

Online Appendix of “Let Me Be the Judge: Ideology,  
Identity and Judicial Selection’

# Appendices

<b>A</b>	<b>The process of becoming a lay judge in Sweden</b>	<b>1</b>
A.1	The 2016 - 2019 Communications Campaign . . . . .	4
<b>B</b>	<b>Additional Information on the Experimental Design</b>	<b>7</b>
B.1	Experimental Design . . . . .	8
B.2	Names Used . . . . .	9
B.3	The E-Mails . . . . .	10
B.4	The Pre-Registered Hypotheses . . . . .	14
B.5	Fieldwork . . . . .	14
B.6	Coding of Outcome Variables . . . . .	17
<b>C</b>	<b>Ethics Statement</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Additional Analyses and Extensions</b>	<b>25</b>
D.1	Main Results With No or Limited Sets of Controls . . . . .	25
D.2	Treatment Effects Including Responses Only . . . . .	27
D.3	Is Bias Cumulative? . . . . .	28
D.4	Treatment Effects on Questions about Party Membership and Ideology . . . . .	29
D.5	Treatment Effect of Gender and Ethnicity Interacted with the Other Treatments . . . . .	31
D.6	Treatment Effects by Party Ideology . . . . .	32
D.7	Excluding Potentially Low-Quality Responses . . . . .	35
D.8	Do Response Rates and Treatment Effects Vary Across Different Types of Municipalities? . . . . .	36

## A The process of becoming a lay judge in Sweden

The jury system is based on the basic idea that the lay judges should be the people's representatives in the courts. Therefore, the body of lay judges needs to reflect, as far as possible, the composition in society in terms of age, gender and ethnic background (<http://www.blinamndeman.se>). Accordingly, when electing a corps of lay judges, the aim shall be for the body to have a versatile composition with regard to age, gender, ethnic background and profession. Since the assignment is apolitical, it is also important that people without a party political connection are actually given the opportunity to become a lay judge (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

In Sweden neither the courts nor the Swedish National Courts Administration are involved in the nomination or election process. Rather, it is the political parties that have the formal responsibility to nominate lay judges for election by the Municipal and Regional Councils. The number of nominations a party can make is conditional on the party's relative size in the respective council. The nominations made at the municipal-level corresponds to the district courts and the regional-level to the courts of appeals. Since the assignment is apolitical one can become a lay judge without being engaged in party politics, or member of a political party. Although, one still needs to be nominated by a political party. Therefore, if one wishes to become a lay judge, one must initiate contact with a local political party, which is represented in the Municipal or Regional Council in the municipality, or region, where one resides (<http://www.blinamndeman.se>).

The formal requirements to become a lay judge is that one must be competent and

suitable for the assignment. More precisely, one must be of legal age, a Swedish citizen, not be placed under a trusteeship, nor be declared bankrupt. As a lay judge in a district court, one must have a registered residence in the municipality, or part of the municipality, that belongs to the district court. To be a lay judge in the Court of Administrative Law and the Courts of Appeal, one must have a registered residence in the region, or part of the region, that belongs to the respective court. Moreover, in order to be appointed by the Municipal or Regional Council, one must also meet certain suitability requirements. This means that one must be suitable for the assignment with regard to judgment, independence, and obedience to the law. Also, as the assignment, among other things, entails deciding whether the accused is guilty of a crime, it is important that one also is a good role model in terms of general compliance with the law. Therefore, prior to appointing lay judges, the courts always check the suitability of elected judges by requesting extracts from the national criminal record (<http://www.blinamndeman.se>).

Furthermore, certain professional groups are exempt from becoming elected as lay judges because they risk ending up in a conflict of interest. For example, if one is a legally qualified judge, employed by a court, or work as a prosecutor, police officer, lawyer, or have the profession to bring other people's case before a court, one may not become a lay judge. Also, one may not become a lay judge in the Court of Administrative Law, or the corresponding appellate court, if one is employed by the Swedish Tax Agency, a County Administrative Board, the Swedish Social Insurance Agency, the Swedish Migration Agency or the Swedish Transport Agency (<http://www.blinamndeman.se>).

As mentioned in the paper, recent evaluations show that in 2015 almost all (95%) Swedish lay judges were party members, as well as disproportionately old and native-born compared to the general population (Fritz, 2016). This raises questions as to why there is a discrepancy between the composition in society in terms of age, gender and ethnic background, and the composition of the body of lay judges. One possible explanation could be that the nomination process rests on the function of political parties as gate keepers. In this respect it is worth noting that, while no formal requirement for membership in any specific political party is necessary to become a lay judge, and the parties are supposed to recruit broadly from outside of their membership (Nilsson, Ahlstrand and Lyckman, 2007), there are still no formal regulations prohibiting parties from demanding party membership from those who want to become a lay judge. For someone who wishes to remain apolitical, if membership is required when contacting a political party to put oneself forward as a candidate in the nomination process, such a requirement may be understood as a conflicting request given that the assignment is supposedly apolitical. Also, in most parties already existing members are usually interested in the assignment, which likely reduces the prospects for political outsiders to obtain a nomination (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

Another possible explanation for the under-representation of certain groups could be that they are unaware of the formal requirements for becoming a lay judge and therefore simply do not put themselves forward as candidates for nomination. This possibility of a uninformed public is of great concern for the the Swedish National Courts Administration, which is responsible for informing the public of the possibility of becoming a lay judge. To

ensure that the public receives adequate information, the Swedish National Courts Administration, has in connection with the elections of lay judges in 2007, 2011, and 2015, carried out special communication initiatives both against the nominating and electing bodies and vis-à-vis the public. The purpose of these initiatives has been to bring about a rejuvenation and a broader recruitment of lay judges outside the party political circles. However, seeing how those efforts were not as successful as desired, in 2016, the Swedish National Courts Administration was commissioned by the government to carry out a unprecedented communications effort. Compared to previously, the communications campaign was to be more extensive, well coordinated and long-term. More precisely, the campaign was to run over a period of four years, 2016 - 2019, ahead of the next election in 2019 (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

## **A.1 The 2016 - 2019 Communications Campaign**

The 2016 - 2019 Communications Campaign was to take place prior to the election of new lay judges in autumn of 2019 for the mandate period 2020-2024. The main purpose of this initiative was to contribute to more people outside the party political circle, as well as younger individuals, being given the opportunity to become elected. The communications would be carried out continuously and in dialogue with the nominating and electing bodies. A specific communications effort aimed at prospective members of the public would also be carried out. For the purpose of the campaign, all communications informed about a central website: [blinämndeman.se](http://blinämndeman.se) ([becomealayjudge.se](http://becomealayjudge.se)), which explained the entire process

of nomination and election, the formal requirements for election and what being a lay judge entails (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

In order to improve the conditions for the public to put themselves forward as candidates in the nominating process, a time frame was developed for the campaign. One key communication strategy was to try to get a timely coordination in 2019 between the actors involved in the process of appointing judges - courts, as well as nominating and electing bodies - municipal and regional councils. Therefore, the communication to those who nominate and vote had to start in advance of the elections in the autumn of 2019 (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

Well ahead of the elections, in 2018 and 2019, the Swedish National Courts Administration sent out digital newsletters, aimed at those who nominate and elect board members. The purpose was twofold. First, the idea was to present the message of rejuvenation and broadening of the corps of lay judges. Second, the aim was to increase knowledge of what the assignment entails, so that the target groups themselves could inform those interested. In order to maximize the reach of the newsletter, for each issue that was sent out, information was also disseminated via the Riksdag parties' central organizations and via Sweden's Municipalities and Regions (SKR). Moreover, registrars in all municipalities and regions were asked to distribute the letter both to the nominating parties and to the officials who prepared the election. In addition to the digital communication, in June 2018, a hard copy of information was sent by regular postal service to all registrars. The hard copy was intended for dissemination to nominees and voters and held information about the desire for

the time coordination in 2019, about the newsletters, and about the importance of achieving a rejuvenation and broadening of the corps of lay judges. Moreover, at the campaign central website, checklists and power-point presentations for information meetings with prospective lay judges were available to those who nominate and elect lay judges, as well as e-training material in support for the parties' own nomination work. The Swedish National Courts Administration also produced support material for courts to use in their contacts with municipalities and regions, with messages related to rejuvenation and broadening (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

Communication efforts aimed at prospective lay judges among the public consisted of several parts. To reach an interested public between the ages of 18 and 45 years, short films with judges and moving advertisements were produced. The films and ads were disseminated via social media channels during March to May 2019. To reach prospective judges of all ages, digital spot ads were used in the local and national press for a couple of weeks in the spring of 2019. Another strategy was to direct "clicks" from digital ads to the campaign central website. The campaign was also discussed in media and was visible on posters both on the inside and outside of public transport, as well as on billboards adjacent to public transport stops (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

Nonetheless, the result of the 2016 communications campaign was a body of lay judges with fewer younger and more older members. The average age of the body of lay judges is at present 59.2 years. This means that it has become 2 years older since the last election in 2015. The proportion of members in the age categories 18 - 44 years has decreased from



23 to 18 percent and the proportion of members over the age of 65 has increased from 43 to 47 percent. The current body of lay judges does not reflect Sweden’s adult population, which now has an even greater opposite age distribution; 44 percent of the population is 18-44 years old and 25 percent are 65 years and older. Moreover, following each election, at the beginning of each new mandate period, the Swedish National Courts Administration conducts a survey targeting the body of lay judges. This time, the 2019 election survey was answered by a total of 5,499 out of 8,007 members (approximately 69 percent of the body). The survey showed that only 5 percent of the members were elected without belonging to a political party, which compared to the survey that was undertaken after the previous election in 2015 is unchanged. However, 7 percent of the members reported having been members of a party for less than a year, which compared to the previous survey (4 percent) possibly could indicate that the parties have nominated slightly more new people from outside the party. In sum, despite continuous communication efforts carried out in good time before the election, aimed at both those who nominate and elect committee members and the general public, the corps of lay judges has neither been rejuvenated nor broadened (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020).

