

Appendix

Table A1. Summary of the experiment design

Experimental condition number	Factor		
	Party position	Politician's opinion	Own voters
1	No opinion	No opinion	No
2	No opinion	No opinion	Yes
3	No opinion	PRO	No
4	No opinion	PRO	Yes
5	CON	PRO	Yes
6	CON	PRO	No
7	CON	No opinion	Yes
8	CON	No opinion	No

Table A2. Checks for randomization between groups

Control factors	Mean scores (number of participants)								Grand mean (n)	Sig.	F-quota
	Expgrp 1	Expgrp 2	Expgrp 3	Expgrp 4	Expgrp 5	Expgrp 6	Expgrp 7	Expgrp 8			
Age	.57 (329)	.58 (320)	.58 (327)	.59 (316)	.56 (306)	.57 (305)	.58 (321)	.57 (309)	.57 (2533)	.179	1.46
Sex (women)	.37 (329)	.35 (322)	.40 (328)	.34 (319)	.42 (307)	.36 (307)	.36 (325)	.39 (309)	.37 (2546)	.405	1.03
Level of education	.59 (329)	.63 (322)	.63 (327)	.66 (319)	.65 (306)	.68 (306)	.59 (325)	.64 (309)	.63 (2543)	.249	1.29
Party in national gov.	.48 (324)	.45 (317)	.49 (317)	.47 (317)	.45 (304)	.47 (303)	.44 (319)	.50 (303)	.47 (2504)	.712	0.65
Political position	.02 (329)	.05 (322)	.05 (328)	.04 (320)	.07 (307)	.06 (307)	.05 (325)	.06 (309)	.05 (2547)	.271	0.271
Total N	329	322	328	320	307	307	325	309			

Comment: One-way ANOVA. Age has values between 20 and 85. Sex, 0 = man, 1 = woman. Level of education, 0 = junior high school, senior high school or other post-high school education that is not university level, 1 = university. Political affiliation, 0 = party is in opposition on national level (Left Party, Social Democratic Party, Green Party and Sweden Democrats), 1 = party is in government on national level (Center Party, Christian Democrats, Moderates and Liberal Party). Political position 0 = not a member in the national parliament 1 = a member in the national parliament.

Analyses of covariance (ANOVA) are presented in Tables A3-A14. A3-A8 present the effect of a party's disagreeing position on different response options. The tables include "type of contacting group" and "own agreeing opinion" and interactions between the different treatments. Tables A9-A14 develop the analyses of the mitigating effect of strong personal incentives on responsiveness when a party disagrees with the contacting group's proposal. In all tables, the dependent variable runs from 1 to 7, where 1 = "not at all likely" and 7 = "very likely."

Table A3. Willingness to explain own position

Independent variables	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Model	373.43	7	53.35	18.95	0.000
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	58.54	1	58.54	20.80	0.000
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	95.58	1	95.58	33.96	0.000
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	126.63	1	126.63	44.99	0.000
Party * Contacting group	2.78	1	2.78	0.99	0.321
Party * Own opinion	87.30	1	87.30	31.02	0.000
Contacting group * Own opinion	0.63		0.63	0.22	0.636
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion	10.1	1	10.14	3.60	0.058
Residual	7008.03	1	2.81		
Total = 2498		2490			

Comment: 'Own position' was measured via the question on how likely it would be to: "Answer their e-mail and develop your position on the question."

Table A4. Willingness to explain the party's position

Independent variables	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Model	70.18	7	10.03	6.21	0.000
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	18.78	1	18.78	11.63	0.001
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	15.22	1	15.22	9.43	0.002
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	16.93	1	16.93	10.49	0.001
Party * Contacting group	0.04	1	0.04	0.03	0.872
Party * Own opinion	20.52	1	20.52	12.71	0.000
Contacting group* Own opinion	0.01	1	0.01	0.01	0.939
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion	0.02	1	0.02	0.01	0.920
Residual	4021.97	2491	1.61		
Total = 2499					

Comment: Party position was measured via the question on how likely it would be for the respondents to “Answer their e-mail and explain your party’s position on the question.”

