.6344	0.6407	0.6793	1.0000

Table D2: Correlations between Measures of Localness

Appendix E: Regression Tables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	MPs' Response Rate				
(Log) Distance	0.020 [0.047]	-0.049 [0.062]	-0.050 [0.062]	-0.085 [0.060]	-0.083 [0.061]
Co-Partisan Cue	0.194 [0.154]	-0.385 [0.360]	-0.388 [0.361]	-0.350 [0.358]	-0.392 [0.356]
(Log) Distance x Co-Partisan Cue		0.147* [0.085]	0.149* [0.085]	0.141* [0.084]	0.150* [0.084]
Female Cue	0.128 [0.149]	0.126 [0.149]	0.131 [0.150]	0.144 [0.154]	0.118 [0.156]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.028 [0.145]	-0.040 [0.146]	-0.039 [0.147]	-0.062 [0.149]	-0.098 [0.150]
Working Class Cue	-0.120 [0.145]	-0.126 [0.145]	-0.131 [0.146]	-0.135 [0.151]	-0.133 [0.154]
Constant	0.741*** [0.249]	1.029*** [0.305]	0.672 [0.429]	1.057 [0.673]	1.651 [1.210]
Wave, Email Version and Name of Constituents	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
MPs' personal features (party, sex, ethnicity, education, former MP)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Contextual features (marginality, electorate share, constituency's size)	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	944	944	944	920	920

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table E1: Linear regressions of responsiveness by localness and partisanship

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	MPs' Response Rate				
(Log) Distance	0.020 [0.047]	-0.073 [0.058]	-0.075 [0.057]	-0.095* [0.055]	-0.087 [0.056]
Female Cue	0.128 [0.149]	-0.647* [0.347]	-0.655* [0.348]	-0.479 [0.349]	-0.485 [0.353]
(Log) Distance x Female Cue		0.195*** [0.075]	0.199*** [0.075]	0.156** [0.074]	0.151** [0.075]
Co-Partisan Cue	0.194 [0.154]	0.192 [0.155]	0.196 [0.155]	0.209 [0.157]	0.206 [0.159]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.028 [0.145]	-0.019 [0.146]	-0.015 [0.146]	-0.045 [0.148]	-0.082 [0.150]
Working Class Cue	-0.120 [0.145]	-0.132 [0.146]	-0.139 [0.147]	-0.134 [0.152]	-0.131 [0.154]
Constant	0.861*** [0.249]	1.239*** [0.297]	0.867** [0.427]	1.167* [0.660]	1.741 [1.192]
Wave, Email Version and Name of Constituents	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
MPs' personal features (party, sex, ethnicity, education, former MP)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Contextual features (marginality, electorate share, constituency's size)	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	944	944	944	920	920

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table E2: Linear regressions of responsiveness by localness and gender

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MPs' Response Rate			
Log (Distance)	0.020 [0.047]	0.006 [0.055]	0.005 [0.055]	-0.036 [0.055]	-0.031 [0.058]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.028 [0.145]	-0.144 [0.328]	-0.152 [0.330]	-0.174 [0.324]	-0.211 [0.324]
(Log) Distance x Ethnic Minority Cue		0.029 [0.074]	0.032 [0.074]	0.030 [0.072]	0.030 [0.071]
Female Cue	0.128 [0.149]	0.130 [0.150]	0.135 [0.151]	0.146 [0.154]	0.119 [0.156]
Co-Partisan Cue	0.194 [0.154]	0.192 [0.154]	0.196 [0.154]	0.208 [0.157]	0.204 [0.159]
Working Class Cue	-0.120 [0.145]	-0.122 [0.145]	-0.128 [0.146]	-0.130 [0.151]	-0.128 [0.153]
Constant	0.861*** [0.249]	0.917*** [0.279]	0.556 [0.407]	0.960 [0.664]	1.466 [1.192]
Wave, Email Version and Name of Constituents	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
MPs' personal features (party, sex, ethnicity, education, former MP)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Contextual features (marginality, electorate share, constituency's size)	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	944	944	944	920	920

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table E3: Linear regressions of responsiveness by localness and ethnicity

