# Supplementary file

## Sample size and characteristics

Conjoint analysis does not require large sample sizes to yield reliable estimates since the number of observations can be increased by enlarging the number of comparisons each respondent makes (Orme, 2010; Aguinis and Bradley, 2014). Orme (Orme, 2010, p. 64) recommends determining the number of respondents with the formula: (nta)/c>=500, where *n* is number of respondents, *t* is number of comparisons (here 5), *a* is number of alternatives to choose from (here 2) and c is the largest number of levels for any attribute (here 12 since analyses include a 3x4 interaction). According to this, the required number of respondents is 600. However, this is a minimum requirement that should not justify too small sample sizes (Orme, 2010, p. 65). Another rule-of-thumb is to include at least 200 respondents in each group when making comparisons across groups. Here the inclusion of interaction effects between policy issues and other attributes split respondents into four groups, which means there should be 800 respondents. It is also necessary to consider generalisability to the population of interest (Aguinis and Bradley, 2014). To ensure a representative sample of the Finnish population, the target sample size was 1000 individuals, which is sufficiently large to achieve credible and generalisable results without wasting resources or creating risks for Type I errors or false positives. In the end, 1050 respondents completed the survey and were included in the final sample. Table SF1 compares age, gender and place of living for the Finnish population and the sample.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Table SF1. Characteristics of the population and sample**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **% in population** | **% in sample (n=1050)** |
| **Age** |  |  |
| ***18-19*** | *3.3* | *4.0* |
| ***20-29*** | *18.8* | *19.0* |
| ***30-39*** | *19.3* | *19.4* |
| ***40-49*** | *18.2* | *17.8* |
| ***50-59*** | *20.2* | *19.9* |
| ***60-69*** | *20.3* | *19.9* |
| **Total** | ***100.0*** | ***100.0*** |
| **Gender (population aged 18–69)** |  |  |
| ***Male*** | *50.0* | *50.1* |
| ***Female*** | *50.0* | *49.9* |
| **Total** | ***100.0*** | ***100.0*** |
| **Region**  |  |  |
| ***Usimaa (incl. Helsinki area)*** | *30.0* | *32.9* |
| ***Western Finland*** | *13.0* | *21.0* |
| ***Ostrobothnia*** | *14.0* | *8.0* |
| ***Central Finland*** | *15.0* | *12.5* |
| ***South Finland*** | *10.0* | *9.0* |
| ***East Finland*** | *14.0* | *13.3* |
| ***Lapland*** | *4.0* | *3.3* |
| **Total** | ***100.0*** | ***100.0*** |
| Source: Statistics Finland 2017 |  |

The sample resembles the Finnish population well when it comes to age and gender, but Western Finland is overrepresented while Ostrobothnia is underrepresented. Nonetheless, all analyses are carried out without weighting data since there is no reason to expect this to bias the results.

