**Online Appendix**

**How to survey about electoral turnout? The efficacy of the face-saving response items in 19 different contexts**

**Question wording (Table A1 to A4)**

**Table A1. German: Germany and Switzerland**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comment preamble  Bei jeder Wahl gibt es viele Leute, die nicht wählen konnten weil sie krank waren oder keine Zeit hatten. | |
| Standard yes/no voting question  Konnten Sie an dieser Wahl teilnehmen?  1. Ja  2. Nein  9. Weiss nicht/keine Angaben | Face-saving voting question  Welche der folgenden Aussagen trifft am ehesten auf Sie zu?  1. Ich habe bei dieser Wahl nicht gewählt  2. Ich habe dieses mal darüber nachgedacht zu wählen, habe es aber nicht getan  3. Normalerweise wähle ich, aber diesmal habe ich es nicht getan  4. Ich bin sicher dass ich an dieser Wahl teilgenommen habe  9. Weiss nicht/keine Angaben |

**Table A2. Spanish: Spain**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comment preamble  En unas elecciones hay muchas personas que no pueden votar porque no están censadas, están enfermas, o porque no tienen tiempo. | |
| Standard yes/no voting question  ¿Pudo Ud. votar en las elecciones?  1. Si  2. No  9. No sabe/prefiero no responder | Face-saving voting question  ¿Cuál de las siguientes afirmaciones se ajusta más a su caso?  1. No voté en las elecciones  2. Pensé en votar pero al final no fui  3. Normalmente voto, pero esta vez no lo hice  4. Estoy seguro de que voté en las elecciones  9. No sabe/prefiero no responder |

**Table A3. Catalan: Spain**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comment preamble  En unes eleccions hi ha moltes persones que no poden votar perquè no estan registrades, estan malaltes, o perquè no tenen temps. | |
| Standard yes/no voting question  Va poder votar en les eleccions?  1. Sí  2. No  9. No ho sap / Prefereixo no responder | Face-saving voting question  Quina de les següents afirmacions s’ajusta més al seu cas?  1. No vaig votar a les eleccions  2. Vaig pensar en votar però al final no hi vaig anar  3. Normalment voto, però aquesta vegada no ho vaig fer  4. Estic segur que vaig votar a les eleccions  9. No ho sap/prefereixo no respondre |

**Table A4. French: France and Quebec\***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comment preamble for the legislative elections in France  À chaque élection, plusieurs personnes ne sont pas en mesure de voter parce qu’elles n’étaient pas inscrites pour voter, elles étaient malades ou elles n’avaient pas le temps. | |
| Standard yes/no voting question  Avez-vous été en mesure de voter au 1er tour de cette élection? (France)  Avez-vous été capable de voter à cette élection? (Québec)  1. Oui  2. Non  9. Ne sait pas/Préfère ne pas répondre | Face-saving voting question  Laquelle des situations suivantes correspond le mieux à votre cas lors du 1er tour de cette élection? (France)  Laquelle des situations suivantes correspond le mieux à votre cas ? (Québec)  1. Je n’ai pas voté à cette élection  2. Je voulais voter mais ne suis pas allé voter  3. Je vote généralement mais ne suis pas allé cette fois-ci  4. Je suis certain d’avoir voté à l’élection  9. Ne sait pas/préfère ne pas réponse. |

\*For the French national and municipal elections, we asked respondents whether they voted at the first round of the election. Therefore, we added a few words to clarify that it did not concern the second round. There is a possibility that some respondents were confused and thought the question concerned the second round. However, we do not expect this confusion to have a strong impact on our result as social pressure is probably relatively equal between the two rounds.

Respondents completed the questionnaires during the 15 days that followed Election Day. In the national and municipal elections in France, for which there are two rounds held within 7 days, “Election Day” refers to the second round.