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	MPs' Response Rate				
Log (Distance)	0.020 [0.047]	-0.009 [0.062]	-0.007 [0.062]	-0.064 [0.062]	-0.054 [0.064]
Working Class Cue	-0.120 [0.145]	-0.349 [0.332]	-0.336 [0.335]	-0.462 [0.345]	-0.422 [0.354]
(Log) Distance x Working Class Cue		0.058 [0.077]	0.053 [0.077]	0.083 [0.078]	0.074 [0.080]
Female Cue	0.128 [0.149]	0.125 [0.150]	0.130 [0.151]	0.140 [0.155]	0.115 [0.157]
Co-Partisan Cue	0.194 [0.154]	0.193 [0.154]	0.197 [0.154]	0.205 [0.157]	0.201 [0.159]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.028 [0.145]	-0.033 [0.145]	-0.029 [0.146]	-0.058 [0.148]	-0.094 [0.149]
Constant	0.861*** [0.249]	0.981*** [0.304]	0.624 [0.439]	1.114 [0.702]	1.564 [1.223]
Wave, Email Version and Name of Constituents	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
MPs' personal features (party, sex, ethnicity, education, former MP)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Contextual features (marginality, electorate share, constituency's size)	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	944	944	944	920	920

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table E4: Linear regressions of responsiveness by localness and class

Appendix F: Robustness Checks

We ran several robustness checks to validate our findings. We first test if our models hinge on the specific operationalisation of the dependent variable by differentiating MPs who genuinely replied from MPs who replied requesting a postal address in a new ordinal variable. MPs who did not reply at all are coded as 0, those who replied asking for an address are coded as 1 and those who replies with a substantive email addressing the issues raised are coded as 2. We test these findings with multinomial regressions and standard errors clustered by MPs in Table F2. This new regression also allows us to address concerns that our findings are specific to our modelling choice. These tables show that sign and significance of the interaction effects between partisanship and localness, and gender and localness are unaffected by these alternative specifications. The interaction effects between ethnicity and localness, and class and localness remain insignificant², as in the main analysis.

We then need to ensure that our findings hold when we include various measures of localness because being local might mean different things to MPs, especially since they represent constituencies of different sizes. The continuous and binary variables that follow are highly correlated with our main measure of localness, going from 0.779 to 0.847 (see Table F1 for the detailed correlation table). We first replicate the models using a continuous variable that uses the Haversine formula instead of the Vincenty one used in the main analysis. Our models, which are presented in Table F3 remain unchanged. We also complement our continuous variables with binary variables that differentiate local MPs (coded as 0) and non-local MPs (coded as 1). Since the constituencies vary considerably in size³, we use several binary variables that capture various thresholds of localness. Local MPs are MPs whose distance between their place of birth and their constituency is less than 50 and 75 km. Findings, which are relatively consistent to the main models⁴ are presented in Table F4. Finally, we run our models with a new binary variable that measures localness based on regional identity to account for the entrenchment of regional identities (e.g. Scottish,

² We find a positive and significant effect between minority and non-localness among MPs who genuinely replied. This means that non-local MPs are more likely to reply to constituents with minority background. While this effect is not found in our main analysis, it goes in line with our findings for partisanship and gender.

³ The average size is 384 square kilometres, with the largest constituency being North Herefordshire with 12,327 square kilometres and the smallest constituency being Islington North with 7.38 square kilometres.

⁴ We do not find any significant effect for the interaction between gender and localness.

Irish and various English identities) after devolution processes. Regional identification is particularly strong in the UK and it was shown that the stronger the regional identification, the more preferred local candidates are (Collignon and Sajuria, 2018). In this binary variable, local MPs (coded as 0) are those who were born in the region they represent whereas non-local MPs (coded as 1) are those who were not born in the region they represent. Our models, presented in Table F5 demonstrate that, while our coefficients go in the right direction, the effects are insignificant. The null effects show that regional identification does not matter as much and that MPs' localness is best captured at a much lower level of analysis.

Finally, we need to account for potential outliers in our models. In Table F6, we run the models without including MPs who were born outside the UK but raised in the UK. This subset of MPs accounts for only 5% of the total. We find that the results are very similar to the main analysis. Since London MPs represent the smallest constituencies with the highest level of population density and a very high proportion of non-British residents who do not have the right to vote in general elections, we then replicate our main models by excluding them (i.e. 57 MPs). Results, which are displayed in Table F7, are unchanged by the exclusions of these MPs. Our findings are even stronger and more statistically significant with the partisanship cue.