## Distribution of respondents’ characteristics across attributes

**Table SF2. ANOVA tests of differences in mean scores across attributes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Attribute Level** | **Inclusion** | **Popular control** | **Considered judgement** | **Transparency** | **Efficiency** | **Transferability** | **Policy issue** |
| **Mean**  | **SE** | **Mean**  | **SE** | **Mean**  | **SE** | **Mean**  | **SE** | **Mean**  | **SE** | **Mean**  | **SE** | **Mean**  | **SE** |
| **Age** **(2-7)** | 1 | 4.903 | 0.026 | 4.908 | 0.021 | 4.895 | 0.026 | 4.908 | 0.021 | 4.910 | 0.026 | 4.908 | 0.021 | 4.898 | 0.030 |
| 2 | 4.905 | 0.026 | 4.908 | 0.021 | 4.908 | 0.026 | 4.908 | 0.021 | 4.911 | 0.026 | 4.908 | 0.021 | 4.925 | 0.030 |
| 3 | 4.915 | 0.026 |  |  | 4.919 | 0.026 |  |  | 4.902 | 0.026 |  |  | 4.890 | 0.030 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.918 | 0.030 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.943 | 1.000 | 0.808 | 1.000 | 0.962 | 1.000 | 0.816 |
| **Gender** **(0 Female /1 Male)** | 1 | 1.499 | 0.008 | 1.500 | 0.007 | 1.500 | 0.008 | 1.500 | 0.007 | 1.502 | 0.008 | 1.500 | 0.007 | 1.500 | 0.010 |
| 2 | 1.503 | 0.008 | 1.500 | 0.007 | 1.497 | 0.008 | 1.500 | 0.007 | 1.502 | 0.008 | 1.500 | 0.007 | 1.502 | 0.010 |
| 3 | 1.498 | 0.008 |  |  | 1.503 | 0.008 |  |  | 1.496 | 0.008 |  |  | 1.502 | 0.010 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.496 | 0.010 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.925 | 1.000 | 0.887 | 1.000 | 0.875 | 1.000 | 0.955 |
| **Education** **(1-9)** | 1 | 4.669 | 0.031 | 4.676 | 0.025 | 4.677 | 0.030 | 4.676 | 0.025 | 4.668 | 0.030 | 4.676 | 0.025 | 4.668 | 0.035 |
| 2 | 4.678 | 0.030 | 4.676 | 0.025 | 4.673 | 0.030 | 4.676 | 0.025 | 4.679 | 0.031 | 4.676 | 0.025 | 4.690 | 0.035 |
| 3 | 4.682 | 0.030 |  |  | 4.678 | 0.031 |  |  | 4.681 | 0.031 |  |  | 4.682 | 0.035 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.665 | 0.035 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.948 | 1.000 | 0.994 | 1.000 | 0.943 | 1.000 | 0.956 |
| **Political interest** **(1-4)** | 1 | 2.733 | 0.015 | 2.728 | 0.012 | 2.723 | 0.015 | 2.728 | 0.012 | 2.723 | 0.015 | 2.728 | 0.012 | 2.734 | 0.017 |
| 2 | 2.722 | 0.015 | 2.728 | 0.012 | 2.729 | 0.015 | 2.728 | 0.012 | 2.728 | 0.015 | 2.728 | 0.012 | 2.725 | 0.017 |
| 3 | 2.728 | 0.015 |  |  | 2.731 | 0.015 |  |  | 2.732 | 0.015 |  |  | 2.730 | 0.017 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.721 | 0.017 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.877 | 1.000 | 0.936 | 1.000 | 0.920 | 1.000 | 0.949 |
| **Left/right** **(0-10)** | 1 | 5.192 | 0.037 | 5.183 | 0.031 | 5.188 | 0.037 | 5.183 | 0.031 | 5.195 | 0.037 | 5.183 | 0.031 | 5.177 | 0.043 |
| 2 | 5.173 | 0.037 | 5.183 | 0.031 | 5.190 | 0.037 | 5.183 | 0.031 | 5.167 | 0.038 | 5.183 | 0.031 | 5.202 | 0.043 |
| 3 | 5.183 | 0.037 |  |  | 5.171 | 0.038 |  |  | 5.186 | 0.037 |  |  | 5.157 | 0.043 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.195 | 0.043 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.941 | 1.000 | 0.922 | 1.000 | 0.866 | 1.000 | 0.884 |
| **Satsf. Democracy (0-10)** | 1 | 5.273 | 0.039 | 5.273 | 0.032 | 5.287 | 0.039 | 5.273 | 0.032 | 5.275 | 0.039 | 5.273 | 0.032 | 5.290 | 0.045 |
| 2 | 5.274 | 0.039 | 5.273 | 0.032 | 5.272 | 0.039 | 5.273 | 0.032 | 5.268 | 0.039 | 5.273 | 0.032 | 5.285 | 0.045 |
| 3 | 5.273 | 0.039 |  |  | 5.261 | 0.039 |  |  | 5.276 | 0.039 |  |  | 5.276 | 0.045 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.241 | 0.045 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.999 | 1.000 | 0.894 | 1.000 | 0.988 | 1.000 | 0.870 |
| **Internal political efficacy** **(0-8)** | 1 | 4.067 | 0.031 | 4.064 | 0.0253 | 4.051 | 0.031 | 4.064 | 0.025 | 4.063 | 0.031 | 4.064 | 0.025 | 4.061 | 0.035 |
| 2 | 4.054 | 0.031 | 4.064 | 0.0253 | 4.068 | 0.031 | 4.064 | 0.025 | 4.062 | 0.031 | 4.064 | 0.025 | 4.073 | 0.036 |
| 3 | 4.070 | 0.031 |  |  | 4.072 | 0.031 |  |  | 4.066 | 0.031 |  |  | 4.061 | 0.036 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.060 | 0.036 |
| **ANOVA (Prob > F)** |  | 0.924 | 1.000 | 0.878 | 1.000 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 0.993 |

