## A Two-Stage Theory of Discussant Influence on Vote Choice in Multi-Party Systems: Online Appendix

RÜDIGER SCHMITT-BECK and JULIA PARTHEYMÜLLER

### A1: Check of Robustness to Panel Attrition

To check whether the outcomes of our models are affected by panel attrition we replicated the cross-sectional analysis whose findings are reported in Table 3 of the paper for the panel cases only. The results of this additional analysis are reported in Table A1 which can be directly compared to Table 3. Its entries are almost identical to those based on all first-wave respondents. Our findings thus appear robust to panel attrition.

*Table A1: Moderators of discussant influence: cross-sectional models (probit estimates for dyads; panel cases only)*

| | Same camp | | Same party within camp | | Difference camp minus party | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Estimate (Sig.) | AME | Estimate (Sig.) | AME | ΔAME | 95%-Confidence interval |
| Type of relationship (ref. co-worker): | | | | | | |
| - Spouse/life partner | 0.60*** | 0.17*** | 0.38** | 0.12** | 0.05 | [0.03 – 0.06] |
| - Relative | 0.31** | 0.09** | 0.25* | 0.08* | 0.01 | [0.00 – 0.03] |
| - Friend | 0.30** | 0.09** | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.08 | [0.06 – 0.10] |
| - Neighbour | -0.10 | -0.03 | 0.08 | 0.03 | -0.06 | [-0.09 – -0.02] |
| - Other | 0.04 | 0.01 | -0.04 | -0.01 | 0.02 | [-0.01 – 0.05] |
| Most frequent discussant (1=yes, 0=no) | -0.08 | -0.02 | 0.20** | 0.06** | -0.08 | [-0.09 – -0.07] |
| Discussant effective communication (RL) | -0.02 | -0.00 | -0.09*** | -0.03*** | 0.02 | [0.02 – 0.03] |
| Discussant political expertise (0-3) | 0.27*** | 0.08*** | 0.12* | 0.04* | 0.04 | [0.03 – 0.04] |
| Discussant political trustworthiness (0-3) | 0.63*** | 0.18*** | 0.36*** | 0.11*** | 0.06 | [0.05 – 0.07] |
| PId–vote correspondence (1=yes, 0=no/no PId/undecided) | 0.71*** | 0.21*** | 0.92*** | 0.31*** | -0.10 | [-0.11 – -0.09] |
| Evaluation of grand coalition (-5 -+5) | -0.01 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | -0.01 | [-0.01 – 0.00] |
| Interest in election outcome (0-4) | 0.10* | 0.03* | 0.09* | 0.03* | 0.00 | [0.00 – 0.01] |
| Vote intention of discussant (ref. CDU/CSU): | | | | | | |
| - SPD | 0.02 | 0.00 | -0.34*** | -0.11*** | 0.11 | [0.10 – 0.12] |
| - FDP | -0.06 | -0.02 | -0.48*** | -0.15*** | 0.13 | [0.11 – 0.16] |
| - Greens | 0.31** | 0.08** | -0.36** | -0.11** | 0.19 | [0.17 – 0.21] |
| - Left | 0.28* | 0.08* | -0.32* | -0.10* | 0.17 | [0.16 – 0.19] |
| Age (in years) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | [0.00 – 0.00] |
| Sex (1=male, 0=female) | 0.15* | 0.04* | -0.06 | -0.02 | 0.06 | [0.05 – 0.07] |
| Education (1= secondary compltd., 0= lower) | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.11 | -0.03 | 0.03 | [0.02 – 0.05] |
| Constant | -2.14*** | | -1.44*** | | | |
| McKelvey & Zavoina $R^2$ | 0.38 | | 0.33 | | | |
| N | 2038 | | 1595 | | | |

Note: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (cluster-robust standard errors). The average marginal effect (AME) for dummy variables indicates the discrete change from the base level. ΔAME is the difference in AME between the camp and the party model; the 95%-confidence interval indicates whether this difference significantly differs from zero.

### A2: Testing for Differences within Primary Relationships

From Tables 3 and 4 it cannot be directly seen whether the effects of various primary relationships differ significantly from each other. We therefore re-estimated these models with alternative reference categories. Except for the estimates obtained for the various types of relationships the results of these analyses are of course identical to those reported in Tables 3 and 4. Therefore, they are not displayed again in the tables below. The cross-sectional results show that the influence of spouses is significantly stronger than the one of relatives and friends (see Table A2). However, relatives and friends do not differ significantly from each other in terms of influence on camp agreement. But friends exert less influence on party agreement than relatives. In the panel models conversations with spouses also have

a strong impact on camp agreement, while friends and relatives are again statistically indistinguishable (see Table A3). As already noted in Table 4, in the panel analysis the type of relationship does not affect agreement on parties within camps. This outcome remains unchanged in the modified analysis reported in Table A3.