## **B Additional Information on the Experimental Design**

In this section, we provide details on how we used the factorial design to vary the appeal of ‘party sympathy’ in our letters. We describe how the names used as aliases were selected and combined. We also outline the content of our letters used in the experiment, and describe

how we varied our treatments. In addition, we also explain how we performed the coding of outcome variables and summarize the pre-registered hypotheses.

## **B.1 Experimental Design**

The experiment employs a factorial design, a design which allows us to study the main effects of several factors using the same sample size that would be required for the study of one independent variable without loss of statistical power (Collins, Dziak and Li, 2009).

This type of design also allows for interactions between treatments, albeit statistical power will be lower when studying such interactions.

The experiment focuses on testing the effect of Arabic-sounding female and male aliases of different ages versus Nordic-sounding female and male names of different ages on a) the number of party replies, and b) the tone, and c) the information content of the replies to our emails. Using a factorial design, we also examine the potential variations in outcomes by varying appeals of party sympathy. Thus we randomly vary signals of supposed gender (Male/Female) and ethnicity (Arabic-sounding name/Nordic-sounding name), as well as the age (25/35/45/55/65) and the appeal of ‘party sympathy’ (Yes/No) made in the e-mails. On the one hand, the latter manipulation allow us to test the extent to which party-political allegiances play a role in the recruitment to these supposedly apolitical positions. By means of the demographic manipulations, on the other hand, we are able to evaluate whether the goal of recruiting a descriptively representative body of lay judges can be achieved in this type of system. Taking all variables into account, then, our study relies on a  $2 \times 2 \times 5 \times 2$

Table B.1: Factorial Design for Demographic and Political Signals

Treatments	Levels				
Gender	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
Arabic-sounding name	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Age	25	35	45	55	65
Party Sympathy	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No

factorial design. Table B.1 summarizes our design.

## B.2 Names Used

To create Arabic-sounding and Nordic-sounding aliases for our letters, we contacted Statistics Sweden (SCB). On March 21, 2018 they provided a list of the three most common first and last names in Swedish and Arabic from the Swedish population registry. By combining first and last name in pairs we created 9 unique name-combinations for each supposed ethnicity and gender, yielding a total of 36 aliases. The names are provided below.

Table B.2: Arabic female and male first names

Language	Gender	First name
Arabic	female	Sara
Arabic	female	Zainab
Arabic	female	Noor
Arabic	male	Ali
Arabic	male	Mohammed
Arabic	male	Ahmed

Table B.3: Arabic last names

Hussein	Ibrahim	Hassan
---------	---------	--------

Table B.4: Swedish female and male first names

Language	Gender	First name
Swedish	female	Anna
Swedish	female	Eva
Swedish	female	Maria
Swedish	male	Lars
Swedish	male	Mikael
Swedish	male	Anders

Table B.5: Swedish last names

Andersson	Johansson	Karlsson
-----------	-----------	----------

### B.3 The E-Mails

We first drafted a standard e-mail (see Figures B.1 for Swedish and B.2 for the translated English version), to be sent out to party officials. However, using a factorial design (see Table B.1) we also examine the effect of the appeal of ‘party sympathy’ (Yes/No)(see Figures B.3 for Swedish and B.4 for the translated English version). Thus, in Figures B.1 to B.4, we give examples of our letters.

Our design gives us one variable that varies (party sympathy Yes/No). Each one of the 2 types of letters makes up 1/2 of the universe of letters. Apart from the appeal, the only experimental variation is in *the name and age* of the sender. To lessen the risk of detection by the political parties, therefore, two of the sentences have been varied in their wording, though the content remains the same. More precisely, the letter has five sentences with actual content. Two variants of sentence three and sentence five were created (for example

of these variants of wording see Figures B.5 for Swedish and B.6 for the translated English version below), which means that we in total get three variants of sentence two to five, i.e.  $3^4 = 81$  different letters with roughly the same meaning.

In addition, we also varied the alias name ([first name] [last name]), which gives further combinations. To maximize statistical power we focus only on Arabic-sounding female and male aliases versus Nordic-sounding female and male names. Since each alias should be found about as equally many times on each letter version, one has to multiply 81 by the number of aliases to get an approximate number of letter types. Since we signed the letters with names that signal two different ethnic backgrounds and also vary the supposed gender (male / female) of the sender, we arrive at  $4 * 81 = 324$  different letter combinations.

Moreover, as mentioned previously, in half of the letters we also added the appeal of ‘party sympathy’, signaling that the fictitious letter writer sympathizes with the party. In these letters, the second sentence begins with "I have for a long time sympathized with [party name]". In total, this yields 648 letter combinations, which intends to ensure that the study could be carried out without detection while at the same time fulfilling the purpose of the study. Finally, an age between 25 and 65 was also drawn randomly and assigned to the letter, further increasing the number of variations of the letter.

Hej!

Jag heter [förnamn] och är [ålder] år gammal. Jag skriver för att jag är intresserad av att bli nämndeman. Är det er jag ska vända mig till? Kan jag bli nominerad av [partinamn]? Vad krävs för att bli nämndeman?

Med vänlig hälsning,  
[förnamn] [efternamn]

Figure B.1: Example of neutral email sent to the political parties (Swedish)

Hello!

My name is [first name] and I am [age] years old. I write because I am interested in being a lay judge. Is this where I should turn to? Can I be nominated by [party name]? What is required to become a lay judge?

With kind regards,  
[first name] [last name]

Figure B.2: Example of neutral email sent to the political parties (English)

Hej!

Jag heter [förnamn] och är [ålder] år gammal. Jag **har länge sympatiserat med [partinamn] och** skriver för att jag är intresserad av att bli nämndeman. Är det er jag ska vända mig till? Kan jag bli nominerad av [partinamn]? Vad krävs för att bli nämndeman?

Med vänlig hälsning,  
[förnamn] [efternamn]

Figure B.3: Example of neutral + **party sympathy** email sent to the political parties (Swedish). The letter conveys an inclination toward the party

Hello!

My name is [first name] and I am [age] years old. **I have for a long time sympathized with [party name] and** I write because I am interested in being a lay judge. Is this where I should turn to? Can I be nominated by [party name]? What is required to become a lay judge?

With kind regards,  
[first name] [last name]

Figure B.4: Example of neutral + **party sympathy** email sent to the political parties (English). The letter conveys an inclination toward the party

Hej!

Jag heter [förnamn] och är [ålder] år gammal. Jag [har länge sympatiserat med [partinamn] och] skriver för att jag är intresserad av att bli nämndeman. Är det er jag ska vända mig till?/**Är det er jag pratar med om det?** Kan jag bli nominerad av [partinamn]? Vad krävs för att bli nämndeman?/**Vilka krav finns det för att bli nämndeman?**

Med vänlig hälsning,  
[förnamn] [efternamn]

Figure B.5: Example of neutral + [party sympathy] + **variations in wording** of the emails sent to the political parties (Swedish).

Hello!

My name is [first name] and I am [age] years old. [I have for a long time sympathized with [party name] and] I write because I am interested in being a lay judge. Is this where I should turn to?/**Is it you that I should talk to?** Can I be nominated by [party name]? What is required to become a lay judge?/**What are the requirements for becoming a lay judge?**

With kind regards,  
[first name] [last name]

Figure B.6: Example of neutral + [party sympathy] + **variations in wording** of the emails sent to the political parties (English).

## B.4 The Pre-Registered Hypotheses

Our study has been registered prior to realization of outcomes in the Evidence in Governance and Politics (EGAP) registry [**details will be added in the event of publication**]. Unless otherwise noted, all analyses are pre-registered.

## B.5 Fieldwork

We sent one e-mail to each local branch of the eight political parties represented in the Swedish parliament, which are the Social Democrats (S), the Conservatives (M), the Sweden Democrats (SD), the Greens (MP), the Center Party (C), the Left Party (V), the Liberals (L) and the Christian Democrats (KD). These local branches are located in one of the 290 municipalities of Sweden. In total, we collected 2,104 e-mail addresses to party officials in local branches using the parties' web-pages. To send out the emails we created 36 gmail-accounts holding the first and last name of our respective aliases followed by a combination of the numbers 123 and @gmail.com.<sup>1</sup> We sent only one (randomly selected) e-mail to each local party branch official because, first, we wanted to minimize the risk of detection and, second, we worried about ethical implications. In particular, we did not want the party officials to spend more time than necessary answering fictitious e-mails and we did not want them to overestimate neither the local support of their party, nor the general interest in becoming a lay judge.