## Correlation matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **[1]** | **[2]** | **[3]** | **[4]** | **[5]** | **[6]** | **[7]** | **[8]** | **[9]** | **[10]** | **[11]** | **[12]** | **[13]** |
| **[1] Inclusiveness: Representative sample** | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[2] Inclusiveness: Key stakeholders** | 0.49 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[3] Popular control: Advisory role** | -0.01 | 0.02 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[4] Considered judgement: Expert advice** | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[5] Considered judgement: Moderated discussions** | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.51 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[6] Transparency: Open to public** | -0.02 | -0.07 | -0.01 | 0.00 | -0.01 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[7] Efficiency: 2-5 instances** | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.02 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[8] Efficiency: 5-10 instances** | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.51 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **[9] Transferability: Offline** | -0.04 | -0.06 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | -0.02 | -0.02 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| **[10] Policy issue: Wolf protection** | -0.04 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| **[11] Policy issue: Regional reform** | -0.04 | 0.01 | -0.05 | -0.03 | -0.06 | -0.01 | -0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 1.00 |  |  |
| **[12] Policy issue: Economic growth** | -0.06 | 0.00 | 0.04 | -0.02 | -0.03 | -0.04 | -0.03 | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.47 | 0.61 | 1.00 |  |
| **[13] Constant** | -0.28 | -0.32 | -0.32 | -0.38 | -0.34 | -0.28 | -0.36 | -0.35 | -0.26 | -0.41 | -0.41 | -0.42 | 1.00 |

## Regression results

**Table SF3. Regression of all attributes**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | β | **SE** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **Inclusiveness (ref. all interested)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***Representative sample*** | 0.007 | 0.012 | 0.553 | -0.016 | 0.031 |
|  ***Key stakeholders*** | -0.014 | 0.013 | 0.257 | -0.039 | 0.010 |
| **Popular control (ref. directly implemented)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***Advisory role*** | 0.093 | 0.011 | 0.000 | 0.071 | 0.114 |
| **Considered judgement (ref. own judgement)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***Expert advice*** | 0.049 | 0.012 | 0.000 | 0.025 | 0.073 |
|  ***Moderated discussions*** | 0.115 | 0.012 | 0.000 | 0.091 | 0.139 |
| **Transparency (ref. Behind closed doors)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***Open to public*** | 0.093 | 0.010 | 0.000 | 0.073 | 0.113 |
| **Efficiency (ref. 1 instance)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***2-5 instances*** | -0.004 | 0.013 | 0.756 | -0.030 | 0.022 |
|  ***5-10 instances*** | -0.050 | 0.013 | 0.000 | -0.075 | -0.025 |
| **Transferability (Ref. Online)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***Offline*** | 0.033 | 0.010 | 0.001 | 0.014 | 0.053 |
| **Policy issue (ref Vegan food)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  ***Wolf protection*** | 0.001 | 0.015 | 0.970 | -0.029 | 0.030 |
|  ***Regional gov. reform*** | 0.140 | 0.016 | 0.000 | 0.109 | 0.172 |
|  ***Ec. growth*** | 0.112 | 0.016 | 0.000 | 0.082 | 0.143 |
| **Constant** | 0.293 | 0.018 | 0.000 | 0.258 | 0.328 |
| N  | 10500 |
| Note: Entries are regression coefficients (β) from a linear regression analysis with clustered standard errors (SE), P-values (P) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The R2 is not reported since model fit is irrelevant for the current purposes.  |