Table A5. Willingness to ask for information

Independent variables	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Model	91.24	7	13.03	3.67	0.001
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	18.73	1	18.73	5.28	0.022
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	27.08	1	27.08	7.63	0.006
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	12.44	1	12.44	3.51	0.061
Party * Contacting group	0.83	1	0.83	0.23	0.630
Party * Own opinion	5.58	1	5.58	1.57	0.210
Contacting group* Own opinion	25.84	1	25.84	7.28	0.007
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion	0.14	1	0.14	0.04	0.840
Residual	8740.22	2463	3.55		
Total = 2470					

Comment: Ask for information was measured via the question how likely it would be for the respondents to “Ask them to send additional information.”

Table A6. Willingness to suggest a meeting

Independent variables	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Model	183.99	7	183.99	9.31	0.000
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	25.50	1	25.50	9.03	0.003
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	142.14	1	142.14	50.33	0.000
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	2.59	1	2.59	1.05	0.307
Party * Contacting group	0.76	1	0.76	0.27	0.605
Party * Own opinion	5.96	1	5.96	2.11	0.146
Contacting group* Own opinion	7.33	1	7.33	2.60	0.107
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion	0.00	1	0.00	0.00	0.988
Residual	7026.47	2488	2.82		
Total = 2495					

Comment: Suggest a meeting was measured via the question how likely it would be for the respondents to “Suggest a personal meeting.”

Table A7. Willingness to try to convince party

Independent variables	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Model	702.93	7	100.42	38.40	0.000
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	51.97	1	51.97	19.87	0.000
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	52.57	1	52.57	20.10	0.000
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	581.39	1	581.39	222.33	0.000
Party * Contacting group	2.31	1	2.31	0.89	0.347
Party * Own opinion	17.32	1	17.32	6.62	0.146
Contacting group* Own opinion	1.46	1	1.46	0.56	0.456
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion	0.47	1	0.47	0.18	0.673
Residual	6516.46	2492	2.62		
Total = 2499					

Comment: Convince party was measured via the question how likely it would be for the respondents to “Take the question further and try to get others in your party to listen to their arguments.”

Table A8. Willingness to go to media

Independent variables	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Model	520.88	7	74.41	20.77	0.000
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	295.44	1	295.44	82.45	0.000
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	13.64	1	13.64	3.81	0.051
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	165.16	1	165.16	46.09	0.000
Party * Contacting group	14.58	1	14.58	4.07	0.044
Party * Own opinion	20.32	1	20.32	5.67	0.017
Contacting group* Own opinion	2.79	1	2.79	0.78	0.377
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion	6.83	1	6.83	1.91	0.168
Residual	8839.68	2467	3.58		
Total = 2474					

Comment: Go to media was measured via the question how likely it would be for the respondents to “Take the question further and try to get the media to become interested in their cause.”

In Tables A9-A14, the mitigating effect of personal incentives when the party disagrees with the contacting group’s proposal is analyzed using ANOVA. We measure personal incentives to respond via the treatments “contacting group” and “own opinion.” Strong incentives are defined as the respondent being in agreement with the contacting group and that the contacting group consists of her own voters. Weak incentives mean that the opinion of the respondent is not mentioned in the vignettes and that she is contacted by a more anonymous group of citizens. Attention is thereby given to experimental groups 5 and 8; see Table A1.