On April 17, 2019 we distributed 1,962 emails directly via our gmail-accounts and an

---

<sup>1</sup>Example of email adress: sara.ibrahim213213@gmail.com.



additional 142 emails via contact forms on local party web-pages. Out of the 2,104 emails we sent out 123 bounced (coded as missing), which left us with 1,981 emails to expect possible responses from. We received 848 replies, which gives a response rate of 40% for the 2,104 emails that we originally distributed and 43% for the 1,981 emails that did not bounce.

On May 07, 2019, we collected and registered the responses to our emails. At this point we also responded to them with a short reply. In the reply we explained that our alias had realized that she/he would not have time to get engaged at the present moment because of responsibilities at home and at work. Again, in order to lessen the risk of detection by the political parties, we varied the sentences of the reply-letters in their wording, though the content remained the same. More precisely, the reply-letter has three sentences with actual content. In total, three versions of sentence one were created, whereas four versions were created for sentence two and three respectively. All in all this generated 48 different types of response letters (for an example of a response letter see Figures B.7 and B.8).

Hej!

Tack så mycket för ditt svar. Emellertid så har jag funderat lite, och inser nu att jag inte hinner med ett uppdrag som nämndeman, eftersom jag har små barn och dessutom fått nytt jobb. Jag hör gärna av mig igen framöver om det finns mer tid.

Med vänlig hälsning,  
[förnamn] [efternamn]

Figure B.7: Example of reply e-mail sent to the political parties' response e-mails (Swedish). The letter is intended to minimize potential negative effects on party officials of not receiving any response to their replies

Hello!

Thank you very much for your answer. However, I have thought a bit, and I now realize that I do not have time for an assignment as a lay judge, because I have small children and I also got a new job. I would be happy to get in touch in the future if there is more time.

With kind regards,  
[first name] [last name]

Figure B.8: Example of reply e-mail sent to the political parties' response e-mails (English). The letter is intended to minimize potential negative effects on party officials of not receiving any response to their replies

After May 07, 2019 we did not collect any further emails and thus closed the experiment. Considering that our experiment took cover of a public campaign carried out by the Swedish National Courts Administration, we thought it important from an ethical point of view to time our experiment with the campaign and to keep it short in duration. In particular, we did not want to risk interfering with the ongoing recruitment process. We therefore decided to limit our experiment to the midst of the campaign and to only three weeks. In this way we left time for the political parties to work on their selections both before and after our communications. To recap, the campaign by the Swedish National Courts Administration was carried out between March and June of 2019 and we launched our experiment on April 17, 2019 and closed it on May 07, 2019. After June, and throughout the fall of 2019, the local branches of the political parties began to formalize their nominations by finalizing and forwarding their lists of nominees to the electing bodies (Ridal Ceder and Yngve, 2020)

## B.6 Coding of Outcome Variables

To be able to categorize the response emails, we developed a coding scheme. The first version of this scheme was tested by coding 100 randomly selected emails in a double-blind parallel process. This was done by the one of the authors and the research assistant. After the coding was completed, the results were compared. Initially the average inter-coder reliability rate was 91,5%, where the lowest rate for a single variable was 49% and the highest was 100%. To improve the clarity of interpretation of the scheme, the discrepancies were discussed and the coding scheme up-dated. Thereafter 100 new emails were randomly drawn and the process repeated. This time, the average inter-coder reliability rate was 95%, with a lowest agreement rate for a single variable of 83% and the highest still at 100%. This was deemed satisfactory, and the resultant coding scheme is shown in Table B.6.

We have coded twelve outcomes in total. First, we have coded whether our alias receives a reply. Second, to measure the *informativeness of the response*, we have counted the number of words for each response, and coded whether it answers any of our alias' questions, or provides additional information. Third, to capture how welcoming the responses were we coded *the tone of the response*, by noting whether it used the name of our alias or welcomed our alias. Fourth, we also coded if the response proposed initiatives *to follow up* with our alias, either by invitation to party activities or by inviting for a personal contact in the future. Finally, we also coded the prevalence of questions regarding *party membership and ideology*. To avoid post-treatment bias (Montgomery, Nyhan and Torres, 2018), we have coded non-responses as zero rather than missing (Coppock, 2019).

Table B.6: Final Coding Scheme

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Interpretation Guide for Coding of Email</b>
<b>1</b> Re- sponse	Yes/No	Any non-bounce back e-mail sent from the party's account.
<b>2</b> # of Words	Number	Word count of the response, excluding information in signature, such as official position or function in the party.
<b>3</b> An- swers Ques- tions	All=3, Two=2, One=1 None=0	Were any of the questions in the email answered? For questions see the letters.
<b>4</b> Ad- ditional Informa- tion	Yes/No	Is more information given than asked for? Coded as Yes if the party representative sends a link to the Swedish National Courts Administration's website, or if the information is NOT topically related to any of our 3 questions. Example: additional contact information such as Facebook, attached party program, information on how to obtain political assignments, what such assignments entail, or where the party facilities are located etc.
<b>5</b> Uses Name	Yes/No	Is the communication personalized by the use of the alias' first name?
<b>6</b> Wel- comes E-mail	Yes/No	Is our alias welcomed? The word welcome is specifically used, or praise/positive confirmation is extended. Example: "Thank you for your email", or "How nice of you to contact us", etc.
<b>7</b> Future Party Contact	Yes/No	Is our alias invited for further contact with the party? Example: indicates dates and times for meetings and activities. Coded as Yes only if it is clear that our alias is welcome to these meetings, and/or if the meetings are open to everyone, if it is possible to identify when and where they take place, or if our alias is invited to visit the local party office. Otherwise No.
<b>8</b> Future Personal Contact	Yes/No	Is our alias offered help? Coded as willing to meet in person, to talk on the phone, email further, or a general offer to follow-up. Only coded as Yes if it concerns future contact with the representative in question, otherwise see Party Contact (7). However, variables 7 and 8 are not mutually exclusive. Example: If the representative writes "on Thursday we have a meeting at .... please drop by to meet with us. I will be there. ", then both 7 and 8 are coded as Yes. Questions such as "which court are you most interested in?", or "have you ever been politically active before?", or "can you give me some references that I may call", or "can you please send me a short presentation, or motivation, and/or your CV", are coded as Yes. However, questions that only state "where do you live", or if contact is offered only after payment of the party membership fee, are coded as No. Also questions like "are you a member" is coded as No.

<b>9</b> Party Membership Check	Yes/No	Does the response letter ask our alias if she/he is a party member? Or does the party representative notify our alias that she/he has not been found in the party's membership registry upon search? Also coded as Yes if our alias is encouraged to become a party member.
<b>10</b> Party Membership Required	Yes/No	Does the party representative inform our alias that only party members will be considered as nominees to become lay judges? Also coded as Yes if the reply expresses that it is "preferable" that one is a party member.
<b>11</b> Party Ideology Check	Yes/No	Does the party representative state/ask our alias if she/he shares the party's values and ideology in any regard?
<b>12</b> Party Ideology Required	Yes/No	Does the party representative state/ask our alias if she/he is known by any of the party's members to share their values and ideology? Example: coded as Yes if any of the following is expressed: "the nominee has to have the trust of the party members" ... "we have to know you personally"... "you have to have been politically active in the party for some time, not necessarily as a politician, but partaking in meetings and campaigns" etc.

The descriptive statistics for the outcome variables are presented in Table B.7.

Table B.7: Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Variables

Outcome:	Mean	Std Dev.
Response	0.420	0.494
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>		
# of Words	31.118	53.139
Answers Questions	0.857	1.164
Additional Information	0.134	0.340
<i>Tone of Response:</i>		
Uses Name	0.265	0.441
Welcomes E-mail	0.188	0.391
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>		
Future Party Contact	0.023	0.151
Future Personal Contact	0.136	0.343
<i>Party Membership and Ideology:</i>		
Party Membership Check	0.090	0.286
Party Membership Required	0.172	0.377
Party Ideology Check	0.010	0.100
Party Ideology Required	0.090	0.287

*Note:*  $N = 1,981$ . Ranges of all variables are 0 to 1 except for # of Words (0 to 557) and Answers Questions (0 to 3).

Below we present two examples of responses to our letters and how we have coded them. The letters have been selected because they respectively hold the least and the most number of words of all collected responses. As can be seen below, the first response is very short and uninformative. By contrast, the second letter is long and quite informative. We have removed information that could be used to identify the party official.

Hej,  
  
Är du medlem i partiet?  
  
Vänligen, [REDACTED]

Figure B.9: Example of short response e-mail (Swedish). The response is to a neutral email + **party sympathy**, where the original letter conveys an inclination toward the party. The original letter was sent from our Arabic-sounding alias: Ali Hussein, who is 45 years old. In line with our Coding Scheme (Table A.6) we coded the twelve outcome variables in this specific response as follows: 1(Yes), 2(9), 3(No), 4(No), 5(No), 6(No), 7(No), 8(No), 9(Yes), 10(No), 11(No), 12(No).

Hello,  
  
Are you a member of the party?  
  
