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# LETTER OF INVITATION TO CITIZEN DIALOUGE

(THE LETTER OF INVITATION IS REMOVED TO SECURE THE ANONYMITY OF THE AUTHOR)

# VARIABLES

## Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI)

Table I contains the items included in the ten-item personality inventory (both English and Swedish versions. Each item was scored on a seven-point scale along the dimension Disagree Strongly to Agree Strongly. The introductory text for the survey is as follows:

**English version**

Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other. I see myself as:

Table I. TIPI Items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | English | Corresponding Trait | Value |
| 1 | Outgoing, Enthusiastic | Extraversion | 1 |
| 2 | Critical, quarrelsome | Agreeableness | -1 |
| 3 | Dependable, self-disciplined | Conscientiousness | 1 |
| 4 | Anxious, easily upset | Emotional Stability | 1 |
| 5 | Open to new experiences, complex | Openness | 1 |
| 6 | Reserved, quiet | Extraversion | -1 |
| 7 | Sympathetic, warm | Agreeableness | 1 |
| 8 | Messy, sloppy | Conscientiousness | -1 |
| 9 | Calm, emotionally stable | Emotional Stability | -1 |
| 10 | Conventional, uncreative | Openness | -1 |

## Interaction Variables

#### Civic Duty, Need for Judgment, Political Efficacy

The interacting variables — Civic Duty, Need for Judgement and Political Efficacy (two items, “a” and “b”) — were measured via the items listed in Table III. Each item was scored on a five-point scale along the dimension Disagree to Agree — with an addition option of do not know / no opinion.

Table II. Interaction Variables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | English | Source |
| Civic Duty | Every citizen has a responsibility to make sure we have a good government | (Gastil 1994) |
| Need for Judgement | It is very important to me to hold strong opinions. | (Neblo et al. 2010) |
| Political Efficacy (a) | I am not able to think clearly about political issues regardless of how much I read about or discuss it with other | (Neblo et al. 2010) |
| Political Efficacy (b) | I am capable of participating effectively and contribute to discussions on important political issues. | (Neblo et al. 2010) |

#### Opinion Strength

The variable Opinion Strength was measured by looking at to what extent respondents gave either high or low scores on 12 questions about their personal opinions about the issue of begging. Table IV shows the 12 items used to assess overall attitude toward the issue of begging. Respondents indicated their opinion on a scale ranging from 1 to 7 and an individual’s strength of opinion was assessed by the mean of their combined scores, where a total score on either 1-2 or 6-7 means to score high on Opinion Strength..

Table III. Issue Attitude Items

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No. | English Version |
| 1 | I am responsible for helping the begging Roma in Sweden. |
| 2 | The municipality is responsible for helping the begging Roma in Sweden. |
| 3 | The Swedish state is responsible for helping the begging Roma in Sweden. |
| 4 | Home countries Romania and Bulgaria are responsible for helping the begging Roma in Sweden. |
| 5 | The EU is responsible for helping the begging Roma in Sweden. |
| 6 | Our tax money should go to the Swedes not to foreign beggars. |
| 7 | It is good to give money to beggars. |
| 8 | Begging is part of an organized crime led by a mafia. |
| 9 | Begging is caused by widespread poverty and discrimination against minorities in some EU countries. |
| 10 | The beggars want to go back to Romania. |
| 11 | The beggars have it good here in Sweden. |
| 12 | If we begin to help those who come here to beg there will soon be even more. |

# MOTIVATIONAL SURVEY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11. | Are you interested in participating in the Citizen Dialogue Uppsala Speaks?[ ]  Yes, please, I would like to participate Continue to question 12[ ]  No, thank you, I do not want to participate Continue to question 13 |
| 11. | If you answered Yes and are interested in participating in the Citizen Dialogue:How well do the following statements apply to you?I want to participate because: |
|  |  | Do not apply at all | Apply rather poorly | Neither apply good or bad | Apply relatively well | Apply very well  | Do not know/No opinion |  |
| a.  | I enjoy discussing with others | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| b.  | I can learn something new  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| c.  | I can influence politics | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| d.  | I get an economic reimbursement  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| e.  | I find the issue of begging important | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| f.  | To get others to understand the real problem with begging | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| g.  | Other reason for why I want to participate: |
| 11. | If you answered No and do not want to participate in the Citizen dialogue:How well do the following statements apply to you? I do not want to participate because… |
|  |  | Do not apply at all  | Apply rather poorly  | Neither apply good or bad | Apply relatively well  | Apply very well  | Do not know/No opinion  |  |
| a.  | I do not have the time | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| b.  | I do not know enough about the topic of begging | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| c.  | I am uninterested about the topic of begging | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| d.  | Everyone already knows what needs to be done about the topic | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| e.  | The Dialogue will not lead to a formal decision | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| f.  | It is impossible to have a rational, political discussion with other citizens | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| g.  | Political opinions is a private business | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| h.  | Other reason for why I do not want to participate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table IV below shows the twelve items used to assess the motivations for participation associated with each of the personality traits. The table shows which of the motivational types the item is associated with (civic norm, interpersonal, instrumental) and whether it involves a reason to accept the invitation to participate or to refuse.