Table A9. Willingness to explain own position

Independent variable	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	37.79	1	37.79	12.74	
Residual	1789.37	603	2.97		0.000
Total = 604					

Table A10. Willingness to explain party position

Independent variable	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	5.03	1	5.03	2.69	0.102
Residual	113.73	607	1.88		
Total = 608					

Table A11. Ask for information

Independent variable	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Incentives to respond	12.83	1	12.83	2.69	0.063
(weak/strong)	2208.40	596	3.71		
Residual					
Total = 597					

Table A12. Willingness to suggest a meeting

Independent variable	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	35.40	1	35.40	10.84	0.001
Residual	1972.77	604	3.27		
Total = 605					

Table A13. Willingness to convince party

Independent variable	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	334.01	1	334.40	126.87	0.000
Residual	1595.45	605	2.63		
Total = 606					

Table A14. Willingness to go to media

Independent variable	SS	Df	MS	F-value	p-value
Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	61.08	1	61.08	16.90	0.000
Residual	2165.58	599	2.63		
Total = 600					

Tables A15 to A26 present ordered probit regressions of the treatment effects using two models, one with only treatment effects and one with interaction effects. When using OLS regressions, conclusions are not altered.

Table A15. Willingness to explain own position (Ordered probit regression)

Independent variables	Model I	Model II
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	-0.191*** (.044)	
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	0.264*** (.044)	
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	-0.284*** (.044)	
Party * Contacting group		-0.304** (.126)
Party * Own opinion		-0.592*** (.123)
Contacting group * Own opinion		-0.183 (.126)
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion		0.347** (.176)
Cut point 1	-1.835*** (.062)	-1.688*** (.074)
Cut point 2	-1.494*** (.055)	-1.324*** (.068)
Cut point 3	-1.249*** (.052)	-1.076*** (.066)
Cut point 4	-0.943*** (.049)	-0.768*** (.063)
Cut point 5	-0.513*** (.047)	-0.334*** (.063)
Cut point 6	0.028*** (.046)	0.211*** (.062)
Observations	2498	2498

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A16. Willingness to explain party position (Ordered probit regression)

	Model I	Model II
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	-0.145*** (.045)	
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	0.157*** (.045)	
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	-0.149*** (.045)	
Party * Contacting group		0.002 (.128)
Party * Own opinion		-0.318*** (.123)
Contacting group * Own opinion		-0.007 (.126)
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion		0.016 (.179)
Cut point 1	-2.340*** (.080)	-2.269*** (.091)
Cut point 2	-2.006*** (.064)	-1.934*** (.076)
Cut point 3	-1.709*** (.058)	-1.637*** (.070)
Cut point 4	-1.302*** (.051)	-1.228*** (.065)
Cut point 5	-0.713*** (.048)	-0.637*** (.064)
Cut point 6	-0.039 (.046)	0.039 (.063)
Observations	2499	2499

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A17. Willingness to ask for information (Ordered probit regression)

	Model I	Model II
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	-0.096** (.042)	
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	0.110*** (.042)	
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	0.078* (.042)	
Party * Contacting group		0.057 (.116)
Party * Own opinion		-0.107 (.116)
Contacting group * Own opinion		-0.233** (.116)
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion		-.004 (.117)
Cut point 1	-1.213*** (.048)	-1.146*** (.062)
Cut point 2	-0.808*** (.045)	-0.740*** (.059)
Cut point 3	-0.426*** (.044)	-0.356*** (.058)
Cut point 4	0.052*** (.043)	0.121*** (.058)
Cut point 5	0.519*** (.044)	0.589*** (.059)
Cut point 6	1.034*** (.048)	1.106*** (.062)
Observations	2470	2470

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A18 Willingness to suggest a meeting (Ordered probit regression)

	Model I	Model II
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	-0.110*** (.042)	
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	0.290*** (.042)	
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	0.047 (.042)	
Party * Contacting group		0.046 (.117)
Party * Own opinion		-0.115 (.118)
Contacting group * Own opinion		-0.109 (.114)
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion		-0.020 (.167)
Cut point 1	-1.660*** (.058)	-1.623*** (.071)
Cut point 2	-1.147*** (.049)	-1.110*** (.063)
Cut point 3	-0.791*** (.044)	-0.753*** (.061)
Cut point 4	-0.304*** (.044)	-0.265*** (.060)
Cut point 5	0.232*** (.047)	0.271*** (.061)
Cut point 6	0.823*** (.047)	0.863*** (.063)
Observations	2495	2495

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A19. Willingness to try to convince party (Ordered probit regression)