Cordially, [REDACTED]

Figure B.10: Example of short response e-mail (English). The response is to a neutral email + **party sympathy**, where the original letter conveys an inclination toward the party. The original letter was sent from our Arabic-sounding alias: Ali Hussein, who is 45 years old. In line with our Coding Scheme (Table A.6) we coded the twelve outcome variables in this specific response as follows: 1(Yes), 2(9), 3(No), 4(No), 5(No), 6(No), 7(No), 8(No), 9(Yes), 10(No), 11(No), 12(No).

Hej Lars

Mycket positivt att du är intresserad av att bli nämndeman. Detta är av hävd något som hanteras av de politiska partierna i Sverige. Nämndeman i Tingsrätt hanteras på lokalt plan i kommunerna. Tingsrätterna meddelar respektive kommun i sitt "område" hur många nämndemän de önskar från respektive kommun. Detta fördelas sedan mellan partierna efter hur starka de är i kommunfullmäktige. Om det är flera partier som samarbetar så tillfaller ett antal nämndemansplatser det samarbetet. Vi [REDACTED] i [REDACTED] kommun har till exempel tillsatt en nämndemans plats under de senaste 5 åren.

Platser i Förvaltningsdomstol, Kammarrätt och Hovrätt tillsätts av respektive partis länsorganisation. Inom [REDACTED] i Skåne så är det vår valberedning som föreslår styrelsen, som sedan fastställer. Domstolsverket har sedan länge försökt frikoppla nämndemannasystemet från politiken, vilket jag tycker är bra. Men hittills har man inte kommit fram till något alternativt system för nämndemännens förordnande. Nuvarande system grundas i en tanke att de politiska partierna, genom personkännedom bland sina aktiva medlemmar skall utse personer med god värdegrund och hedervärd vandel. Oftast lyckas det, men tyvärr inte alltid. Domstolsverket önskar också en förnyring, då många av våra nämndemän är pensionärer sedan många år. Ett av skälen för detta är att man måste ha personliga förhållanden som är så att man kan vara ledig från sitt vanliga arbete för att sitta som nämndeman. I bland förekommer det att mål i domstolar sträcker sig över flera dagar och då måste man kunna närvara hela tiden. Det går inte att byta nämndemän mitt under förhandlingen för då måste målet tas om. Därav är det många pensionärer som är nämndemän.

Det är med andra ord en viss startsträcka för att bli nämndeman. Man måste bli medlem i ett parti och sedan vara med på en del möten för att man skall bli en känd person och skapa det förtroende som krävs. Vår nuvarande nämndeman i [REDACTED] i [REDACTED] kommun började på just det sättet. Hon är nu pensionär sedan en del år och jag vet inte hur länge hon kan tänkas vilja fortsätta.

Däremot är det oerhört intressant att vara nämndeman. Det är ett allvarsamt åtagande då man faktiskt dömer andra människor och man har lika stark rösträtt i domstolen som den lagfarna ordförande. Ett uppdrag som verkligen förpliktigar. Så om du vill bli nämndeman så är mitt råd följande: 1, Bli medlem i ett politiskt parti. (gärna i [REDACTED] där du kommer att bli väl omhändertagen)

2, Gå på möten och delta i diskussionerna. Hos oss i [REDACTED] i [REDACTED] kommun får alla medlemmar som kommer på möten vara med och bestämma alltid. Man får med andra ord en möjlighet till påverkan och delaktighet i det som händer i kommunen.

3, Var med i diskussionen när partiet resonerar om vem man skall nominera som kandidat som nämndeman på olika nivåer.

Du är hjärtligt välkommen till oss om du är medborgare i [REDACTED] kommun. Är det av intresse så meddela mig så berättar jag hur du skall bli medlem. Väljer du ett annat parti så är jag ändå glad för att jag kunnat vägleda dig. Vi behöver fler medborgare med samhällsintresse som är intresserade av att vara med och fatta beslut. Många tycker att det räcker med att i efterhand kritisera beslut, vilket naturligtvis är mycket viktigt även det.

Jag svara gärna på fler frågor. Bara att höra av dig.

// [REDACTED], ordförande i [REDACTED]

Figure B.11: Example of long response mail (Swedish). The response is to a neutral email + **party sympathy**, where the original letter conveys an inclination toward the party. The original letter was sent from our Swedish-sounding alias: Lars Johansson, who is 55 years old. In line with our Coding Scheme (Table A.6) we coded the twelve outcome variables in this specific response as follows: 1(Yes), 2(557), 3(3), 4(No), 5(Yes), 6(Yes), 7(No), 8(Yes), 9(Yes), 10(Yes), 11(No), 12(Yes).

Hello Lars

It is very positive that you are interested in becoming a lay judge. This is by tradition something that is handled by the political parties in Sweden. Lay judges in district courts are handled at the local level in the municipalities. The district courts inform each municipality in its "area" how many lay judges that they need from each respective municipality. This total is then distributed between the parties according to how strong they are in the City Council. If there are several parties in alliance, a share of seats will go to that collaboration. We, the ██████ in ██████ municipality, for example, have appointed one lay judge for the past 5 years.

Seats in the Administrative Court, and the two Courts of Appeal are filled by each party's county organization. Within the ██████ in Skåne, it is our nomination committee that proposes the board, which then approves. The Swedish National Courts Administration has long tried to decouple the lay judge system from politics, which I think is good. But so far they have not arrived at an alternative system for the appointment of the judges. The current system is based on the idea that the political parties, through personal knowledge among its active members shall appoint persons with good values and honorable conduct. Usually it succeeds, but unfortunately not always. The Swedish National Courts Administration also wants a rejuvenation, as many of our lay judges are retired since many years. One of the reasons for this is that you must have personal conditions that allow you to be free from your usual work to serve as a lay judge. It occasionally happens that the cases in courts extend over several days and then you have to be able to attend all the time. It is not possible to change lay judges in the middle of the negotiation because then the case must start all over again. As a result, there are many retirees serving as lay judges.

In other words, it is a certain climb that one has to make to become a lay judge. One must become a member of a party and then attend some meetings in order to become a known person and create the trust required. Our current lay judge in ██████ in ██████ municipality started in just this way. She has now been retired for some years and I do not know how long she may want to continue.

In any case, it is extremely interesting to be a lay judge. It is a serious commitment as you actually judge other people and you have as strong a right to vote in the court as the lawful chairman. A mission which really commits. So if you want to become a lay judge, here's my advice: 1, Become a member of a political party. (preferably in the ██████ where you will be well taken care of)

2, Go to meetings and participate in discussions. In our organization, the ██████ in ██████ municipality, all members who come to meetings may participate and are always allowed to partake in the decisions. In other words, you get an opportunity to actively influence what is happening in the municipality.

3, Join the discussion when the party is reasoning about who to nominate as a candidate to become a lay judge at various levels.

You are most welcome to us if you are a citizen of ██████ municipality. If it is of interest, let me know and I will tell you how to become a member. If you choose another party, I'm still glad I was able to guide you. We need more citizens with a public interest that are interested in participating and making decisions. Many people think that it is enough to criticize decisions afterwards, which of course is very important too.

I am happy to answer more questions. Just contact me.

// ██████, chairman for the ██████

Figure B.12: Example of long response e-mail (English). The response is to a neutral email + **party sympathy**, where the original letter conveys an inclination toward the party. The original letter was sent from our Swedish-sounding alias: Lars Johansson, who is 55 years old. In line with our Coding Scheme (Table A.6) we coded the twelve outcome variables in this specific response as follows: 1(Yes), 2(557), 3(3), 4(No), 5(Yes), 6(Yes), 7(No), 8(Yes), 9(Yes), 10(Yes), 11(No), 12(Yes).



## C Ethics Statement

This research has been reviewed by the Regional Ethical Review Board in Stockholm (see approval number 2019-02330) who deemed it exempt as it does not fall under the type of research that requires ethical approval according to Swedish law. In the project we contact the local branches of the eight political parties represented in the Swedish parliament: which are the Social Democrats (S), the Conservatives (M), the Sweden Democrats (SD), the Greens (MP), the Center Party (C), the Left Party (V), the Liberals (L) and the Christian Democrats (KD). The research reported herein thus involves human subjects.

Consent from participants was not obtained as this would undermine the credibility of the study. Specifically, while banned in law, ethnic and gender discrimination occur in subtle and hidden ways. The discriminating agent may not be acting self-consciously, and if they are, social desirability bias may prevent them from reporting accurately about the matter (Zschrnt, 2019). Neither can we be sure that the person discriminated against will notice they are receiving biased treatment. This would rule out standard survey or interview approaches to uncovering discrimination, irrespectively of whether we focus on the discriminating agent or the victim of biased treatment. It is therefore not possible to avoid deception entirely, and have informed consent, if one wishes to use an internally and externally valid method of uncovering discrimination, like the correspondence study reported in our study

According to Swedish law, research that does involve deception and does not procure standard forms of informed consent can still be admissible if there a societal benefits. Dis-

criminatorial behavior threatens the very legitimacy of economic, political and judicial institutions and it is therefore of utmost societal importance to chart its existence. In light of this, our findings should be relevant to both to our study population (i.e. political parties), relevant government actors (i.e. the Swedish National Courts Administration) as well as the general public, including politically marginalized groups in society, such as ethnic minorities (cf. Teele, 2014). We will inform the judicial spokespersons of the parties and the Swedish National Courts Administration about our results (and their potential implications for policy). To reach a politically interested public, we will publish a post on a political science blog detailing the results.