*Table A2. Moderators of discussant influence: cross-sectional models (probit estimates for dyads; exchanging reference categories for relationships)*

| | Same camp | | Same party within camp | | Difference camp minus party | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Estimate (Sig.) | AME | Estimate (Sig.) | AME | ΔAME | 95%-Confidence interval |
| Type of relationship (ref. *spouse/life partner*): | | | | | | |
| - Relative | -0.23** | -0.06** | -0.16* | -0.05* | -0.01 | [-0.02 – -0.01] |
| - Friend | -0.33*** | -0.09*** | -0.39*** | -0.12*** | 0.03 | [0.02 – 0.04] |
| - Co-worker | -0.53*** | -0.15*** | -0.38*** | -0.12*** | -0.03 | [-0.04 – -0.02] |
| - Neighbour | -0.85*** | -0.26*** | -0.41 | -0.13 | -0.12 | [-0.15 – -0.10] |
| - Other | -0.56** | -0.16** | -0.37 | -0.12 | -0.04 | [-0.06 – -0.03] |
| … | *Results for other variables not shown, see Table 3* | | | | | |
| Type of relationship (ref. *relative*): | | | | | | |
| - Spouse/life partner | 0.23** | 0.06** | 0.16* | 0.05* | 0.01 | [0.00 – 0.02] |
| - Friend | -0.10 | -0.03 | -0.22** | -0.07** | 0.04 | [0.03 – 0.05] |
| - Co-worker | -0.30** | -0.09** | -0.21* | -0.07* | -0.02 | [-0.03 – -0.01] |
| - Neighbour | -0.63*** | -0.19*** | -0.25 | -0.08 | -0.11 | [-0.14 – -0.08] |
| - Other | -0.33 | -0.10 | -0.21 | -0.07 | -0.03 | [-0.05 – -0.01] |
| … | *Results for other variables not shown, see Table 3* | | | | | |

Note: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (cluster-robust standard errors). The average marginal effect (AME) for dummy variables indicates the discrete change from the base level. ΔAME is the difference in AME between the camp and the party model; the 95%-confidence interval indicates whether this difference significantly differs from zero.

*Table A3. Moderators of discussant influence: panel models (probit estimates for dyads; exchanging reference categories for relationships)*

| | Same camp | | Same party within camp | | Difference camp minus party | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Estimate (Sig.) | AME | Estimate (Sig.) | AME | ΔAME | 95%-Confidence interval |
| Type of relationship (ref. *spouse/life partner*): | | | | | | |
| - Relative | -0.32* | -0.04* | -0.13 | -0.03 | -0.01 | [-0.03 – 0.00] |
| - Friend | -0.48*** | -0.06*** | -0.14 | -0.03 | -0.03 | [-0.04 – -0.02] |
| - Co-worker | -0.64*** | -0.08*** | -0.24 | -0.05 | -0.03 | [-0.06 – 0.00] |
| - Neighbour | -0.26 | -0.03 | -0.06 | -0.01 | -0.02 | [-0.06 – 0.03] |
| - Other | -0.54* | -0.07* | -0.09 | -0.02 | -0.05 | [-0.11 – 0.02] |
| … | *Results for other variables not shown, see Table 4* | | | | | |
| Type of relationship (ref. *relative*): | | | | | | |
| - Spouse/life partner | 0.32* | 0.04* | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.01 | [0.00 – 0.03] |
| - Friend | -0.16 | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.00 | -0.02 | [-0.05 – 0.01] |
| - Co-worker | -0.32* | -0.04* | -0.11 | -0.03 | -0.02 | [-0.04 – 0.00] |
| - Neighbour | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.02 | -0.01 | [-0.06 – 0.05] |
| - Other | -0.22 | -0.03 | 0.04 | 0.01 | -0.04 | [-0.10 – 0.03] |
| … | *Results for other variables not shown, see Table 4* | | | | | |

Note: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (cluster-robust standard errors). The average marginal effect (AME) for dummy variables indicates the discrete change from the base level. ΔAME is the difference in AME between the camp and the party model; the 95%-confidence interval indicates whether this difference significantly differs from zero.