Appendix 1: Original Vignettes

Von: [alias]

Betreff: Bürgeranfrage: **Arbeitslosigkeit Corona**

Sehr geehrte(r) Frau (Herr) [Name MdB/MdL],

mein Name ist [alias]. Ich wohne in Ihrem Wahlkreis und sende ihnen diese E-Mail zu, weil ich mich durch die aktuelle Diskussion um **die Krise der deutschen Wirtschaft während der Corona Pandemie** verunsichert fühle. Ihre parlamentarische Tätigkeit sowie Ihre Partei haben in der Vergangenheit sehr geholfen und so möchte ich Sie auch hier um Hilfe bitten.

Insbesondere über die **aktuelle Lage des Arbeitsmarktes** gibt es ja die unterschiedlichsten Informationen. Da das Thema für mich eine große Rolle spielt, bitte ich Sie nun um ihre persönliche Einschätzung: **Für wie wichtig halten Sie die aktuelle Krise für die deutsche Wirtschaft?** Und eine Information konnte ich trotz Recherche nicht finden: **Stimmt es, dass die Arbeitslosigkeit in Deutschland bei 24 Prozent liegt?**

Ich bedanke mich recht herzlich für Ihre Hilfe.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

[alias]

Von: [alias]

Betreff: Bürgeranfrage: **erneuerbare Energien**

Sehr geehrte(r) Frau (Herr) [Name MdB/MdL],

mein Name ist [alias]. Ich wohne in Ihrem Wahlkreis und sende ihnen diese E-Mail zu, weil ich mich durch **die aktuelle Diskussion um den Klimawandel** verunsichert fühle. Ihre parlamentarische Tätigkeit sowie Ihre Partei haben in der Vergangenheit sehr geholfen und so möchte ich Sie auch hier um Hilfe bitten.

Insbesondere über die **Rolle der erneuerbaren Energie** in Deutschland gibt es ja die unterschiedlichsten Informationen. Da das Thema für mich eine große Rolle spielt, bitte ich Sie nun um ihre persönliche Einschätzung: **Für wie wichtig halten Sie den Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energien in Deutschland?** Und eine Information konnte ich trotz Recherche nicht finden: **Stimmt es, dass nur 35 Prozent des Stromverbrauchs in Deutschland aus erneuerbaren Energien stammt?**

Ich bedanke mich recht herzlich für Ihre Hilfe.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

[alias]

Von: [alias]

Betreff: Bürgeranfrage: **Migration**

Sehr geehrte(r) Frau (Herr) [Name MdB/MdL],

mein Name ist [alias]. Ich wohne in Ihrem Wahlkreis und sende ihnen diese E-Mail zu, weil ich mich durch die Diskussion um **die Migration nach Deutschland** verunsichert fühle. Ihre parlamentarische Tätigkeit sowie Ihre Partei haben mir in der Vergangenheit sehr geholfen und so möchte ich Sie auch hier um Hilfe bitten.

Insbesondere über die **Rolle von Migranten für die deutsche Wirtschaft** gibt es ja die unterschiedlichsten Informationen. Da das Thema für mich eine große Rolle spielt, bitte ich Sie nun um ihre persönliche Einschätzung: **Für wie wichtig halten Sie Migranten für die deutsche Wirtschaft?** Und eine Information konnte ich trotz Recherche nicht finden: **Stimmt es, dass wirklich 48 Prozent der Ausländer in Deutschland arbeitslos sind?**

Ich bedanke mich recht herzlich für Ihre Hilfe.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

[alias]