Even if there are obvious societal benefits from this study, and even while answering emails must be considered routine for these local elites, steps were undertaken to minimize possible negative effects on the local party organizations. In particular, we kept the emails short so that officials would not need to spend excessive time on reading them, or on responding to them. Moreover, we only sent one e-mail to each party official, so as to bring down the amount work for them, and so as to not affect their perception of party support and the supply of potential lay judges. Finally, this is the first and only such evaluation of the responsiveness of local parties to citizens who put themselves forward as lay judge candidates.

Moreover, to protect the integrity of the research subjects, the experimental data set has been anonymized by the authors. While no individual names were saved, a data set that contains the names of the included local party branches and their e-mail address is kept by

Table D.8: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable. No Controls for Party and Municipality.

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.03 (.022)	.011 (.022)	.081** (.035)	.042 (.035)	.036 (.035)	.029 (.035)	.015 (.022)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-4.45* (2.39)	1.226 (2.386)	8.273** (3.712)	-.948 (3.485)	6.82* (4.099)	2.619 (3.603)	6.552*** (2.384)
Questions Answered	-.066 (.052)	.062 (.052)	.216*** (.083)	.003 (.08)	.076 (.083)	.098 (.082)	.022 (.052)
Additional Information	-.002 (.015)	.017 (.015)	.035 (.025)	.023 (.024)	.009 (.024)	.005 (.023)	-.002 (.015)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.062*** (.02)	.045** (.02)	.059* (.032)	.019 (.031)	.01 (.031)	.02 (.031)	.004 (.02)
Welcomes E-mail	-.004 (.018)	.014 (.018)	.037 (.028)	-.012 (.027)	.013 (.028)	.009 (.027)	.063*** (.018)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.022*** (.007)	.005 (.007)	.008 (.011)	-.009 (.009)	.008 (.011)	-.001 (.01)	.019*** (.007)
Future Personal Contact	-.054*** (.015)	.014 (.015)	.024 (.024)	-.016 (.023)	.037 (.025)	.032 (.024)	.028* (.015)

Note:  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

the author in a separate encrypted file on a password protected server. Moreover, the results are presented in the aggregate, which makes it impossible to identify any single individual.

## D Additional Analyses and Extensions

### D.1 Main Results With No or Limited Sets of Controls

In order to maximize statistical efficiency, the treatment effects in the main paper are estimated while controlling for municipality- and party-effects. This Appendix shows that the main conclusions are robust to changing the model specification so that it includes no or

Table D.9: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable. Controls for Municipality Included.

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.041* (.024)	-.003 (.024)	.098** (.038)	.05 (.037)	.027 (.038)	.052 (.037)	.025 (.023)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-5.45** (2.46)	-.214 (2.616)	11.345*** (3.955)	1.818 (3.927)	8.68* (4.621)	5.78 (3.874)	7.032*** (2.459)
Questions Answered	-.073 (.056)	.018 (.056)	.285*** (.089)	.049 (.087)	.079 (.089)	.165* (.087)	.05 (.055)
Additional Information	-.014 (.016)	.019 (.017)	.032 (.026)	.016 (.026)	.005 (.024)	.015 (.025)	-.003 (.016)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.062*** (.021)	.028 (.022)	.083** (.034)	.044 (.034)	.021 (.034)	.047 (.033)	.007 (.021)
Welcomes E-mail	-.007 (.019)	.004 (.019)	.047 (.03)	.002 (.029)	-.007 (.03)	.017 (.029)	.067*** (.019)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.02** (.008)	.005 (.008)	.002 (.011)	-.012 (.01)	.007 (.011)	-.006 (.011)	.018** (.007)
Future Personal Contact	-.06*** (.016)	.01 (.017)	.033 (.026)	-.013 (.025)	.037 (.027)	.044* (.026)	.023 (.017)

Note:  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments and municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

limited sets of controls.

In Table D.8, the results with no controls are shown. As can be seen, they are only marginally different from the results in the main paper. Notably, the negative impact of an Arabic-sounding name, which is bordering on significant in the main paper, is approximately 25% smaller.

In Table D.9, we add municipality fixed effects. As can be seen, the results are similar to the ones shown in the main paper. Finally, Table D.10 show the results that include fixed effects for the party of the recipient, but exclude municipality effects. Once again, the results are similar to the ones shown in the main paper.

Table D.10: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable. Controls for Party of Recipient Included.

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.032 (.022)	.01 (.022)	.082** (.035)	.052 (.035)	.038 (.035)	.025 (.035)	.008 (.022)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-4.52* (2.4)	1.267 (2.378)	8.539** (3.678)	-.226 (3.48)	7.343* (4.113)	2.504 (3.616)	6.241*** (2.411)
Questions Answered	-.068 (.052)	.062 (.052)	.223*** (.083)	.028 (.08)	.085 (.083)	.096 (.082)	.005 (.052)
Additional Information	-.001 (.015)	.018 (.015)	.037 (.024)	.028 (.024)	.013 (.024)	.004 (.023)	-.003 (.015)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.065*** (.02)	.044** (.02)	.059* (.032)	.025 (.031)	.011 (.031)	.018 (.031)	0 (.02)
Welcomes E-mail	-.004 (.018)	.014 (.017)	.04 (.028)	-.006 (.027)	.018 (.028)	.009 (.027)	.06*** (.018)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.022*** (.007)	.004 (.007)	.007 (.011)	-.009 (.009)	.007 (.011)	-.002 (.01)	.019*** (.007)
Future Personal Contact	-.054*** (.015)	.013 (.015)	.023 (.024)	-.013 (.023)	.034 (.025)	.03 (.024)	.024 (.015)

Note:  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments and the party of the recipient Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

## D.2 Treatment Effects Including Responses Only

As described in the main paper, when analyzing the informativeness, tone, follow-up of the responses, we have coded non-responses as zero rather than missing, because doing otherwise would be tantamount to conditioning on a post-treatment variable and thereby inducing selection bias. As a robustness check, we performed the same analysis, this time only including actual responses. The results are in Table D.11 and are very similar to those presented in the main paper showing little indication of differential treatment neither by ethnicity nor gender.

Table D.11: Treatment Effects Including Responses Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-3.29 (5.23)	-.55 (5.393)	8.773 (7.74)	.507 (8.504)	14.625 (9.854)	-3.652 (8.678)	9.887** (4.988)
Questions Answered	.093 (.084)	.107 (.084)	.115 (.125)	-.128 (.137)	.016 (.135)	.003 (.133)	.001 (.083)
Additional Information	-.019 (.041)	.044 (.043)	-.005 (.064)	-.024 (.068)	-.086 (.065)	-.035 (.067)	-.045 (.04)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.061 (.043)	.072* (.043)	.038 (.067)	.087 (.07)	.024 (.072)	.018 (.067)	-.014 (.042)
Welcomes E-mail	.035 (.041)	-.016 (.043)	.055 (.065)	.026 (.072)	-.012 (.071)	.018 (.07)	.174*** (.041)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.035* (.021)	.003 (.021)	-.004 (.031)	-.028 (.03)	.017 (.03)	-.015 (.032)	.039* (.02)
Future Personal Contact	-.087** (.041)	.019 (.041)	-.022 (.063)	-.069 (.067)	.021 (.067)	.069 (.065)	.015 (.041)

Note:  $N = 832$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

### D.3 Is Bias Cumulative?

In the main paper, we study several outcomes: whether our alias received a reply, the informativeness of the reply, the tone of the reply, and whether the party representative suggests a follow up with our alias. When analyzing each individual outcome, our study finds little evidence of ideological and identitarian bias in the selection of laymen jurors, with the possible exception of when the alias has an Arabic-sounding name. In the latter case, there exists evidence of small bias on some outcomes.

In this section, we ask whether many small biases add up to more significant bias. To do this, we create four dichotomous dependent variables: The first is coded as one if respondents get a positive response on at least one of the four dimensions (response, informativeness, tone

Table D.12: Is Bias Cumulative?

Positive Outcomes:	Arabic Name	Female Name	Treatment Effects:				
			Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
>0	-.043* (.023)	-.003 (.023)	.11*** (.037)	.072* (.037)	.04 (.036)	.063* (.036)	.023 (.023)
>1	-.05** (.02)	.018 (.023)	.108*** (.036)	.05 (.036)	.036 (.036)	.07* (.036)	.036 (.022)
>2	-.043** (.02)	.019 (.021)	.044 (.033)	.011 (.033)	.015 (.033)	.035 (.032)	.03 (.02)
>3	-.012 (.014)	.002 (.015)	.004 (.023)	.001 (.023)	.007 (.024)	.025 (.023)	.002 (.015)

*Note:*  $N = 1981$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

and meeting). The second variable is coded as one if respondents get a positive response on at least two of the four dimensions, and so on.

If many small biases add up to more significant bias, we would expect to see larger treatment effects for the dependent variables that require get more positive outcomes. As is clear from Table D.12, no such pattern is evident for any of the treatments; it is not the case here that many small biases add up to more significant bias.