**Table A5. Dates of Election Day and Dates of Data Collection**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Election** | **Region** | **Election Day** | **Survey period** |
| Canada | 2011 Provincial election  2012 Provincial election | Ontario  Québec | Oct. 6  Sept. 4 | Oct. 7-13  Sept. 5-20 |
| France | 2012 Legislative election  2012 Legislative election | PACA  Ile-de-France | June 10\*  June 10\* | June 18-27  June 18-27 |
|  | 2014 Municipal election | Paris | March 23\* | March 31-Apr. 14 |
|  | 2014 Municipal election | Marseille | March 23\* | March 31-Apr. 14 |
|  | 2014 European election | PACA | May 25 | May 26-June 9 |
|  | 2014 European election | Ile-de-France | May 25 | May 26-June 9 |
| Germany | 2013 State election | Lower Saxony | Jan. 20 | Jan. 21-25 |
|  | 2014 European election | Lower Saxony | May 25 | May 26- June 9 |
| Spain | 2011 National election  2011 National election  2012 Regional election | Madrid  Catalonia  Catalonia | Nov. 20  Nov. 20  Nov. 25 | Nov. 21-27  Nov. 21-27  Nov. 28-Dec. 7 |
|  | 2014 European election | Madrid | May 25 | May 26-June 9 |
|  | 2014 European election | Catalonia | May 25 | May 26-June 10 |
| Switzerland | 2011 Federal election  2011 Federal election  2011 Cantonal election  2011 Cantonal election | Lucerne  Zurich  Lucerne  Zurich | Oct. 23  Oct. 23  Apr. 10  Apr. 3 | Oct. 24-Nov. 6  Oct. 24-Nov. 6  Apr. 12-19  Apr. 4-9 |

\* First round of the election.

**Table A6. Response Distribution to the Turnout Question Across Experimental Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | | | |  |  | Control group | |  | Treatment group | | | |  | Effect | p-value |  |  | Participation rate | |
| Country | Region (or City) | Level | N | Actual turnout (%) |  | % Yes (Votedc) | % No |  | % I am sure I voted in the election (Votedt) | % I usually vote but didn't this time | % I thought about voting this time but didn't | % I did not vote in the election |  | (Votedt ‒ Votedc) | Two-tailed tests |  |  | Pre-election survey | Attrition |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France | Marseille | M | 517 | 40 |  | 79.46 | 20.54 |  | 73.47 | 6.65 | 4.61 | 15.27 |  | -6.00 | 0.232 |  |  | 9 | 39 |
| Paris | M | 856 | 43 |  | 84.03 | 15.97 |  | 76.51 | 6.00 | 7.26 | 10.23 |  | -7.52 | 0.019 |  |  | 12 | 35 |
| PACA | N | 719 | 56 |  | 79.72 | 20.28 |  | 78.73 | 4.27 | 5.25 | 11.75 |  | -1.00 | 0.82 |  |  | 13 | 26 |
| IDF | N | 748 | 54 |  | 75.40 | 24.60 |  | 74.70 | 6.94 | 3.77 | 14.59 |  | -0.70 | 0.873 |  |  | 10 | 21 |
| PACA | E | 806 | 43 |  | 84.95 | 15.05 |  | 70.71 | 4.87 | 4.16 | 20.26 |  | -14.24 | <0.001 |  |  | 13 | 21 |
| IDF | E | 834 | 54 |  | 81.02 | 18.98 |  | 63.04 | 8.97 | 8.28 | 19.71 |  | -17.98 | <0.001 |  |  | 12 | 13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spain | Catalonia | R | 800 | 70 |  | 94.00 | 6.00 |  | 87.25 | 2.68 | 2.89 | 7.17 |  | -6.75 | 0.001 |  |  | 16 | 19 |
| Catalonia | N | 818 | 65 |  | 91.05 | 8.95 |  | 88.64 | 4.52 | 1.23 | 5.61 |  | -2.41 | 0.284 |  |  | 17 | 12 |
| Madrid | N | 823 | 73 |  | 96.56 | 3.44 |  | 90.57 | 2.78 | 2.75 | 3.91 |  | -6.00 | 0.003 |  |  | 17 | 12 |
| Catalonia | E | 811 | 46 |  | 83.83 | 16.17 |  | 71.60 | 7.57 | 4.75 | 16.08 |  | -12.23 | 0.002 |  |  | 8 | 16 |
| Madrid | E | 805 | 46 |  | 83.10 | 16.90 |  | 69.42 | 7.80 | 6.60 | 16.17 |  | -13.68 | 0.001 |  |  | 11 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Switzerland | Lucerne | R | 904 | 44 |  | 81.83 | 18.17 |  | 69.30 | 11.82 | 4.77 | 14.11 |  | -12.53 | <0.001 |  |  | 35 | 25 |
| Zurich | R | 843 | 35 |  | 84.17 | 15.83 |  | 75.92 | 7.56 | 4.26 | 12.25 |  | -8.25 | 0.005 |  |  | 36 | 29 |
| Lucerne | N | 844 | 53 |  | 85.18 | 14.82 |  | 76.10 | 7.27 | 5.16 | 11.47 |  | -9.08 | 0.003 |  |  | 34 | 23 |
| Zurich | N | 840 | 50 |  | 86.21 | 13.79 |  | 81.74 | 4.25 | 5.27 | 8.74 |  | -4.47 | 0.126 |  |  | 32 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Germany | L. Saxony | R | 818 | 59 |  | 85.90 | 14.10 |  | 80.22 | 7.41 | 3.60 | 8.77 |  | -5.68 | 0.152 |  |  | 17 | 21 |
| L. Saxony | E | 791 | 49 |  | 80.21 | 19.79 |  | 74.28 | 10.75 | 3.94 | 11.02 |  | -5.93 | 0.21 |  |  | 6 | 17 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canada | Quebec | R | 724 | 75 |  | 95.74 | 4.26 |  | 85.74 | 3.97 | 4.38 | 5.90 |  | -10.00 | <0.001 |  |  | 11 | 26 |
| Ontario | R | 884 | 49 |  | 82.88 | 17.12 |  | 82.69 | 4.83 | 3.44 | 9.04 |  | -0.19 | 0.95 |  |  | 14 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: The cells under the "Control group" and "Treatment group" headings present the percentage of respondents in the said experimental group that chooses each response item. The cells under the "Treatment effect" column present percentage points. Coding for the "Level " column: M for "Municipal," R for "Regional," N for "National," and E for "European." The cells under the “Pre-election survey” column present percentages of panellists who filled the pre-election survey among those who received an invitation to do so. The cells under the “Attrition rate” column present percentages of respondents who completed the pre-election survey, but did not complete the post-election survey. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Randomization Check (Table A7 to A12)**