*Randomized parts are in bold.*

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A1: Polled information questions |
| Unemployment | *Of 100 people in Germany, how many are unemployed and search for a job?* |
| Renewable energy | *What is the share of total energy consumption that goes back to renewable energies?* |
| Immigration | *Of 100 immigrants in Germany, how many are unemployed and search for a job?* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Appendix Table A2: Summary statistics |   |   |   |
|   | N | mean | sd | min | max |
| responsiveness | 2,503 | 0.513 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
| misinformation toleration | 1,283 | 0.0795 | 0.270 | 0 | 1 |
| Self reply parliamentarian | 1,283 | 0.349 | 0.469 | 0 | 1 |
| positioning economics | 2,503 | 5.066 | 1.836 | 1.286 | 7.905 |
| salience economics | 2,503 | 6.411 | 1.575 | 3.190 | 8.100 |
| positioning immigration | 2,503 | 5.477 | 2.490 | 1.700 | 9.900 |
| salience immigration | 2,503 | 7.042 | 1.488 | 5.050 | 9.800 |
| positioning environment | 2,503 | 5.417 | 1.987 | 1.550 | 8.450 |
| salience environment | 2,503 | 6.237 | 1.427 | 4.950 | 9.700 |
| state election 2021 | 2,503 | 0.361 | 0.480 | 0 | 1 |
| constituency (directly elected) | 2,503 | 0.459 | 0.498 | 0 | 1 |
| government | 2,503 | 0.584 | 0.493 | 0 | 1 |
| Bundestag | 2,503 | 0.281 | 0.450 | 0 | 1 |
| female | 2,503 | 0.312 | 0.464 | 0 | 1 |
| faction size | 2,503 | 67.24 | 68.57 | 1 | 246 |
| AfD | 2,503 | 0.131 | 0.338 | 0 | 1 |
| Gruene | 2,503 | 0.133 | 0.340 | 0 | 1 |
| FDP | 2,503 | 0.0763 | 0.266 | 0 | 1 |
| SPD | 2,503 | 0.247 | 0.431 | 0 | 1 |
| CDU\_CSU | 2,503 | 0.327 | 0.469 | 0 | 1 |
| DIE\_LINKE | 2,503 | 0.0855 | 0.280 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A3: Overview sampled politicians |
|   | Total | Bundestag | Länder |
| AfD | 329 | 89 | 240 |
| CDU&CSU | 819 | 246 | 573 |
| DIE\_LINKE | 214 | 69 | 145 |
| FDP | 191 | 80 | 111 |
| GRÜNEN | 333 | 67 | 266 |
| SPD | 617 | 152 | 465 |
| Total | 2503 | 703 | 1800 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A4a: Randomization checks across waves |
| Wave | No Response | Response | Total |
| 1 | 571 | 620 | 1,191 |
|  | (48%) | (52%) | (100%) |
| 2 | 648 | 664 | 1,312 |
|  | (49%) | (51%) | (100%) |
| Total | 1,219 | 1,284 | 2,503 |
|  | (49%) | (51%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across waves according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (1) = 0.523, p = 0.47 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A4b: Randomization checks across aliases |
| Name | No Response | Response | Total |
| 1 | 609 | 640 | 1,249 |
|  | (49%) | (41%) | (100%) |
| 2  | 610 | 644 | 1,254 |
|  | (49%) | (51%) | (100%) |
| Total | 1,219 | 1,284 | 2,503 |
|  | (49%) | (51%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across names according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (1) = 0.003, p = 0.95 |