## D.4 Treatment Effects on Questions about Party Membership and Ideology

As mentioned in the main text, we have also analyzed the impact on the various treatments on four non-preregistered outcome variables. The first two outcomes capture whether the local party official who responded to the email spontaneously asked the e-mailer about whether he/she was a member of the party and whether they shared the party's ideology. The second

Table D.13: Treatment Effects on Questions about Party Membership and Ideology Posed by the Party Representative

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Party Membership Check	.006 (.014)	.004 (.014)	.038* (.022)	.045* (.023)	.027 (.022)	.014 (.021)	.007 (.014)
Party Membership Required	.008 (.018)	.006 (.018)	.071** (.029)	.007 (.028)	.011 (.029)	.03 (.028)	-.013 (.018)
Party Ideology Check	.003 (.005)	-.004 (.005)	.004 (.007)	.005 (.007)	-.004 (.006)	.003 (.008)	.005 (.004)
Party Ideology Required	.013 (.014)	-.009 (.014)	.028 (.023)	.014 (.022)	.001 (.022)	.004 (.021)	.004 (.014)

*Note:*  $N = 832$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

are similar, but code statements indicating that being a member or sharing the party's ideology is mandatory/required. As can be seen in Table D.13, the treatment effects on these non-registered outcomes are generally small and statistically insignificant.



Table D.14: Differences in Treatment Effects for all Dependent Variables by Gender of E-mailer.

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:					
	Arabic Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	.038 (.048)	-.024 (.077)	-.009 (.074)	-.076 (.075)	-.071 (.075)	.021 (.046)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>						
# of Words	-2.584 (5.13)	10.322 (8.186)	2.486 (7.757)	-.41 (8.322)	2.816 (8.241)	-4.35 (5.183)
Questions Answered	.018 (.115)	.062 (.181)	.125 (.173)	.023 (.179)	-.046 (.179)	.063 (.111)
Additional Information	.029 (.033)	-.022 (.053)	-.031 (.052)	-.013 (.049)	.006 (.051)	-.03 (.033)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>						
Uses Name	-.016 (.044)	-.045 (.069)	-.08 (.067)	-.179*** (.068)	-.038 (.066)	-.009 (.042)
Welcomes E-mail	-.002 (.039)	-.041 (.061)	.026 (.058)	-.034 (.062)	-.005 (.062)	-.031 (.038)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>						
Future Party Contact	-.004 (.016)	0 (.024)	-.028 (.021)	.011 (.023)	-.003 (.024)	-.012 (.015)
Future Personal Contact	.019 (.033)	-.009 (.051)	-.045 (.05)	-.124** (.052)	-.09* (.053)	-.018 (.033)

Note:  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are the difference between OLS-coefficients for e-mailers with female-sounding and male-sounding names (female effect-male effect). They are taken from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

## D.5 Treatment Effect of Gender and Ethnicity Interacted with the Other Treatments

While such tests will have lower statistical power (Collins, Dziak and Li, 2009), our factorial design allows for tests of whether treatments interact with each other. In Table D.14. we show the difference between the treatment effects for male and female e-mailers (the effect for males is subtracted from that for women). For example, the treatment effect of a female-sounding name is 2.1 percentage points more positive for e-mailers that signal co-partisanship than for e-mailers who do not. This difference, however, is not statistically significant. And

as can be seen, the general pattern is similar in that treatment effects for female and male aliases are rarely statistically distinguishable from each other. In sum, the gender treatment does not appear to interact with the other treatments in any systematic fashion.

Moving on to ethnicity, Table D.15 contains similar results, but this time by supposed ethnicity. Specifically, the impact of a treatment for an e-mailer with an Arabic-sounding name is compared to the impact of the same treatment for an e-mailer with a Nordic-sounding name. As can be seen, the ethnic treatment does not appear to interact with the other treatments in any systematic fashion. The treatment effects are, with only a few exceptions, statistically indistinguishable when comparing e-mailer with Nordic- and Arabic-sounding names.

## **D.6 Treatment Effects by Party Ideology**

Since previous research has shown that parties of different ideologies may place different emphasis on issues of discrimination (see, e.g., Eriksson and Vernby, 2021), it is possible that the main results mask important between-party differences in their responses to individuals who put themselves forward as lay judge candidates. We have therefore performed an analysis where we interact each treatment with the left-right position of the party to which the local official being contacted belongs. The latter are taken from the Chapel Hill Expert Survey of 2019 (Bakker et al., 2015; Polk et al., 2017; Bakker et al., 2019). As can be seen in Table D.16, virtually none of the interaction effects are statistically significant, suggesting that ideology is not an important factor in this particular setting.

Table D.15: Differences in Treatment Effects for all Dependent Variables by Ethnicity of E-mailer.

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:					
	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	.04 (.048)	-.154** (.077)	-.023 (.074)	-.083 (.075)	-.111 (.074)	-.02 (.048)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>						
# of Words	-2.259 (5.138)	-2.091 (8.14)	9.911 (7.827)	-6.107 (8.499)	-6.094 (7.838)	-6.077 (5.228)
Questions Answered	.02 (.115)	-.109 (.18)	.104 (.175)	-.111 (.177)	-.202 (.175)	-.011 (.111)
Additional Information	.031 (.034)	-.086 (.053)	-.061 (.053)	-.12** (.049)	-.075 (.05)	.01 (.032)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>						
Uses Name	-.009 (.044)	-.047 (.069)	.073 (.068)	-.071 (.067)	-.098 (.066)	-.022 (.043)
Welcomes E-mail	-.002 (.039)	.014 (.06)	.076 (.058)	0 (.06)	-.047 (.058)	-.055 (.038)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>						
Future Party Contact	-.004 (.016)	0 (.025)	.014 (.023)	.014 (.024)	.018 (.024)	-.013 (.014)
Future Personal Contact	.022 (.033)	-.141*** (.051)	-.069 (.049)	-.085 (.052)	-.085* (.051)	-.054 (.034)

*Note:*  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are the difference between OLS-coefficients for e-mailers with Arabic-sounding and Nordic-sounding names (Arabic effect-Nordic effect). They are taken from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

A similar, but more detailed, way of testing whether ideology matters is to estimate by-party treatment effects. Tables D.17 through D.24 provide treatment effects broken down by the partisan affiliation of the local official who received the e-mail. As can be seen, few effects are statistically significant when breaking down the analysis by party. Apart from the fact that treatment effects are small, which they also are when using the complete sample in the main paper, the analyses that focus on one party at a time, have a fairly small sample size (The sample size ranges from 226 to 290, depending on which party the analysis focuses on). Looking at the size of treatment effects, no clear partisan pattern is evident.

Table D.16: Main Treatment Effects and Treatment Effects Interacted with Parties' Left-Right Ideology

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.014 (.062)	.056 (.062)	.058 (.102)	.074 (.1)	-.002 (.1)	0 (.099)	.08 (.062)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-4.025 (6.329)	3.85 (6.54)	20.086* (10.851)	1.965 (10.556)	5.522 (10.521)	-2.584 (9.622)	12.805** (6.313)
Questions Answered	-.068 (.138)	.155 (.141)	.34 (.226)	-.04 (.221)	.162 (.224)	.076 (.216)	.224 (.139)
Additional Information	.012 (.044)	.061 (.044)	.07 (.076)	.074 (.076)	.025 (.07)	.003 (.067)	.02 (.045)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.069 (.054)	.072 (.054)	.078 (.091)	-.024 (.09)	-.033 (.09)	-.007 (.088)	.097* (.054)
Welcomes E-mail	-.026 (.047)	.049 (.048)	.087 (.076)	.073 (.077)	.043 (.082)	.025 (.075)	.103** (.048)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.048** (.023)	.011 (.022)	.046 (.035)	-.004 (.03)	.024 (.037)	-.017 (.032)	.032 (.022)
Future Personal Contact	-.003 (.044)	.039 (.044)	.1 (.07)	.044 (.072)	.01 (.071)	.112 (.071)	.067 (.044)
Outcome:	Treatment Effects Interacted with Left-Right Position:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.005 (.01)	-.01 (.01)	.007 (.017)	-.002 (.016)	.005 (.016)	.008 (.016)	-.011 (.01)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-.252 (1.051)	-.676 (1.095)	-1.488 (1.737)	.113 (1.734)	.623 (1.793)	1.461 (1.64)	-1.057 (1.086)
Questions Answered	-.002 (.023)	-.023 (.023)	-.008 (.037)	.021 (.037)	-.014 (.037)	.016 (.036)	-.034 (.023)
Additional Information	-.004 (.007)	-.007 (.007)	-.006 (.012)	-.009 (.012)	-.003 (.011)	.002 (.011)	-.004 (.007)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	.001 (.009)	-.008 (.009)	.001 (.015)	.013 (.015)	.009 (.015)	.009 (.014)	-.016* (.009)
Welcomes E-mail	.003 (.008)	-.008 (.008)	-.006 (.013)	-.011 (.013)	-.008 (.013)	-.001 (.013)	-.007 (.008)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	.005* (.003)	-.001 (.003)	-.008 (.005)	-.001 (.005)	-.003 (.006)	.002 (.005)	-.002 (.003)
Future Personal Contact	-.01 (.007)	-.005 (.007)	-.012 (.011)	-.009 (.012)	.004 (.012)	-.013 (.012)	-.008 (.007)