The random assignment ensures that differences in reported turnout among the two experimental groups is caused by the treatment and not by other covariates. The experimental design thus allows to make causal claims. However, it is also possible that, by chance, the randomization failed to generate experimental groups that are equal, on average, for all covariates. This situation will be problematic if those covariates are associated to the outcome of interest, i.e. reported turnout. For instance, if respondents of the control group are more interested in politics than those of the treatment group, the reported turnout will be higher, even though this has anything to do with the effect of the treatment.

For each of our 19 surveys, we performed a randomization check on five variables. Four of them are conventionally associated with the probability to vote: interest in the election, duty to vote, education and age. The exact labels of the educational attainment categories vary from country to country. These labels are available upon request to the corresponding author. In addition, we also checked whether gender is well-balanced across the experimental groups. We use the same weights that those used in the paper when performing our randomization checks.

We produced contingency tables crossing each of these variables with the randomized. We use the *p value* associated with the Pearson’s chi-square statistic to test independence between the rows and columns (control vs. treatment variables). Some of our 95 contingency tables (19 surveys x 5 variables = 95 contingency tables) reveal statistically significant imbalances. The contingency tables that display p<.05 are in bold. Note, however, that none of the p values are smaller than .01.

Some of these imbalances may in fact lead to an underestimation of the treatment effect. This is for example the case for the European election survey in Madrid or the regional election survey in Ontario. The treatment group is slightly older than the control group (and older people tend to vote more).

In one case, we find that the imbalance between the treatment group and the control group may have lead to an overestimating of the treatment effect. In the cantonal election survey in Lucerne, we observe that participants in the treatment group were 5 percentage points more likely to believe that voting in cantonal election is a choice and not a duty when compared to the control group. As previous research shows, believing that voting is a duty is strongly associated with voting. It is impossible for us to distinguish what part of the difference in turnout between the experimental groups (Te= -12.53, p<0.001) is actually attributable to this imbalance. Yet, it seems obvious that an imbalance of five percentage points cannot completely account for a treatment effect of 12.5 percentage points.