Appendix Table A4a and A4b show no systematic impact of wave and alias on the legislator’s response behaviour.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A5a: Balance test: Waves |
| Wave | Renewable Energy | Unemployment Immigrants | Unemployment Corona | Total |
| 1 | 400 | 411 | 380 | 1,191 |
|  | (34%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| 2 | 438 | 448 | 426 | 1,312 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Total | 838 | 859 | 806 | 2,503 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across waves according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (2) = .09, p = 0.955 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A5b: Balance test: Alias |
| Name | Renewable Energy | Unemployment Immigrants | Unemployment Corona | Total |
| 1  | 418 | 430 | 401 | 1,249 |
| (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| 2  | 420 | 429 | 405 | 1,254 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Total | 838 | 859 | 806 | 2,503 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across names according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (2) = .015, p = .992 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A5c: Balance test: Gender |
| Gender | Renewable Energy | Unemployment Immigrants | Unemployment Corona | Total |
| Female | 249 | 276 | 257 | 782 |
|  | (32%) | (35%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| Male | 589 | 583 | 549 | 1,721 |
|  | (34%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Total | 838 | 859 | 806 | 2,503 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across names according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (2) = 1.38, p = 0.50 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A5d: Balance test: Faction |
| Faction | Renewable Energy | Unemployment Immigrants | Unemployment Corona | Total |
| AfD | 112 | 114 | 103 | 329 |
|  | (34%) | (35%) | (31%) | (100%) |
| CDU | 162 | 166 | 160 | 488 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| CDU\_CSU | 82 | 82 | 82 | 246 |
|  | (33%) | (33%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| CSU | 28 | 29 | 28 | 85 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| DIE\_LINKE | 71 | 75 | 68 | 214 |
|  | (33%) | (35%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| FDP | 65 | 66 | 60 | 191 |
|  | (34%) | (35%) | (31%) | (100%) |
| GRÜNEN | 111 | 116 | 106 | 333 |
|  | (33%) | (35%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| SPD | 207 | 211 | 199 | 617 |
|  | (34%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Total | 838 | 859 | 806 | 2,503 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across faction according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (14) = 0.54, p = 1.0 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A5e: Balance test: Parliament |
| Parliament | Renewable Energy | Unemployment Immigrants | Unemployment Corona | Total |
| Baden-Württemberg | 46 | 48 | 44 | 138 |
| (33%) | (35%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Bayern | 59 | 61 | 56 | 176 |
|  | (34%) | (35%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Berlin | 52 | 54 | 51 | 157 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Brandenburg | 27 | 30 | 26 | 83 |
|  | (33%) | (36%) | (31%) | (100%) |
| Bremen | 28 | 30 | 26 | 83 |
|  | (34%) | (36%) | (30%) | (100%) |
| Bundestag | 235 | 236 | 232 | 703 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| Hamburg | 40 | 41 | 41 | 122 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (34%) | (100%) |
| Hessen | 46 | 47 | 42 | 135 |
|  | (34%) | (35%) | (31%) | (100%) |
| Mecklenburg-Vorpommern | 24 | 24 | 21 | 69 |
| (35%) | (35%) | (30%) | (100%) |
| NRW | 65 | 67 | 64 | 196 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| Niedersachsen | 45 | 45 | 43 | 133 |
|  | (34%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Rheinland-Pfalz | 33 | 33 | 31 | 97 |
|  | (34%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Saarland | 17 | 16 | 16 | 49 |
|  | (35%) | (33%) | (33%) | (100%) |
| Sachsen | 40 | 41 | 38 | 119 |
|  | (34%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Sachsen-Anhalt | 28 | 29 | 26 | 83 |
|  | (34%) | (35%) | (31%) | (100%) |
| Schleswig-Holstein | 22 | 24 | 22 | 68 |
| (32%) | (35%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| Thüringen | 31 | 33 | 28 | 92 |
|  | (34%) | (36%) | (30%) | (100%) |
| Total | 838 | 859 | 806 | 2,503 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across faction according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (32) = 1.24, p = 1.0 |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A5f: Balance test: Constituency (directly elected legislators) |
|  | Renewable Energy | Unemployment Immigrants | Unemployment Corona | Total |
| No | 460 | 476 | 418 | 1,354 |
|  | (34%) | (35%) | (31%) | (100%) |
| Yes | 378 | 383 | 388 | 1,149 |
|  | (33%) | (33%) | (34%) | (100%) |
| Total | 838 | 859 | 806 | 2,503 |
|  | (33%) | (34%) | (32%) | (100%) |
| N | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| Note: Entries are absolute number of responses. Row percentages are in parentheses. No systematic differences across constituency according to a Pearson χ2-test for the independence of the rows and columns, with χ2 (2) = 2.44, p = 0.296 |