Note:  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table D.17: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Left Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	.045 (.062)	.069 (.063)	.028 (.102)	.026 (.101)	-.048 (.1)	-.097 (.098)	.021 (.063)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	2.2 (6.44)	4.973 (6.396)	7.471 (11.005)	1.396 (10.439)	.709 (10.73)	-8.883 (9.415)	5.564 (6.468)
Questions Answered	.085 (.133)	.15 (.134)	.234 (.214)	.074 (.207)	.022 (.215)	-.099 (.197)	.067 (.132)
Additional Information	.042 (.046)	.013 (.045)	.069 (.078)	.061 (.075)	-.019 (.069)	-.04 (.066)	.042 (.046)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.017 (.051)	.098* (.052)	-.013 (.087)	-.029 (.086)	-.043 (.086)	-.118 (.08)	.016 (.051)
Welcomes E-mail	.015 (.044)	.063 (.045)	-.006 (.07)	.024 (.072)	.005 (.071)	-.006 (.071)	.05 (.045)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.035 (.025)	.021 (.024)	.04 (.04)	-.002 (.029)	.04 (.041)	.011 (.035)	.039 (.026)
Future Personal Contact	.022 (.043)	.046 (.044)	.035 (.069)	.047 (.07)	-.013 (.065)	-.006 (.066)	.104** (.043)

Note:  $N = 273$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

## D.7 Excluding Potentially Low-Quality Responses

If party officials' responses state that party membership or shared ideology is a requirement to become a lay judge, despite there being a co-partisanship signal in the e-mail that the local party official has received, this may suggest that the official has not read the email carefully. In total, there are 227 response where the party official asked about the partisan or ideological belonging of the e-mailer, alternatively stated that party membership or ideological affinity was a requirement, despite the e-mail containing a co-partisanship signal. We therefore reanalyze our results excluding these responses. However, our exclusion criterion induces a mechanical negative correlation between co-partisanship and the outcome variables in the

Table D.18: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Green Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.054 (.059)	.107* (.058)	.025 (.094)	.106 (.097)	.065 (.098)	.063 (.093)	.039 (.061)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-12.76** (5.98)	6.382 (5.627)	15.225* (9.188)	8.048 (7.566)	14.276 (9.502)	2.97 (5.975)	9.906 (6.302)
Questions Answered	-.202 (.127)	.188 (.126)	.152 (.204)	-.008 (.189)	.252 (.218)	.179 (.194)	.015 (.137)
Additional Information	-.018 (.044)	.13*** (.044)	.09 (.072)	.059 (.072)	.032 (.071)	-.009 (.065)	-.031 (.044)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.153*** (.054)	.053 (.052)	.028 (.087)	-.021 (.087)	.056 (.091)	.048 (.086)	.054 (.055)
Welcomes E-mail	-.051 (.046)	.051 (.044)	.065 (.075)	.063 (.073)	.076 (.077)	-.04 (.063)	.091* (.048)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.028 (.022)	-.009 (.02)	.033 (.035)	-.004 (.029)	.02 (.037)	-.02 (.022)	.037* (.021)
Future Personal Contact	-.047 (.042)	.089** (.04)	-.008 (.062)	.011 (.064)	-.007 (.065)	.077 (.069)	.021 (.042)

Note:  $N = 290$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

remaining data. Therefore, the analysis includes responses only. The results are in Table D.25 and, as can be seen, there are few significant treatment effects and the patterns generally mimics that found in the main analyses.

## D.8 Do Response Rates and Treatment Effects Vary Across Different Types of Municipalities?

In this section, we analyze whether response rates differ, and react differently to treatments, across different types of municipalities. Specifically, we estimate four models in which we interact all treatments with one of the following municipal-level moderators: share

Table D.19: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Social Democratic Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.062 (.063)	-.028 (.063)	.15 (.101)	.084 (.108)	.105 (.1)	.113 (.098)	.038 (.063)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-3.84 (6.66)	-4.442 (6.529)	14.333 (12.526)	-13.358 (10.957)	-3.955 (11.839)	-3.932 (11.257)	12.543* (6.676)
Questions Answered	-.155 (.159)	.082 (.157)	.403 (.254)	-.048 (.258)	.177 (.253)	.173 (.246)	.16 (.159)
Additional Information	.017 (.046)	-.012 (.047)	-.049 (.067)	.022 (.08)	.054 (.076)	.009 (.07)	-.058 (.046)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.081 (.059)	.009 (.06)	.202** (.097)	.039 (.099)	-.038 (.09)	.05 (.09)	.057 (.059)
Welcomes E-mail	-.014 (.052)	-.007 (.053)	.108 (.083)	.03 (.083)	.011 (.08)	.091 (.079)	.135*** (.052)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.048** (.02)	.02 (.021)	0 (.039)	-.013 (.035)	-.023 (.034)	-.009 (.035)	.013 (.023)
Future Personal Contact	-.094* (.05)	-.02 (.05)	.186** (.086)	-.079 (.069)	.056 (.079)	.094 (.079)	.014 (.053)

Note:  $N = 286$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

of immigrants in population, population size, population density and number of parties in municipality.

The results are in Table D.26. Looking at the coefficients for the different moderator variables, they show no indication of there being any systematic differences in response rates across different types of municipalities. Moving on to the interaction effects, only in in 28 is statistically significant, which is what we would have expected from pure chance. We therefore conclude that the the response rates do not react differently depending on these municipal-level moderators.

Table D.20: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Center Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.049 (.057)	-.064 (.058)	.043 (.096)	-.011 (.09)	.015 (.091)	-.07 (.095)	-.025 (.058)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	.05 (5.3)	.816 (5.389)	8.57 (6.955)	3.468 (7.424)	7.352 (6.835)	9.174 (9.526)	-4.014 (5.274)
Questions Answered	-.111 (.14)	-.039 (.144)	.183 (.239)	-.141 (.211)	.038 (.222)	-.05 (.244)	-.037 (.144)
Additional Information	-.004 (.033)	-.052 (.033)	.013 (.048)	.036 (.049)	.034 (.047)	.068 (.064)	.001 (.035)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.05 (.049)	.005 (.051)	-.017 (.082)	.007 (.08)	-.017 (.079)	-.064 (.079)	-.014 (.049)
Welcomes E-mail	-.006 (.042)	-.016 (.043)	.045 (.068)	-.01 (.061)	.068 (.067)	.003 (.068)	.015 (.043)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	.01 (.017)	.021 (.016)	.035 (.026)	.015 (.018)	.013 (.017)	.02 (.022)	.006 (.017)
Future Personal Contact	-.003 (.041)	-.036 (.042)	.05 (.058)	.031 (.054)	.144** (.066)	.049 (.065)	-.004 (.042)

Note:  $N = 270$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .



Table D.21: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Liberal Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.024 (.068)	.052 (.069)	.11 (.107)	-.013 (.1)	-.038 (.105)	.044 (.103)	-.005 (.068)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-10.51 (9.53)	2.301 (10.136)	-.977 (13.624)	-26.608** (12.364)	5.673 (19.943)	2.831 (15.472)	15.691 (10.657)
Questions Answered	-.059 (.162)	.112 (.163)	.116 (.259)	-.278 (.23)	-.097 (.269)	.026 (.252)	.059 (.164)
Additional Information	-.029 (.046)	.012 (.048)	.035 (.074)	-.011 (.066)	-.035 (.065)	.032 (.072)	.005 (.048)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.035 (.06)	.135** (.061)	.079 (.098)	-.025 (.084)	-.002 (.094)	.069 (.091)	-.008 (.061)
Welcomes E-mail	.087 (.057)	.032 (.057)	.079 (.091)	-.053 (.077)	.024 (.089)	.1 (.088)	.056 (.057)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.025 (.021)	.002 (.018)	-.016 (.042)	-.046 (.033)	-.043 (.031)	-.021 (.039)	.005 (.022)
Future Personal Contact	-.046 (.037)	.048 (.039)	.002 (.056)	-.04 (.047)	.063 (.069)	.015 (.057)	.034 (.04)

Note:  $N = 226$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table D.22: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Conservative Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.05 (.062)	.028 (.063)	.23** (.092)	.139 (.098)	.229** (.1)	.099 (.092)	.064 (.063)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	1.26 (7.01)	4.308 (6.732)	15.395* (9.262)	15.063 (11.054)	19.383 (11.844)	11.166 (9.302)	6.674 (6.761)
Questions Answered	-.055 (.158)	.197 (.156)	.474** (.232)	.282 (.236)	.277 (.241)	.273 (.233)	-.015 (.158)
Additional Information	-.017 (.05)	0 (.05)	.035 (.074)	.006 (.077)	.031 (.08)	.019 (.073)	.039 (.051)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.065 (.058)	.072 (.058)	.229*** (.084)	.207** (.089)	.228** (.092)	.115 (.077)	.003 (.057)
Welcomes E-mail	.002 (.055)	-.009 (.054)	.06 (.082)	.001 (.082)	.059 (.09)	-.003 (.077)	.095* (.053)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.016 (.015)	-.015 (.015)	-.015 (.015)	-.015 (.016)	.037 (.038)	.002 (.023)	.014 (.015)
Future Personal Contact	-.059 (.046)	.016 (.045)	.046 (.065)	.046 (.068)	.07 (.075)	.052 (.063)	.022 (.044)