**Table SF4. Including interaction with policy issue**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | β | **SE** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **Policy issue (ref Vegan food)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Wolf protection*** | 0.019 | 0.042 | 0.653 | -0.064 | 0.101 |
| ***Regional gov. reform*** | 0.126 | 0.041 | 0.002 | 0.046 | 0.206 |
| ***Ec. Growth*** | 0.060 | 0.042 | 0.157 | -0.023 | 0.143 |
| **Inclusiveness (ref. all interested)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Representative sample*** | 0.026 | 0.023 | 0.269 | -0.020 | 0.071 |
| ***Key stakeholders*** | -0.038 | 0.023 | 0.092 | -0.083 | 0.006 |
| ***Representative sample # Wolf protection*** | -0.062 | 0.033 | 0.064 | -0.127 | 0.004 |
| ***Representative sample # Regional gov. reform*** | -0.004 | 0.032 | 0.893 | -0.067 | 0.059 |
| ***Representative sample # Ec. Growth*** | -0.007 | 0.032 | 0.835 | -0.069 | 0.056 |
| ***Key stakeholders # Wolf protection*** | 0.027 | 0.032 | 0.403 | -0.036 | 0.089 |
| ***Key stakeholders # Regional gov. reform*** | 0.032 | 0.032 | 0.314 | -0.031 | 0.096 |
| ***Key stakeholders # Ec. Growth*** | 0.038 | 0.031 | 0.224 | -0.023 | 0.098 |
| **Popular control (ref. directly implemented)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Advisory role*** | 0.064 | 0.019 | 0.001 | 0.027 | 0.102 |
| ***Advisory role # Wolf protection*** | 0.040 | 0.026 | 0.119 | -0.010 | 0.091 |
| ***Advisory role # Regional gov. reform*** | 0.008 | 0.025 | 0.755 | -0.041 | 0.057 |
| ***Advisory role # Ec. Growth*** | 0.064 | 0.025 | 0.012 | 0.014 | 0.113 |
| **Considered judgement (ref. own judgement)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Expert advice*** | 0.067 | 0.023 | 0.003 | 0.023 | 0.111 |
| ***Moderated discussions*** | 0.075 | 0.024 | 0.002 | 0.028 | 0.122 |
| ***Expert advice # Wolf protection*** | -0.028 | 0.032 | 0.380 | -0.090 | 0.034 |
| ***Expert advice # Regional gov. reform*** | -0.033 | 0.031 | 0.295 | -0.093 | 0.028 |
| ***Expert advice # Ec. Growth*** | -0.014 | 0.032 | 0.673 | -0.077 | 0.050 |
| ***Moderated discussions # Wolf protection*** | 0.049 | 0.034 | 0.145 | -0.017 | 0.115 |
| ***Moderated discussions # Regional gov. reform*** | 0.058 | 0.031 | 0.067 | -0.004 | 0.119 |
| ***Moderated discussions # Ec. Growth*** | 0.052 | 0.033 | 0.117 | -0.013 | 0.117 |
| **Transparency (ref. Behind closed doors)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Open to public*** | 0.117 | 0.019 | 0.000 | 0.079 | 0.154 |
| ***Open to public # Wolf protection*** | -0.037 | 0.026 | 0.162 | -0.089 | 0.015 |
| ***Open to public # Regional gov. reform*** | -0.037 | 0.026 | 0.157 | -0.088 | 0.014 |
| ***Open to public # Ec. Growth*** | -0.019 | 0.026 | 0.455 | -0.070 | 0.032 |
| **Efficiency (ref. 1 instance)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***2-5 instances*** | -0.015 | 0.024 | 0.537 | -0.061 | 0.032 |
| ***5-10 instances*** | -0.027 | 0.025 | 0.271 | -0.075 | 0.021 |
| ***2-5 instances # Wolf protection*** | -0.015 | 0.032 | 0.643 | -0.077 | 0.047 |
| ***2-5 instances # Regional gov. reform*** | 0.031 | 0.031 | 0.331 | -0.031 | 0.092 |
| ***2-5 instances # Ec. Growth*** | 0.025 | 0.032 | 0.425 | -0.037 | 0.088 |
| ***5-10 instances # Wolf protection*** | -0.002 | 0.033 | 0.944 | -0.067 | 0.062 |
| ***5-10 instances # Regional gov. reform*** | -0.055 | 0.033 | 0.097 | -0.119 | 0.010 |
| ***5-10 instances # Ec. Growth*** | -0.038 | 0.033 | 0.254 | -0.103 | 0.027 |
| **Transferability (Ref. Online)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Offline*** | 0.022 | 0.019 | 0.237 | -0.014 | 0.058 |
| ***Offline # Wolf protection*** | -0.018 | 0.026 | 0.478 | -0.069 | 0.032 |
| ***Offline # Regional gov. reform*** | 0.039 | 0.026 | 0.143 | -0.013 | 0.091 |
| ***Offline # Ec. Growth*** | 0.024 | 0.026 | 0.362 | -0.028 | 0.076 |
| Constant | 0.306 | 0.029 | 0.000 | 0.248 | 0.364 |
| N  | 10500 |
|  Note: Entries are regression coefficients (β) from a linear regression analysis with clustered standard errors (SE), P-values (P) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The R2 is not reported since model fit is irrelevant for the current purposes. |