Table IV. Motivation for Participation Survey Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Motivation Category | Short header | Item | Accept/Refuse |
| 1 | Civic Norms | Important Issue | The begging issue is important to me. | Accept |
| 2 | Civic Norms | Uninteresting Topic | I'm not interested in the topic | Refuse |
| 3 | Civic Norms | Politics is Private | Politics is a private issue | Refuse |
| 4 | Interpersonal | Enjoyment | I think it would be fun to discuss. | Accept |
| 5 | Interpersonal | Learning Opportunity | So I can learn something new. | Accept |
| 6 | Interpersonal | Impossible to discuss | It's not possible to have a rational political conversation with others | Refuse |
| 7 | Interpersonal | Lack of Knowledge | I don't know much about the topic | Refuse |
| 8 | Instrumental | Influence others | To get others to understand the begging issue. | Accept |
| 9 | Instrumental | Influence politics | So that I can influence politics. | Accept |
| 10 | Instrumental | Economic imbursement | For the payment. | Accept |
| 11 | Instrumental | Lack of Time | I don't have time | Refuse |
| 12 | Instrumental | Already knows what to do | Everyone already knows what needs to be done | Refuse |

# RESULTS

Table V. Trait Effects and Control Variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Traits | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Extraversion | 0.035\*\*\*(0.012) | 0.034\*\*\*(0.012) | 0.034\*\*\*(0.012) | 0.032\*\*\*(0.012) | 0.030\*\*\*(0.012) | 0.029\*\*(0.012) |
| Agreeableness | -0.016(0.016) | -0.015(0.016) | -0.022(0.017) | -0.014(0.016) | -0.016(0.016) | -0.020(0.017) |
| Conscientiousness | -0.045\*\*\*(0.014) | -0.046\*\*\*(0.014) | -0.037\*\*(0.015) | -0.044\*\*\*(0.014) | -0.041\*\*\*(0.014) | -0.035\*\*(0.014) |
| Emotional Stability | 0.019(0.014) | 0.018(0.014) | 0.018(0.014) | 0.017(0.014) | 0.021(0.014) | 0.019(0.014) |
| Openness to Experience | 0.031\*\*(0.016) | 0.030\*(0.016) | 0.032\*\*(0.016) | 0.032\*\*(0.015) | 0.031\*\*(0.015) | 0.032\*\*(0.016) |
| Membership civil organisations |  |  |  | 0.036(0.027) |  | 0.010(0.027) |
| Membership political organisations |  |  |  |  | 0.250\*\*\*(0.066) | 0.222\*\*\*(0.069) |
| Adj. R2 | 0.052 | 0.052 | 0.060 | 0.053 | 0.073 | 0.079 |
| Number of cases | 1054 | 1054 | 1030 | 1054 | 1054 | 1030 |

*Note*: Standard errors in parentheses

All models include controls for age, gender and residential municipality (by municipality dummies).

\* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01

## Single versus Multiple Traits Models

Table VI shows the predictive models for participation in Uppsala Speaks for each of the traits separate (models 1-5) and together (model 6). The results show a similar outcome for single versus the five-trait model.

Table VI. Interplay of Traits and Willingness to Participate

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Trait | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Extraversion | 0.042\*\*\*(0.010) |  |  |  |  | 0.035\*\*\*(0.012) |
| Agreeableness |  | 0.006(0.014) |  |  |  | -0.016(0.016) |
| Conscientiousness |  |  | -0.032\*\*(0.014) |  |  | -0.045\*\*\*(0.014) |
| Emotional Stability |  |  |  | 0.017(0.012) |  | 0.019(0.014) |
| Openness to Experience |  |  |  |  | 0.047\*\*\*(0.013) | 0.031\*\*(0.016) |
| Adj. R2 | 0.039 | 0.020 | 0.027 | 0.023 | 0.033 | 0.052 |
| Number of cases | 1061 | 1059 | 1064 | 1060 | 1059 | 1054 |

## Interaction Models

Figure I shows the average marginal effect of the variable Need for Judgement on the relationship between Extraversion and the probability of accepting the invitation to participate in Uppsala Speaks. It shows that as Need for Judgement increases, the relationship moves from a negative to a positive association.

Figure I. Interaction between Extraversion and Need for Judgement

******

In the case of the interacting relationship between Conscientiousness and Civic Duty (Figure II), there is a positive relationship. However, in all cases Conscientiousness remains negatively associated with participation, although the probability of refusal decreases with greater Civic Duty.

Figure II. Interaction between Conscientiousness and Civic Duty
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