	Log (Distance)	Non-Local MPs (>50km)	Non-Local MPs (>75km)
Log (Distance)	1.0000		
Non-Local MPs (>50km)	0.7865	1.0000	
Non-Local MPs (>75km)	0.7793	0.8473	1.0000

Table F1: Correlation Table between all distance measures

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	MPs' Response Rate				
Baseline (No Reply)					
<i>MPs who replied requesting an address</i>					
(Log) Distance	-0.031 [0.049]	-0.019 [0.061]	-0.097 [0.066]	-0.104* [0.062]	-0.096* [0.058]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.066 [0.155]	0.046 [0.345]	-0.074 [0.155]	-0.075 [0.156]	-0.059 [0.156]
Log (Distance) x Ethnic Minority Cue		-0.028 [0.077]			

Working Class Cue	-0.136	-0.134	-0.666*	-0.143	-0.142
	[0.161]	[0.161]	[0.374]	[0.162]	[0.162]
Log (Distance) x Working Class Cue			0.131		
			[0.084]		
Co-Partisan Cue	0.085	0.086	0.078	-0.564	0.085
	[0.169]	[0.169]	[0.170]	[0.373]	[0.169]
Log (Distance) x Co-Partisan Cue				0.163*	
				[0.088]	
Female Cue	0.037	0.033	0.029	0.037	-0.527
	[0.165]	[0.166]	[0.167]	[0.165]	[0.376]
Log (Distance) x Female Cue					0.142*
<hr/>					
Constant	0.894	0.845	1.173	1.306	1.210
	[1.239]	[1.249]	[1.278]	[1.260]	[1.243]
Observations	920	920	920	920	920
<hr/>					
<i>MPs who genuinely replied to the email</i>					
(Log) Distance	0.021	-0.059	0.049	-0.031	-0.065
	[0.063]	[0.077]	[0.079]	[0.086]	[0.082]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.143	-0.841**	-0.138	-0.149	-0.135
	[0.192]	[0.414]	[0.191]	[0.192]	[0.192]
Log (Distance) x Ethnic Minority Cue		0.171*			
		[0.089]			
Working Class Cue	-0.110	-0.124	0.154	-0.116	-0.114
	[0.201]	[0.201]	[0.449]	[0.201]	[0.202]
Log (Distance) x Working Class Cue			-0.063		
			[0.102]		
Co-Partisan Cue	0.509**	0.501**	0.512**	0.042	0.511**
	[0.199]	[0.199]	[0.199]	[0.458]	[0.199]
Log (Distance) x Co-Partisan Cue				0.118	
				[0.106]	
Female Cue	0.309	0.323*	0.311	0.311	-0.381
	[0.195]	[0.195]	[0.195]	[0.195]	[0.426]
Log (Distance) x Female Cue					0.172*
<hr/>					
Constant	0.392	0.771	0.250	0.697	0.797
	[1.659]	[1.658]	[1.695]	[1.694]	[1.671]
Observations	920	920	920	920	920
<hr/>					

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table F2: Multinomial Models with an Ordinal Variable

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	MPs' Response Rate			
Log (Distance)	-0.031 [0.058]	-0.053 [0.064]	-0.083 [0.061]	-0.087 [0.056]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.211 [0.324]		-0.098 [0.150]	-0.082 [0.150]
Log (Distance) x Ethnic Minority Cue	0.030 [0.071]			
Working Class Cue	-0.128 [0.153]	-0.421 [0.353]	-0.133 [0.154]	-0.131 [0.154]
Log (Distance) x Working Class Cue		0.073 [0.080]		
Co-Partisan Cue	0.204 [0.159]	0.203 [0.159]	-0.392 [0.356]	0.206 [0.159]
Log (Distance) x Co-Partisan Cue			0.150* [0.084]	
Female Cue	0.119 [0.156]		0.118 [0.156]	-0.485 [0.353]
Log (Distance) x Female Cue			0.150* [0.084]	
Constant	1.466 [1.192]	1.562 [1.216]	1.784 [1.207]	1.741 [1.192]
Observations	920	920	920	920