By using the bivariate tests above, we show that our control variables are unrelated to the respective issue treatments. The wave at which the mail was sent (Table A5a) as well as the parliamentarian's name (Table A5b) are both orthogonal to the treatment variable. The legislator’s gender (Table A5c) faction (Table A5d), parliament (Table A5e) and mode of election (Table A5f) turn out to be independent of the treatment variable.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A6: Response rate by faction (chi-square: Ha: meanAfD≠mean non-AfD) |
|   | Unemployment  | Renewable Energy  | Unemployment Immigrants  | Total |
| AfD | 43.71 |   | 42.86 |   | 39.47 |   | 41.64 |   |
| CDU&CSU | 57.04 | \*\*\* | 62.87 | \*\* | 46.57 |   | 55.43 | \*\*\* |
| DIE\_LINKE | 61.76 | \*\* | 53.52 |  | 42.67 |   | 52.34 | \*\* |
| FDP | 63.33 | \*\* | 49.23 |   | 45.45 |   | 52.36 | \*\* |
| GRÜNEN | 50.94 |   | 55.86 | \* | 39.66 |   | 48.65 | \* |
| SPD | 52.26 |  | 56.52 | \*\* | 45.97 | \* | 51.54 | \*\*\* |
| Total | 54.22 |  | 55.85 |  | 44.12 |   | 51.30 |   |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A7a: Linear Probability Models Responsiveness |
|   | Unemployment | Renewable Energy | Immigration | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| salience economics | -0.004 | 0.022 |  |  |
|  | (0.105) | (0.021) |  |  |
| salience environment | -0.017 |  | 0.008 |  |
|  | (0.074) |  | (0.022) |  |
| salience immigration | 0.002 |  |  | -0.008 |
|  | (0.071) |  |  | (0.016) |
| Bundestag  | 0.250\*\*\* | 0.259\*\*\* | 0.276\*\*\* | 0.187\* |
|  | (0.085) | (0.067) | (0.064) | (0.107) |
| government  | 0.062 | 0.039 | 0.124 | 0.037 |
|  | (0.072) | (0.083) | (0.073) | (0.069) |
| state election 2021  | 0.076 | 0.042 | 0.123\*\* | 0.061 |
|  | (0.059) | (0.071) | (0.052) | (0.079) |
| directly elected | 0.033 | 0.035 | 0.066 | 0.005 |
|  | (0.030) | (0.055) | (0.042) | (0.031) |
| faction size | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.000) | (0.001) |
| AfD | -0.103 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.273) |  |  |  |
| Gruene  | 0.035 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.188) |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.491 | 0.279\* | 0.311\*\* | 0.371\*\* |
|  | (1.498) | (0.152) | (0.132) | (0.144) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 2,503 | 806 | 838 | 859 |
| R-squared | 0.047 | 0.053 | 0.053 | 0.044 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A7b: Linear Probability Models ‘Fake News’ Toleration |
|   | Unemployment | Renewable Energy | Immigration | Total |
|   |  |  |  |  |
| positioning economics | 0.016\* |  |  |  |
|  | (0.009) |  |  |  |
| positioning environm. |  | 0.020\*\* |  |  |
|  |  | (0.008) |  |  |
| positioning immigration |  |  | 0.030\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | (0.011) |  |
| Bundestag  | 0.018 | 0.008 | 0.107 | 0.028 |
|  | (0.074) | (0.051) | (0.101) | (0.033) |
| government  | -0.033 | -0.039 | -0.066 | -0.011 |
|  | (0.030) | (0.036) | (0.045) | (0.019) |
| state election 2021  | 0.005 | 0.036 | 0.005 | 0.013 |
|  | (0.037) | (0.035) | (0.041) | (0.019) |
| directly elected | 0.016 | 0.041 | -0.036 | 0.024 |
|  | (0.031) | (0.033) | (0.030) | (0.018) |
| faction size | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.001 | -0.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.001) | (0.000) |