	Model I	Model II
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	-0.169*** (.042)	
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	0.176*** (.042)	
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	0.611*** (.043)	
Party * Contacting group		0.037 (.115)
Party * Own opinion		0.139 (.121)
Contacting group * Own opinion		-0.087 (.115)
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion		0.079 (.167)
Cut point 1	-1.498*** (.057)	-1.540*** (.071)
Cut point 2	-1.020*** (.048)	-1.062*** (.063)
Cut point 3	-0.619*** (.045)	-0.660*** (.060)
Cut point 4	-0.073*** (.044)	-0.112*** (.059)
Cut point 5	0.452*** (.044)	0.414*** (.060)
Cut point 6	1.100*** (.047)	1.062*** (.062)
Observations	2492	2492

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A20. Willingness to go to media (Ordered probit regression)

	Model I	Model II
Party (not mentioned/disagree)	-0.369*** (.042)	
Contacting group (citizen/own voters)	0.074* (.042)	
Own opinion (not mentioned/agree)	0.277*** (.042)	
Party * Contacting group		0.054 (.117)
Party * Own opinion		-0.306*** (.116)
Contacting group * Own opinion		-0.193* (.115)
Party* Contacting group* Own opinion		0.224 (.167)
Cut point 1	-0.918*** (.046)	-0.866*** (.061)
Cut point 2	-0.436*** (.045)	-0.383*** (.060)
Cut point 3	-0.071*** (.044)	-0.016*** (.060)
Cut point 4	0.386*** (.045)	0.442*** (.060)
Cut point 5	0.834*** (.046)	0.891*** (.062)
Cut point 6	1.315*** (.051)	1.373*** (.065)
Observations	2474	2474

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table A21. Willingness to explain own position (Ordered probit regression)

Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	-0.299*** (.089)
Cut point 1	-1.905*** (.105)
Cut point 2	-1.501*** (.087)
Cut point 3	-1.225*** (.080)
Cut point 4	-0.892*** (.074)
Cut point 5	-0.500*** (.069)
Cut point 6	0.032*** (.067)
Observations	604

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A22. Willingness to explain party position (Ordered probit regression)

Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	-0.138 (.089)
Cut point 1	-2.250 (.140)
Cut point 2	-1.850 (.105)
Cut point 3	-1.569 (.091)
Cut point 4	-1.192*** (.080)
Cut point 5	-0.660*** (.071)
Cut point 6	0.012*** (.067)
Observations	608

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A23. Willingness to ask for information (Ordered probit regression)

Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	0.156* (.085)
Cut point 1	-1.067*** (.077)
Cut point 2	-0.614*** (.069)
Cut point 3	-0.294*** (.066)
Cut point 4	0.181*** (.066)
Cut point 5	0.618*** (.068)
Cut point 6	1.189*** (.078)
Observations	597

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A24. Willingness to suggest a meeting (Ordered probit regression)

Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	0.293*** (.085)
Cut point 1	-1.488*** (.093)
Cut point 2	-0.952*** (.075)
Cut point 3	-0.577*** (.069)
Cut point 4	-0.158*** (.066)
Cut point 5	0.320*** (.066)
Cut point 6	0.835*** (.071)
Observations	605

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A25. Willingness to convince party (Ordered probit regression)

Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	0.920*** (.088)
Cut point 1	-1.326*** (.092)
Cut point 2	-0.756*** (.073)
Cut point 3	-0.370*** (.068)
Cut point 4	0.153*** (.067)
Cut point 5	0.701*** (.071)
Cut point 6	1.336*** (.079)
Observations	606

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table A26. Willingness to go to media (Ordered probit regression)

Incentives to respond (weak/strong)	0.326*** (.086)
Cut point 1	-0.552*** (.069)
Cut point 2	-0.069 (.066)
Cut point 3	0.306*** (.067)
Cut point 4	0.723*** (.070)
Cut point 5	1.180*** (.078)
Cut point 6	1.579*** (.089)
Observations	600

Note: robust standard errors in parentheses * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01