Standard errors are

clustered by MP

*** p<0.01, **

p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table F3: With another continuous variable of localness (using the Haversine formula)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	MPs' Response Rate							
Non-Local MPs (>50km)	-0.050 [0.230]		-0.110 [0.241]		-0.295 [0.237]		-0.105 [0.226]	
Non-Local MPs (>75km)		-0.168 [0.225]		-0.141 [0.241]		-0.306 [0.235]		-0.128 [0.228]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.158 [0.222]	-0.218 [0.205]	-0.071 [0.147]	-0.070 [0.147]	-0.088 [0.149]	-0.082 [0.148]	-0.067 [0.147]	-0.068 [0.147]
Non-Local MPs (>50km) x Ethnic Minority Cue	0.164 [0.300]							
Non-Local MPs (>75km) x Ethnic Minority Cue		0.327 [0.299]						
Working Class Cue	-0.159 [0.153]	-0.156 [0.153]	-0.302 [0.224]	-0.276 [0.210]	-0.161 [0.153]	-0.158 [0.153]	-0.158 [0.153]	-0.159 [0.153]
Non-Local MPs (>50km) x Working Class Cue			0.270 [0.311]					
Non-Local MPs (>75km) x Working Class Cue				0.259 [0.308]				
Co-Partisan Cue	0.195 [0.158]	0.194 [0.158]	0.197 [0.158]	0.196 [0.158]	-0.171 [0.222]	-0.102 [0.205]	0.200 [0.158]	0.200 [0.158]
Non-Local MPs (>50km) x Co- Partisan Cue					0.697** [0.320]			
Non-Local MPs (>75km) x Co- Partisan Cue						0.658** [0.325]		
Female Cue	0.126 [0.156]		0.123 [0.156]	0.122 [0.156]	0.126 [0.155]	0.132 [0.155]	-0.028 [0.235]	0.009 [0.215]
Non-Local MPs (>50km) x Female Cue							0.286 [0.312]	
Non-Local MPs (>75km) x Female Cue								0.254 [0.310]
Constant	1.627 [1.154]	1.703 [1.159]	1.656 [1.169]	1.649 [1.169]	1.848 [1.170]	1.810 [1.168]	1.673 [1.162]	1.671 [1.162]
Observations	948	948	948	948	948	948	948	948

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table F4: With various binary variables of localness

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	MPs' Response Rate			
No Regional Localness	0.096 [0.238]	-0.310 [0.248]	-0.200 [0.242]	0.015 [0.240]
Ethnic Minority Cue	0.085 [0.212]	-0.091 [0.149]	-0.090 [0.150]	-0.088 [0.150]
Log (Distance) x Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.364 [0.302]			
Working Class Cue	-0.112 [0.154]	-0.321 [0.215]	-0.114 [0.154]	-0.114 [0.154]
Log (Distance) x Working Class Cue		0.430 [0.309]		
Co-Partisan Cue	0.223 [0.159]	0.223 [0.159]	0.107 [0.210]	0.223 [0.160]
Log (Distance) x Co-Partisan Cue			0.247 [0.324]	
Female Cue	0.121 [0.157]	0.119 [0.158]	0.117 [0.157]	0.222 [0.223]
Log (Distance) x Female Cue				-0.213 [0.313]
Constant	1.494 [1.178]	1.725 [1.183]	1.659 [1.175]	1.513 [1.188]
Observations	930	930	930	930

Standard errors are clustered by MP

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, *

p<0.1

Table F5: With regional identification as an alternative measure of localness

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	MPs' Response Rate				
Log (Distance)	-0.016 [0.047]	-0.031 [0.058]	-0.054 [0.064]	-0.083 [0.061]	-0.087 [0.056]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.089	-0.211	-0.094	-0.098	-0.082

	[0.149]	[0.324]	[0.149]	[0.150]	[0.150]
Log (Distance) x Ethnic Minority Cue		0.030 [0.071]			
Working Class Cue	-0.126 [0.153]	-0.128 [0.153]	-0.422 [0.354]	-0.133 [0.154]	-0.131 [0.154]
Log (Distance) x Working Class Cue			0.074 [0.080]		
Co-Partisan Cue	0.205 [0.159]	0.204 [0.159]	0.201 [0.159]	-0.392 [0.356]	0.206 [0.159]
Log (Distance) x Co-Partisan Cue				0.150* [0.084]	
Female Cue	0.117 [0.156]	0.119 [0.156]	0.115 [0.157]	0.118 [0.156]	-0.485 [0.353]
Log (Distance) x Female Cue					0.151** [0.075]
Constant	1.399 [1.187]	1.466 [1.192]	1.564 [1.223]	1.784 [1.207]	1.741 [1.192]
Covariates	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	920	920	920	920	920