| AfD  |  |  |  | 0.231\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.034) |
| Gruene  |  |  |  | 0.007 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.021) |
| Constant | 0.003 | -0.009 | 0.013 | 0.053\*\*\* |
|  | (0.053) | (0.048) | (0.070) | (0.015) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 436 | 468 | 379 | 1,283 |
| R-squared | 0.040 | 0.047 | 0.091 | 0.077 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A8: Share tolerator by faction (chi-square: Ha: meanAfD≠mean non-AfD) |
|   | Unemployment  | Renewable Energy  | Unemployment Immigrants  | Total |
| AfD | 22.72 |   | 25.00 |   | 40.00 |   | 29.2 |   |
| CDU&CSU | 5.19 | \*\*\* | 8.19 | \*\*\* | 7.75 | \*\*\* | 7.05 | \*\*\* |
| DIE\_LINKE | 4.76 | \*\*\* | 2.63 | \*\*\* | 3.13 | \*\*\* | 3.57 | \*\*\* |
| FDP | 0.00 | \*\*\* | 9.38 | \*\* | 16.67 | \*\* | 8.00 | \*\*\* |
| GRÜNEN | 0.00 | \*\*\* | 6.45 | \*\*\* | 13.04 | \*\*\* | 6.17 | \*\*\* |
| SPD | 0.00 | \*\*\* | 3.42 | \*\*\* | 4.12 | \*\*\* | 2.52 | \*\*\* |
| Total | 4.81 |  | 8.12 |  | 11.61 |  | 8.02 |   |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix Table A9: Logistic regression model: toleration rate (post-treatment bias corrected)  |
|   | Unemployment | Renewable Energy | Immigration | Total |
|   |  |  |  |  |
| positioning economics | 0.055 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.067) |  |  |  |
| positioning environm. |  | 0.070 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.053) |  |  |
| positioning immigration |  |  | 0.057 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.050) |  |
| Bundestag  | -1.001 | -0.988\*\* | -0.536 | -0.921\*\* |
|  | (0.616) | (0.440) | (0.529) | (0.398) |
| government  | -0.272 | -0.527\* | -0.288 | -0.255 |
|  | (0.268) | (0.274) | (0.305) | (0.251) |
| state election 2021  | -0.170 | -0.372\* | -0.248 | -0.275 |
|  | (0.273) | (0.224) | (0.261) | (0.205) |
| directly elected | -0.128 | -0.128 | -0.091 | -0.082 |
|  | (0.229) | (0.195) | (0.167) | (0.135) |
| faction size | -0.001 | 0.000 | -0.003 | -0.000 |
|  | (0.004) | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.002) |
| AfD  |  |  |  | 0.701\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.247) |
| Gruene  |  |  |  | 0.080 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.254) |
| Constant | 0.281 | 0.337 | 0.768\*\* | 0.579\*\*\* |
|  | (0.388) | (0.404) | (0.376) | (0.213) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 806 | 838 | 859 | 2,503 |
| R-squared | 0.0436 | 0.0442 | 0.0321 | 0.0424 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |
|  |

In order to control for post-treatment bias, non-responses were coded as if they had tolerated misinformation (as suggested by Coppock, 2019).

**Appendix Figures**

Appendix Figure A1: Numerical deviation from official value, by party, in percent


Source: Own depiction

Appendix Figure A2a: Box plot, numerical deviations from official statistics by party, in percent, unemployment query


Source: Own depiction

Appendix Figure A2b: Box plot numerical deviations from official statistics by party, in percent, renewable energy query

Source: Own depiction

Appendix Figure A2c: Box plot numerical deviations from official statistics by party, in percent, unemployment immigrants query

Source: Own depiction