**Table A7. Provence-Alpes-Côte-d’Azur et Marseille**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur (and Marseille) | | | | | | | |
|  | Municipal | |  | National | |  | European | |
|  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |
| **Number of obs. in the experiment** | 261 | 256 |  | 370 | 349 |  | 418 | 388 |
| **Interest in this election** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 3% | 5% |  | 6% | 5% |  | 7% | 7% |
| 1 | 2% | 4% |  | 2% | 2% |  | 3% | 3% |
| 2 | 2% | 2% |  | 1% | 1% |  | 7% | 8% |
| 3 | 3% | 5% |  | 4% | 3% |  | 6% | 5% |
| 4 | 4% | 4% |  | 6% | 3% |  | 7% | 5% |
| 5 | 12% | 15% |  | 16% | 14% |  | 18% | 18% |
| 6 | 8% | 7% |  | 6% | 12% |  | 13% | 10% |
| 7 | 17% | 13% |  | 12% | 10% |  | 9% | 10% |
| 8 | 18% | 17% |  | 15% | 17% |  | 15% | 18% |
| 9 | 11% | 9% |  | 9% | 10% |  | 5% | 4% |
| 10 | 18% | 18% |  | 20% | 25% |  | 10% | 12% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 1% | 0% |  | 3% | 0% |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Voting is duty or a choice** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duty | 70% | 63% |  | 62% | 64% |  | 51% | 52% |
| Choice | 24% | 31% |  | 32% | 32% |  | 42% | 43% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 6% | 6% |  | 6% | 4% |  | 7% | 5% |
| **Educational attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2% | 2% |  | 3% | 7% |  | 3% | 5% |
| 2 | 5% | 7% |  | 14% | 4% |  | 9% | 9% |
| 3 | 7% | 10% |  | 9% | 7% |  | 8% | 8% |
| 4 | 18% | 24% |  | 24% | 29% |  | 24% | 28% |
| 5 | 21% | 18% |  | 8% | 11% |  | 15% | 10% |
| 6 | 22% | 16% |  | 10% | 12% |  | 8% | 10% |
| 7 | 25% | 23% |  | 15% | 15% |  | 11% | 8% |
| 8 |  |  |  | 16% | 14% |  | 6% | 5% |
| 9 |  |  |  | 1% | 1% |  | 13% | 15% |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3% | 2% |
| **Age category** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 8% | 9% |  | 13% | 7% |  | 6% | 8% |
| 25-34 | 25% | 21% |  | 16% | 22% |  | 22% | 19% |
| 35-44 | 14% | 11% |  | 15% | 13% |  | 15% | 13% |
| 45-54 | 17% | 14% |  | 17% | 15% |  | 19% | 17% |
| 55-64 | 23% | 32% |  | 24% | 27% |  | 24% | 25% |
| 65 and over | 13% | 13% |  | 17% | 16% |  | 14% | 18% |
| **Female** | 61% | 54% |  | 55% | 52% |  | 55% | 51% |

**Table A8. Île-de-France and Paris**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Municipal | |  | Legislative | |  | European | |
|  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |
| **Number of obs. in the experiment** | 445 | 411 |  | 358 | 390 |  | 426 | 408 |
| **Interest in this election** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 4% | 3% |  | 5% | 3% |  | **10%** | **6%** |
| 1 | 2% | 2% |  | 2% | 2% |  | **6%** | **1%** |
| 2 | 2% | 3% |  | 1% | 2% |  | **5%** | **9%** |
| 3 | 5% | 5% |  | 2% | 3% |  | **6%** | **6%** |
| 4 | 6% | 6% |  | 4% | 3% |  | **5%** | **8%** |
| 5 | 13% | 14% |  | 15% | 12% |  | **13%** | **15%** |
| 6 | 11% | 11% |  | 12% | 13% |  | **11%** | **17%** |
| 7 | 17% | 17% |  | 12% | 14% |  | **11%** | **11%** |
| 8 | 18% | 18% |  | 17% | 17% |  | **16%** | **14%** |
| 9 | 12% | 8% |  | 11% | 11% |  | **5%** | **5%** |
| 10 | 10% | 14% |  | 18% | 19% |  | **12%** | **7%** |
| Don't know/Refuse | 0% | 0% |  | 0% | 2% |  | **0%** | **1%** |
| **Voting is duty or a choice** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duty | 59% | 62% |  | 60% | 68% |  | 49% | 47% |
| Choice | 35% | 35% |  | 36% | 28% |  | 43% | 46% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 5% | 3% |  | 4% | 4% |  | 8% | 7% |
| **Educational attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1% | 1% |  | 8% | 2% |  | 4% | 3% |
| 2 | 2% | 6% |  | 9% | 6% |  | 6% | 7% |
| 3 | 4% | 6% |  | 7% | 8% |  | 9% | 5% |
| 4 | 10% | 6% |  | 18% | 22% |  | 19% | 19% |
| 5 | 15% | 18% |  | 10% | 11% |  | 11% | 11% |
| 6 | 16% | 12% |  | 8% | 11% |  | 8% | 9% |
| 7 | 51% | 50% |  | 13% | 17% |  | 11% | 10% |
| 8 |  |  |  | 27% | 23% |  | 5% | 6% |
| 9 |  |  |  | 2% | 1% |  | 24% | 27% |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3% | 4% |
| **Age category** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 7% | 8% |  | 11% | 9% |  | 5% | 6% |
| 25-34 | 32% | 30% |  | 21% | 19% |  | 22% | 25% |
| 35-44 | 12% | 15% |  | 17% | 17% |  | 15% | 19% |
| 45-54 | 16% | 12% |  | 21% | 21% |  | 19% | 19% |
| 55-64 | 19% | 19% |  | 22% | 25% |  | 23% | 18% |
| 65 and over | 14% | 16% |  | 8% | 9% |  | 17% | 13% |
| **Female** | 55% | 51% |  | 56% | 59% |  | 57% | 54% |

