EGAP - pre-analysis plan - Public perceptions of interest groups: A conjoint analysis

Conjoint design

We use a choice-based conjoint design with six attributes of advocacy initiatives with sixteen levels as presented in table 1.

Table 1. Conjoint design: Attributes and levels

1. Types of actors
    a. *Private company*
    b. *Union*
    c. *NGO*
    d. *Organized citizens*
2. Position
    a. *Against*
    b. *In favor*
3. Scope of action
    a. *Change the core of a legislative act (directional influence)*
    b. *Change details of a legislative act (technical influence)*
    c. *Generate public debate (Agenda-setting capability*
4. Transparency
    a. *Information on the initiative is published on its website*
    b. *Information on the initiative has not yet been published*
5. Repertoires
    a. *Contact government members*
    b. *Protest*
    c. *Organize a media campaign*
6. Compliance
    a. *Complies with all legal requirements*
    b. *Does not comply with all legal requirements*

The initiatives deal with the most important issue signaled by respondents. They can choose from a list of issues that include multiple types as presented in table 2.

Table 2. Issues

	New	Established
Environmental	Sanctions for non-compliance with recycling practices	Economic growth and environmental laws
Labor	Taxation for the industrial use of robots	Regulation of labor market conditions
Other	Regulation of Gambling and Betting Services	Taxes for increasing public services and social benefits

Hypotheses

1. Position
   1.1. Stronger support for initiatives that favor individual's issue positions
   1.2. Initiatives against government receive higher support when they defend favorable positions than when they defend opposing positions: position moderates the opposing nature of initiatives against statu-quo
   1.3. Stronger support for initiatives that favor individual's issue positions especially for individuals highly involved to the issue. Support for initiatives that favor individual's issue positions is mediated by issue involvement.

2. Compliance and transparency
   2.1. Stronger support for initiatives that are compliant with existing procedures
   2.2. Stronger support for initiatives that are transparent (disclose public information)
   2.2. Individuals will support opaque initiatives (no public information) if they favor an issue position they share and if they are highly interested in that issue: individual issue preferences moderate support for bad practices.
   2.3. Individuals will support non-compliance (initiatives that do not follow the established procedures) if initiatives favor an issue position they share and if they are highly interested in that issue: individual issue preferences moderate support for bad practices.
   2.4. Non-compliance is tolerated less than non-transparency. Non-compliance as illegal while non-transparency is detrimental for normative views of public action, but it is not a violation of established agreements.
   2.5. Compliance is perceived to be more important for Contacting government than for other types of action

3. Scope of action
   3.1. Stronger support for initiatives that seek radical policy change exclusively for initiatives that favor an issue position they share and if they are highly interested in that issue: individual issue preferences moderate support for radical action.

4. Types of actors
   4.1. Stronger support for citizen associations and NGOs than for Unions and Business associations
   4.2. Stronger support for organizations that individuals perceive as closer to them
   - Individual knowledge about organizations moderates support
   - Wealthier individuals prefer initiatives by business associations than other type of organizations
   - Right-leaning individuals or those identified with rightist parties prefer initiatives by business associations than other type of organizations

5. Repertoires
5.1. Stronger support for protest than non-direct repertoires for conflict-affine individuals: affinity towards conflict moderate preferences for repertoires
5.2. Weaker support for repertoires that individuals perceive as a threatening situation: Individual perceptions of risk toward repertoires moderate support
5.3. Stronger support for repertoires that individuals perceive as close to them
    5.3.1. Individual experiences of past participation in particular repertoires moderate support
    5.3.2. Wealthier individuals support less protest than other type of repertoires
    5.3.3. Right-leaning individuals or those identified with rightist parties support less protest than other type of repertoires
5.4. When initiatives are contrary to individuals' position, they support media campaigns but not protest
5.5. Contact and campaigns promoted by interest groups receive more support by individuals who perceive lobbying as positive

Survey instrument

Socio-demographics
- Gender
- Age
- Zip code
- Country of birth
- Education
- Income

Issues
- Issue interest
- Issue position

Choice based conjoint (3 rounds)
Below we will show you a couple of initiatives related to [PREFERRED ISSUE] Please read carefully the differences between them.

- Choice - Which of the two initiatives do you like the most?
- Rating - Some people criticize certain political initiatives, but support others. To what extent would you support each of these initiatives? (4 categories)

Issue salience

Attitudes
- Political interest
- Past participation
- Frequency of political information
- Conflict aversion
- Ideology
- National identification
- Trust in organizations
- Partisan identity
- Party closeness

Interest groups
- Positive traits
- Negative
- Registry
- Effectiveness on issues
- Lobbying
- Knowledge of business organizations
- Knowledge of NGOs - left
- Knowledge of NGOs - right