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table F6: Without MPs born outside the UK

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	MPs' Response Rate			
Log (Distance)	0.024 [0.065]	0.045 [0.073]	-0.060 [0.067]	-0.051 [0.067]
Ethnic Minority Cue	-0.125 [0.358]	-0.058 [0.161]	-0.083 [0.163]	-0.047 [0.162]
Log (Distance) x Ethnic Minority Cue	0.017 [0.080]			
Working Class Cue	-0.324* [0.166]	-0.227 [0.387]	-0.328** [0.167]	-0.330** [0.167]
Log (Distance) x Working Class Cue		-0.025 [0.089]		
Co-Partisan Cue	0.213 [0.173]	0.215 [0.172]	-0.637* [0.387]	0.211 [0.172]

			0.221**	
Log (Distance) x Co-Partisan Cue			[0.095]	
	0.033	0.032	0.025	-0.608
Female Cue	[0.177]	[0.176]	[0.177]	[0.410]
				0.164*
Log (Distance) x Female Cue				[0.090]
Constant	0.395	0.311	0.859	0.731
	[1.222]	[1.240]	[1.233]	[1.222]
Observations	810	810	810	810

Standard errors are clustered by MP.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table F7: Without London MPs

Data Availability Statement

The replication files are available at <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/VBQSM6>. MPs were informed that their personal information would be removed from the dataset, implying restrictions on data sharing. We only include the localness variable without any more geographical information nor constituency controls to avoid tracking any information back to an individual MP (the geographical data merged with the demographics of the MPs can allow tracking them back to individual MPs). This means that the findings from the replication file with the restricted data do not exactly match the ones from the paper (but the significance and size of the effects remain similar). We provide information on how the data was constructed and what was removed from the dataset. We also include the do file of how we produced all the results presented in the paper and the supplemental material before restricting the dataset.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank other members of this multi-country project, of which this manuscript is a part: Markus Baumann, Tom Louwerse, Wouter Schakel, Simon Stückelberger and Thomas Zittel. The authors would also express their gratitude towards participants of the 2022 Election, Public Opinion and Parties (EPOP) conference and the 2021 and 2022 Castasegna workshops organised by the University of Zurich. Finally, the authors appreciate the comments and guidance from the editors and anonymous reviewers.

Author Contribution Statement

DB came up with the idea for the paper, and DB and RC jointly developed the theory based on the experiment within the main comparative project. DB ran the experiment under RC's mentorship and carried out the statistical analyses. RC wrote the "MPs' localness" (introduction and theory) and "Conclusion" sections. DB wrote the "Research Design", "Data and Methods" and "Results" sections, along with the Supplementary Material. DB led the revision process but DB and RC jointly reviewed and edited the manuscript and Supplementary Material at each stage of the submission process.

Financial Support

This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council as part of the Open Research Area scheme with the grant number ES/S015728/1 entitled ORA (Round 5) The Nature of Political Representation in Times of Dealignment.

Competing Interests

None.

Ethical standards

The research was conducted in accordance with the protocols approved by the Ethics Committee of King's College London.

References

- Bischof, Daniel, Gidon Cohen, Sarah Cohen, Florian Foos, Patrick Michael Kuhn, Kyriaki Nanou, Neil Visalvanich, and Nick Vivyan. 2022. Advantages, Challenges and Limitations of Audit Experiments with Constituents. *Political Studies Review* 20(2):192-200.
- Campbell, Rosie, and Diane Bolet. 2022. Measuring MPs' Responsiveness: How to Do it and Stay Out of Trouble. *Political Studies Review* 20(2):175-83.
- Collignon, Sofia, and Javier Sajuria. 2018. Local means local, does it? Regional identification and preferences for local candidates. *Electoral Studies* 56:170-78.
- Desposato, Scott. 2016. *Ethics and Experiments: Problems and Solutions for Social Scientists and Policy Professionals*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Schulz KF, Grimes DA. (2002) Sample size slippages in randomised trials: exclusions and the lost and wayward. *Lancet*; 359:781–85.

Zittel, Thomas, Tom Louwerson, Helene Helboe Pedersen, and Wouter Schakel. Should we conduct correspondence study field experiments with political elites? *International Political Science Review* 0(0):01925121211026489.