**Table A9. Catalonia**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Regional | |  | National | |  | European | |
|  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |
| **Number of obs. in the experiment** | 397 | 403 |  | 395 | 423 |  | 417 | 394 |
| **Interest in this election** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 5% | 4% |  | 6% | 7% |  | 14% | 9% |
| 1 | 3% | 2% |  | 4% | 2% |  | 3% | 2% |
| 2 | 4% | 3% |  | 4% | 5% |  | 6% | 5% |
| 3 | 4% | 1% |  | 4% | 3% |  | 5% | 10% |
| 4 | 3% | 3% |  | 4% | 8% |  | 7% | 10% |
| 5 | 9% | 12% |  | 13% | 13% |  | 14% | 17% |
| 6 | 8% | 8% |  | 8% | 8% |  | 12% | 10% |
| 7 | 12% | 13% |  | 13% | 13% |  | 13% | 10% |
| 8 | 17% | 14% |  | 19% | 15% |  | 11% | 11% |
| 9 | 13% | 12% |  | 10% | 8% |  | 7% | 5% |
| 10 | 21% | 26% |  | 15% | 19% |  | 8% | 12% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 0% | 0% |  | 0% | 0% |  | 0% | 1% |
| **Voting is duty or a choice** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duty | 62% | 62% |  | 65% | 62% |  | 42% | 42% |
| Choice | 36% | 36% |  | 33% | 34% |  | 51% | 50% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 1% | 2% |  | 2% | 4% |  | 7% | 8% |
| **Educational attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1% | 2% |  | 2% | 2% |  | 13% | 11% |
| 2 | 12% | 11% |  | 9% | 8% |  | 6% | 7% |
| 3 | 48% | 44% |  | 49% | 46% |  | 24% | 23% |
| 4 | 25% | 25% |  | 25% | 26% |  | 27% | 23% |
| 5 | 9% | 11% |  | 10% | 11% |  | 22% | 28% |
| 6 | 5% | 7% |  | 5% | 7% |  | 8% | 9% |
| **Age category** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 12% | 11% |  | 9% | 10% |  | 6% | 9% |
| 25-34 | 17% | 18% |  | 19% | 19% |  | 16% | 20% |
| 35-44 | 21% | 24% |  | 21% | 23% |  | 24% | 21% |
| 45-54 | 19% | 17% |  | 16% | 20% |  | 16% | 19% |
| 55-64 | 25% | 24% |  | 30% | 22% |  | 31% | 23% |
| 65 and over | 6% | 6% |  | 5% | 6% |  | 6% | 8% |
| **Female** | 49% | 52% |  | 52% | 50% |  | 54% | 51% |

**Table A10. Madrid**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | National | |  | European | |
|  | C | T |  | C | T |
| **Number of obs. in the experiment** | 426 | 397 |  | 404 | 401 |
| **Interest in this election** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 4% | 5% |  | 17% | 14% |
| 1 | 2% | 3% |  | 5% | 5% |
| 2 | 5% | 3% |  | 5% | 6% |
| 3 | 5% | 5% |  | 5% | 7% |
| 4 | 3% | 3% |  | 4% | 6% |
| 5 | 9% | 11% |  | 15% | 14% |
| 6 | 10% | 9% |  | 11% | 11% |
| 7 | 15% | 12% |  | 12% | 14% |
| 8 | 18% | 12% |  | 9% | 11% |
| 9 | 10% | 12% |  | 4% | 6% |
| 10 | 20% | 25% |  | 12% | 7% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 0% | 0% |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Voting is duty or a choice** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duty | 65% | 72% |  | 42% | 44% |
| Choice | 32% | 27% |  | 54% | 54% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 3% | 1% |  | 4% | 2% |
| **Educational attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2% | 4% |  | 12% | 4% |
| 2 | 12% | 7% |  | 4% | 4% |
| 3 | 43% | 51% |  | 20% | 20% |
| 4 | 25% | 23% |  | 25% | 27% |
| 5 | 10% | 10% |  | 28% | 31% |
| 6 | 8% | 5% |  | 11% | 13% |
| **Age category** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 13% | 11% |  | **4%** | **8%** |
| 25-34 | 24% | 24% |  | **19%** | **22%** |
| 35-44 | 19% | 16% |  | **29%** | **19%** |
| 45-54 | 14% | 12% |  | **15%** | **17%** |
| 55-64 | 23% | 32% |  | **22%** | **28%** |
| 65 and over | 7% | 4% |  | **10%** | **6%** |
| **Female** | 48% | 52% |  | 53% | 51% |