**Table SF5. Including interactions with process preferences**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | β | **SE** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **Process preference (ref citizens)**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Intermediate** | -0.024 | 0.053 | 0.652 | -0.127 | 0.079 |
| **Elected representatives** | -0.072 | 0.049 | 0.138 | -0.168 | 0.023 |
| **Inclusiveness (ref. all interested)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Representative sample*** | 0.019 | 0.028 | 0.510 | -0.037 | 0.074 |
| ***Key stakeholders*** | -0.044 | 0.032 | 0.178 | -0.108 | 0.020 |
| ***Representative sample*#Intermediate** | -0.022 | 0.035 | 0.522 | -0.091 | 0.046 |
| ***Representative sample*#Elected representatives** | -0.006 | 0.033 | 0.850 | -0.071 | 0.059 |
| **Key stakeholders#Intermediate** | 0.004 | 0.039 | 0.925 | -0.073 | 0.080 |
| **Key stakeholders #Elected representatives** | 0.059 | 0.037 | 0.114 | -0.014 | 0.131 |
| **Popular control (ref. directly implemented)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Advisory role*** | 0.053 | 0.029 | 0.066 | -0.004 | 0.110 |
| ***Advisory role*#Intermediate** | 0.025 | 0.034 | 0.464 | -0.042 | 0.092 |
| ***Advisory role*#Elected representatives** | 0.064 | 0.033 | 0.050 | 0.000 | 0.128 |
| **Considered judgement (ref. own judgement)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Expert advice*** | 0.036 | 0.029 | 0.212 | -0.021 | 0.092 |
| ***Moderated discussions*** | 0.103 | 0.030 | 0.001 | 0.045 | 0.162 |
| ***Expert advice* #Intermediate** | 0.013 | 0.035 | 0.714 | -0.056 | 0.082 |
| ***Expert advice* #Elected representatives** | 0.016 | 0.034 | 0.629 | -0.050 | 0.083 |
| ***Moderated discussions* #Intermediate** | 0.004 | 0.037 | 0.917 | -0.068 | 0.075 |
| ***Moderated discussions* #Elected representatives** | 0.021 | 0.035 | 0.548 | -0.047 | 0.089 |
| **Transparency (ref. Behind closed doors)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Open to public*** | 0.071 | 0.025 | 0.005 | 0.021 | 0.121 |
| ***Open to public*#Intermediate** | 0.025 | 0.031 | 0.431 | -0.037 | 0.086 |
| ***Open to public*#Elected representatives** | 0.028 | 0.029 | 0.336 | -0.029 | 0.085 |
| **Efficiency (ref. 1 instance)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***2-5 instances*** | -0.002 | 0.032 | 0.939 | -0.064 | 0.059 |
| ***5-10 instances*** | -0.062 | 0.034 | 0.068 | -0.129 | 0.005 |
| ***2-5 instances*#Intermediate** | -0.004 | 0.040 | 0.928 | -0.081 | 0.074 |
| ***2-5 instances*#Elected representatives** | 0.001 | 0.037 | 0.986 | -0.071 | 0.072 |
| ***5-10 instances*#Intermediate** | -0.001 | 0.040 | 0.975 | -0.079 | 0.077 |
| ***5-10 instances*#Elected representatives** | 0.025 | 0.038 | 0.510 | -0.050 | 0.101 |
| **Transferability (Ref. Online)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Offline*** | -0.002 | 0.024 | 0.936 | -0.049 | 0.046 |
| ***Offline*#Intermediate** | 0.061 | 0.030 | 0.039 | 0.003 | 0.119 |
| ***Offline*#Elected representatives** | 0.026 | 0.028 | 0.357 | -0.029 | 0.081 |
| **Policy issue (ref Vegan food)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Wolf protection*** | 0.044 | 0.038 | 0.246 | -0.031 | 0.119 |
| ***Regional gov. reform*** | 0.175 | 0.039 | 0.000 | 0.098 | 0.251 |
| ***Ec. Growth*** | 0.124 | 0.038 | 0.001 | 0.050 | 0.198 |
| ***Wolf protection*#Intermediate** | -0.056 | 0.046 | 0.223 | -0.147 | 0.034 |
| ***Wolf protection*#Elected representatives** | -0.049 | 0.044 | 0.258 | -0.135 | 0.036 |
| ***Regional gov. reform*#Intermediate** | -0.033 | 0.048 | 0.491 | -0.128 | 0.061 |
| ***Regional gov. reform*#Elected representatives** | -0.046 | 0.045 | 0.311 | -0.134 | 0.043 |
| ***Ec. Growth*#Intermediate** | -0.030 | 0.046 | 0.519 | -0.119 | 0.060 |
| ***Ec. Growth*#Elected representatives** | -0.002 | 0.044 | 0.955 | -0.089 | 0.084 |
| **Constant** | 0.337 | 0.042 | 0.000 | 0.255 | 0.419 |
| N | 10500 |
| Note: Entries are regression coefficients (β) from a linear regression analysis with clustered standard errors (SE), P-values (P) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The R2 is not reported since model fit is irrelevant for the current purposes. |

## Marginal means

**Figure SF1. Marginal means for all attributes**



**Figure SF2. Marginal means across policy issue**



**Figure SF3. Marginal means across process preferences**



1. Regions were in the preregistered plan divided into four NUTS-2 regions, but since this division is not commonly known, a different categorisation was chosen to make it easier for respondents to pick the correct place of living. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)