Note:  $N = 273$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table D.23: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Christian Democrat Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.006 (.064)	-.062 (.065)	.019 (.11)	-.081 (.103)	-.071 (.109)	-.047 (.109)	-.031 (.065)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-5.89 (6.94)	-8.513 (7.445)	1.569 (11.013)	-9.889 (9.585)	-5.249 (11.176)	7.475 (13.533)	4.365 (7.001)
Questions Answered	-.065 (.146)	-.221 (.148)	-.063 (.239)	-.164 (.242)	-.226 (.243)	.007 (.259)	-.094 (.146)
Additional Information	.025 (.041)	.017 (.041)	.09 (.074)	-.009 (.059)	.024 (.07)	-.012 (.061)	-.003 (.04)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.05 (.056)	-.016 (.056)	.037 (.092)	-.031 (.085)	-.042 (.089)	.065 (.096)	-.053 (.056)
Welcomes E-mail	.015 (.05)	-.018 (.053)	.038 (.092)	-.037 (.085)	-.061 (.088)	-.059 (.084)	.025 (.054)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.017 (.012)	-.019 (.014)	-.004 (.004)	.016 (.017)	-.001 (.004)	.018 (.021)	.021 (.015)
Future Personal Contact	-.074* (.04)	-.03 (.04)	-.087 (.071)	-.033 (.072)	-.094 (.071)	-.046 (.076)	.073* (.042)

Note:  $N = 248$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table D.24: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Sweden Democrat Party Officials Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
Response	-.064 (.069)	-.028 (.07)	.039 (.112)	.118 (.113)	-.037 (.115)	.044 (.115)	-.045 (.07)
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-4.71 (7.21)	-.466 (7.774)	2.092 (9.277)	10.312 (10.717)	15.103 (14.761)	1.72 (9.423)	2.273 (8.61)
Questions Answered	.014 (.165)	-.017 (.168)	.261 (.252)	.385 (.261)	.029 (.248)	.213 (.259)	-.129 (.172)
Additional Information	-.026 (.041)	.027 (.04)	.014 (.067)	.063 (.073)	-.043 (.062)	-.025 (.062)	-.052 (.04)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.074 (.067)	.004 (.067)	-.127 (.105)	-.006 (.11)	-.148 (.111)	-.067 (.113)	-.08 (.068)
Welcomes E-mail	-.057 (.057)	.029 (.058)	-.084 (.097)	-.105 (.095)	-.111 (.097)	-.001 (.103)	.014 (.058)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.022 (.018)	.018 (.017)	-.025 (.026)	-.028 (.026)	.018 (.038)	.001 (.036)	.025 (.019)
Future Personal Contact	-.133*** (.051)	0 (.048)	-.065 (.079)	-.127* (.075)	-.002 (.093)	-.063 (.085)	-.044 (.048)

Note:  $N = 238$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table D.25: Treatment Effects by Dependent Variable, Excluding Low Quality Responses, Responses Only

Outcome:	Treatment Effects:						
	Arabic Name	Female Name	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55	Age 65	Co-Partisan
<i>Informativeness of Response:</i>							
# of Words	-4.32 (6.06)	-1.571 (6.401)	6.933 (9.335)	-3.839 (11)	9.845 (10.397)	-5.026 (10.385)	-12.709* (6.699)
Questions Answered	.021 (.111)	.069 (.109)	.131 (.162)	-.258 (.167)	-.063 (.172)	-.135 (.167)	-.712*** (.104)
Additional Information	-.006 (.054)	.019 (.056)	-.033 (.083)	-.052 (.086)	-.086 (.087)	-.017 (.088)	.048 (.06)
<i>Tone of Response:</i>							
Uses Name	-.078 (.055)	.055 (.056)	.079 (.092)	.074 (.092)	.061 (.095)	.03 (.088)	-.054 (.06)
Welcomes E-mail	.066 (.052)	.006 (.055)	.038 (.082)	-.022 (.086)	-.086 (.087)	.002 (.085)	.118** (.059)
<i>Follow-up Meeting:</i>							
Future Party Contact	-.047* (.027)	.008 (.024)	-.033 (.04)	-.047 (.037)	.006 (.039)	-.04 (.042)	.03 (.031)
Future Personal Contact	-.042 (.052)	.007 (.055)	.02 (.078)	-.071 (.083)	.049 (.083)	.072 (.083)	-.033 (.058)

Note:  $N = 611$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients from regressions controlling for all other treatments, the party of the recipient and the municipality of the local party branch. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table D.26: Do Response Rates and Treatment Effects Vary With Municipal-Level Moderators?

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Arabic Name	-0.00207 (0.0590)	-0.0393 (0.0253)	-0.0322 (0.0228)	-0.236 (0.191)
Female Name	-0.115* (0.0589)	0.00865 (0.0243)	0.00615 (0.0228)	-0.285 (0.192)
Age 35	0.0236 (0.0968)	0.0953** (0.0382)	0.0932** (0.0366)	-0.000139 (0.313)
Age 45	0.0588 (0.0948)	0.0547 (0.0395)	0.0541 (0.0367)	-0.221 (0.321)
Age 55	0.0663 (0.0948)	0.0184 (0.0414)	0.0280 (0.0368)	0.0577 (0.321)
Age 65	-0.0183 (0.0961)	0.00780 (0.0381)	0.0211 (0.0361)	-0.297 (0.311)
Moderator	0.0218 (0.519)	0.0683 (0.0431)	0.0317 (0.0531)	-0.00409 (0.0374)
Moderator × Arabic Name	-0.201 (0.356)	0.0230 (0.0384)	-0.00386 (0.0388)	0.0276 (0.0258)
Moderator × Female Name	0.810** (0.355)	-0.00631 (0.0302)	0.0120 (0.0410)	0.0395 (0.0259)
Moderator × Age 35	0.410 (0.588)	-0.0337 (0.0386)	-0.0625 (0.0623)	0.0121 (0.0423)
Moderator × Age 45	-0.0442 (0.574)	-0.00659 (0.0494)	-0.00654 (0.0574)	0.0373 (0.0432)
Moderator × Age 55	-0.171 (0.566)	0.0564 (0.0665)	0.0825 (0.0594)	-0.00239 (0.0432)
Moderator × Age 65	0.281 (0.589)	0.0487 (0.0490)	0.0191 (0.0500)	0.0438 (0.0420)
Moderator × Co-Partisan	-0.0716 (0.357)	-0.0332 (0.0250)	0.0328 (0.0395)	0.0339 (0.0258)
Moderator	Immigrant Share	Population	Population Density	Number of Parties

*Note:*  $N = 1,981$ . Entries are OLS-coefficients. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Controls for the party of the recipient are included but not shown. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

## References

- Bakker, Ryan, Catherine De Vries, Erica Edwards, Liesbet Hooghe, Seth Jolly, Gary Marks, Jonathan Polk, Jan Rovny, Marco Steenbergen and Milada Anna Vachudova. 2015. “Measuring party positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill expert survey trend file, 1999–2010.” *Party Politics* 21(1):143–152.
- Bakker, Ryan, Liesbet Hooghe, Seth Jolly, Gary Marks, Jonathan Polk, Jan Rovny, Marco Steenbergen and Milada Anna Vachudova. 2019. “1999–2019 Chapel Hill Expert Survey Trend File.”
- Collins, Linda M, John J Dziak and Runze Li. 2009. “Design of experiments with multiple independent variables: A resource management perspective on complete and reduced factorial designs.” *Psychological methods* 14(3):202.
- Coppock, Alexander. 2019. “Avoiding Post-Treatment Bias in Audit Experiments.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 6(1):1–4.
- Eriksson, Lina and Kåre Vernby. 2021. “Welcome to the Party? Ethnicity and the Interaction between Potential Activists and Party Gate-Keepers.” *Journal of Politics* .
- Fritz, Andreas. 2016. “Genomförda kommunikationsinsatser inför nämndemannavalet 2015, Delrapport (Ju2015/3889/DOM).”
- Montgomery, Jacob M, Brendan Nyhan and Michelle Torres. 2018. “How conditioning on

posttreatment variables can ruin your experiment and what to do about it.” *American Journal of Political Science* 62(3):760–775.

Nilsson, Jörgen, Flyme Ahlstrand and Camilla Lyckman. 2007. “Nämndemannakårens sammansättning, Kartläggning av kåren samt utvärdering av rekryteringsarbetet valet 2006 (2007:2).”.

Polk, Jonathan, Jan Rovny, Ryan Bakker, Erica Edwards, Liesbet Hooghe, Seth Jolly, Jelle Koedam, Filip Kostelka, Gary Marks, Gijs Schumacher et al. 2017. “Explaining the salience of anti-elitism and reducing political corruption for political parties in Europe with the 2014 Chapel Hill Expert Survey data.” *Research & Politics* 4(1):2053168016686915.

Ridal Ceder, Kristina and Peter Yngve. 2020. “Långsiktigt nämndemannauppdrag 2016–2019, Slutrapport (Ju2015/3889/DOM).”.

Teele, Dawn Langan. 2014. “Reflections on the ethics of field experiments.” *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences* pp. 115–140.

Zschirnt, Eva. 2019. “Research ethics in correspondence testing: An update.” *Research Ethics* 15(2):1–21.