**Table A11. Switzerland**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Lucerne | | | | |  | Zurich | | | | |
|  | Regional | |  | National | |  | Regional | |  | National | |
|  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |
| **Number of obs. in the experiment** | 469 | 435 |  | 417 | 427 |  | 431 | 412 |  | 397 | 443 |
| **Interest in this election** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 6% | 4% |  | 5% | 3% |  | 3% | 5% |  | 2% | 3% |
| 1 | 2% | 5% |  | 2% | 2% |  | 1% | 1% |  | 3% | 1% |
| 2 | 4% | 5% |  | 4% | 4% |  | 3% | 4% |  | 3% | 3% |
| 3 | 6% | 6% |  | 7% | 7% |  | 6% | 6% |  | 4% | 3% |
| 4 | 5% | 5% |  | 7% | 5% |  | 5% | 6% |  | 6% | 4% |
| 5 | 12% | 11% |  | 10% | 11% |  | 11% | 11% |  | 9% | 8% |
| 6 | 11% | 10% |  | 8% | 13% |  | 11% | 8% |  | 9% | 8% |
| 7 | 11% | 15% |  | 15% | 11% |  | 13% | 15% |  | 13% | 14% |
| 8 | 16% | 14% |  | 17% | 18% |  | 17% | 14% |  | 20% | 23% |
| 9 | 13% | 9% |  | 11% | 12% |  | 12% | 11% |  | 13% | 15% |
| 10 | 13% | 14% |  | 14% | 15% |  | 19% | 19% |  | 19% | 18% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 0% | 1% |  | 0% | 0% |  | 1% | 0% |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Voting is duty or a choice** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duty | **35%** | **27%** |  | 38% | 36% |  | 33% | 31% |  | 37% | 42% |
| Choice | **62%** | **67%** |  | 59% | 62% |  | 63% | 66% |  | 60% | 56% |
| Don't know/Refuse | **3%** | **6%** |  | 4% | 2% |  | 4% | 3% |  | 3% | 2% |
| **Educational attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0% | 0% |  | 0% | 1% |  | 0% | 0% |  | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | 7% | 11% |  | 9% | 9% |  | 10% | 9% |  | 6% | 6% |
| 3 | 1% | 1% |  | 2% | 1% |  | 1% | 2% |  | 2% | 0% |
| 4 | 51% | 51% |  | 51% | 52% |  | 48% | 48% |  | 45% | 48% |
| 5 | 7% | 6% |  | 6% | 7% |  | 8% | 7% |  | 8% | 9% |
| 6 | 4% | 4% |  | 3% | 2% |  | 4% | 2% |  | 2% | 3% |
| 7 | 14% | 12% |  | 10% | 11% |  | 11% | 11% |  | 15% | 11% |
| 8 | 5% | 4% |  | 3% | 3% |  | 4% | 4% |  | 5% | 4% |
| 9 | 9% | 9% |  | 11% | 11% |  | 14% | 14% |  | 14% | 15% |
| 10 | 3% | 4% |  | 5% | 3% |  | 1% | 2% |  | 2% | 4% |
| **Age category** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 16% | 12% |  | 11% | 13% |  | 9% | 9% |  | **11%** | **8%** |
| 25-34 | 16% | 16% |  | 17% | 20% |  | 17% | 21% |  | **20%** | **16%** |
| 35-44 | 19% | 18% |  | 17% | 20% |  | 15% | 14% |  | **13%** | **21%** |
| 45-54 | 21% | 23% |  | 25% | 19% |  | 26% | 24% |  | **25%** | **22%** |
| 55-64 | 18% | 21% |  | 19% | 18% |  | 18% | 19% |  | **16%** | **21%** |
| 65 and over | 11% | 11% |  | 12% | 10% |  | 15% | 12% |  | **16%** | **13%** |
| **Female** | **48%** | **55%** |  | 54% | 51% |  | 51% | 51% |  | 50% | 50% |

**Table A12. Germany and Canada**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Germany | | | | |  | Canada | | | | |
|  | Lower Saxony | | | | |  | Quebec | |  | Ontario | |
|  | Regional | |  | European | |  | Regional | |  | Regional | |
|  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |  | C | T |
| **Number of obs. in the experiment** | 416 | 402 |  | 370 | 421 |  | 369 | 355 |  | 441 | 443 |
| **Interest in this election** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 3% | 4% |  | 6% | 4% |  | 5% | 7% |  | 2% | 4% |
| 1 | 2% | 0% |  | 6% | 6% |  | 3% | 3% |  | 2% | 1% |
| 2 | 2% | 2% |  | 5% | 2% |  | 3% | 3% |  | 3% | 2% |
| 3 | 6% | 6% |  | 3% | 6% |  | 1% | 3% |  | 4% | 3% |
| 4 | 3% | 4% |  | 5% | 5% |  | 3% | 4% |  | 5% | 5% |
| 5 | 10% | 8% |  | 12% | 15% |  | 9% | 8% |  | 8% | 9% |
| 6 | 12% | 9% |  | 14% | 14% |  | 7% | 7% |  | 11% | 10% |
| 7 | 14% | 12% |  | 13% | 12% |  | 15% | 9% |  | 13% | 13% |
| 8 | 11% | 18% |  | 14% | 16% |  | 21% | 16% |  | 16% | 18% |
| 9 | 15% | 16% |  | 9% | 10% |  | 11% | 13% |  | 14% | 13% |
| 10 | 21% | 20% |  | 14% | 10% |  | 21% | 26% |  | 21% | 22% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 0% | 1% |  | 0% | 0% |  | 1% | 1% |  |  |  |
| **Voting is duty or a choice** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duty | 34% | 29% |  | 24% | 32% |  | 76% | 73% |  | 71% | 71% |
| Choice | 64% | 66% |  | 70% | 61% |  | 19% | 24% |  | 28% | 29% |
| Don't know/Refuse | 2% | 5% |  | 6% | 7% |  | 5% | 3% |  | 1% | 1% |
| **Educational attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1% | 2% |  | 3% | 0% |  | 13% | 10% |  | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | 4% | 3% |  | 4% | 4% |  | 27% | 35% |  | 1% | 1% |
| 3 | 10% | 9% |  | 10% | 10% |  | 9% | 10% |  | 7% | 12% |
| 4 | 22% | 25% |  | 24% | 27% |  | 25% | 23% |  | 31% | 37% |
| 5 | 42% | 34% |  | 35% | 33% |  | 7% | 6% |  | 8% | 8% |
| 6 | 3% | 5% |  | 5% | 3% |  | 12% | 11% |  | 24% | 18% |
| 7 | 18% | 21% |  | 19% | 23% |  | 7% | 5% |  | 6% | 4% |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1% | 1% |  | 13% | 12% |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6% | 5% |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3% | 4% |
| **Age category** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 8% | 10% |  | 7% | 11% |  | 5% | 6% |  | **6%** | **3%** |
| 25-34 | 14% | 15% |  | 13% | 14% |  | 20% | 24% |  | **26%** | **18%** |
| 35-44 | 16% | 18% |  | 24% | 18% |  | 13% | 15% |  | **11%** | **14%** |
| 45-54 | 21% | 19% |  | 19% | 13% |  | 31% | 22% |  | **26%** | **32%** |
| 55-64 | 29% | 25% |  | 30% | 32% |  | 25% | 24% |  | **18%** | **18%** |
| 65 and over | 12% | 15% |  | 7% | 11% |  | 6% | 11% |  | **12%** | **15%** |
| **Female** | 52% | 50% |  | 53% | 47% |  | 51% | 55% |  | 52% | 51% |

**Subgroup Analysis: Likelihood of Voting (pre-election survey)**



As mentioned in our paper, we consider that lower reported turnouts are desirable outcomes. In doing so, we assume that the treatment effect is due to non-voters accurately reporting having abstained at the election when asked the face-saving question and misreporting having voted when asked the standard yes/no question. However, this treatment effect might also be due to actual voters getting confused by the face-saving question and inaccurately reporting having abstained. One way to clarify this issue is to breakdown the treatment effect by subgroups of respondents using a strong predictor of turnout: vote intention (as reported in the pre-election surveys). We find that the treatment effect is larger for respondents who were ‘certain not to vote’ or who said that ‘it was very unlikely’ (Figure A1 and Figure A2). This suggests that the treatment did improve the accuracy of reported turnout. These groups of respondents are most likely composed of actual abstainers, so observing that the treatment effect is larger among them is supportive of the positive effect of the face-saving question. That being said, it is reasonable to assume that the vote intention question is itself subject to a social desirability bias. Respondents who lied about their intention in the first place may very well lie again when asked to report voting behaviour. The full breakdown of this subgroup analysis is reported in the online appendix.

**Figure A1. Treatment Effect by Intention to Vote as Reported in the Pre-Election Survey**

****

Note: In pre-election surveys, respondents were asked: “In this election are you personally: Certain to vote; Very likely to vote; Somewhat likely to vote; Somewhat unlikely to vote; Very unlikely to vote; Certain not to vote.” The figure presents margins from a logit model predicting the probability to report having voted or not. Independent variables are a dummy for the treatment condition, dummies for each category of the “intention to vote” variable (ref: “certain not to vote”), as well as interaction terms between the experimental condition and each category of “intention to vote.” A random effect is added at the level of the survey to correct for the multi-level nature of the data. Marginal probabilities are presented, with 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure A2. Breakdown of Effect Size by Intention to Vote**

****

Note: Bar represent effect sizes compute from the model used to draw Figure A1, with caps displaying 95% confidence intervals.

**Exploratory Analysis of Moderating Effect**

**Table A13. Description of Independent Variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Observations | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Actual turnout | 15,185 | 52.28 | 11.03 | 35 | 75 |
| Participation rate | 15,185 | 17.50 | 9.68 | 6 | 36 |
| Attrition rate | 15,185 | 21.15 | 6.83 | 12 | 39 |
| Age | 15,184 | 45.94 | 14.57 | 17 | 110 |
| Female | 15,185 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Tertiary | 15,177 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Interest in the election | 15,139 | 6.51 | 2.84 | 0 | 10 |
| Mobilization | 14,856 | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0 | 1 |

Note: Question wording for *Interest in the election*: “On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means no interest at all and 10 means a great deal of interest, how much interest do you have… 0 Not interest at all, to 10 A great deal of interest.” This question was asked in pre-election surveys. Question wording for *Mobilization*: “During the campaign, did any of the following individuals encourage you to vote for a particular party or candidate?” Respondents who report having been encouraged by a friend and/or and acquaintance are coded 1, others are coded 0. This question was asked in the post-election surveys. *Tertiary* is a dummy variable coded 1 for respondents who reported having completed a post-secondary degree. See Table A6 for values of *Actual turnout*, *Participation rate*, and *Attrition rate*.

**Table A14. Frequency Table for Level of Government**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Frequency | Percentage |
| National Election | 4,792 | 31.56 |
| Regional Election | 4,973 | 32.75 |
| European Election | 4,047 | 26.65 |
| Municipal Election | 1,373 | 9.04 |
| Total | 15,185 | 100.00 |

**Table A15. Frequency Table for Duty to Vote**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Frequency | Percentage |
| Voting as a duty: Very strongly | 5,119 | 35.34 |
| Voting as a duty: Somewhat strongly | 2,197 | 15.17 |
| Voting as a duty: Not very strongly | 337 | 2.33 |
| Voting is a Choice | 6,834 | 47.17 |
| Total | 14,487 | 100.00 |

Note: In the pre-election surveys, respondents were asked: “Different people feel differently about voting. For some, voting is a DUTY. They feel that they should vote in every election however they feel about the candidates and parties. For others, voting is a CHOICE. They feel free to vote or not to vote in an election depending on how they feel about the candidates and parties. [The order of these two sentences was randomized.] For you personally, is voting first and foremost a duty or a choice?” Respondents were then asked to report they views about that, i.e. whether voting can be considered as a duty or as a choice. Respondents who said that voting is a duty were asked a follow-up question: “How strongly do you personally feel that voting is a duty: Very strongly, somewhat strongly, or not very strongly?”

**Table A16. Frequency Table for Timing of the Decision to Vote or to Abstain**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Frequency | Percentage |
| Months before | 7,226 | 54.82 |
| Weeks before | 2,557 | 19.40 |
| Days before | 1,877 | 14.24 |
| On Election Day | 1,522 | 11.55 |
| Total | 13,182 | 100.00 |

Note: In the post-election surveys, respondents were asked: “When did you decide that you would [not] vote? Months before Election Day; A few weeks before Election Day; A few days before Election Day; On Election Day.” This question was not asked in Lucerne national and Zurich national post-election surveys.

**Table A17. Frequency Table of Closeness to a Party**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Frequency | Percentage |
| Not close | 8,339 | 58.56 |
| Not very close | 452 | 3.17 |
| Somewhat close | 4,037 | 28.35 |
| Very close | 1,411 | 9.91 |
| Total | 14,239 | 100.00 |

Note: In the pre-election survey, respondents were asked “Do you usually think of yourself as close to any particular political party?” Respondents who said yes were then asked to name the party and to assess how close they feel to it. The data for this question is available for all surveys except for Paris municipal and Marseille municipal pre-election surveys.