**Supplementary material**

**Table A1. Overview survey items and mean scores (reproduced from Halpin et al. 2018)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | **Item** (We prioritise an issue when …) | **Mean**  |
| Internal responsiveness | a. the issue is in the *interests* of the people or institutions this organisation represents*\** | 4.4 |
| Internal responsiveness | b. the issue is explicitly mentioned as a priority in our organisation’s *mission* statement, policy statement, or similar document | 4.3 |
| Internal responsiveness | c. the issue is among the stated preferences of our *members* | 4.2 |
| Internal responsiveness | d. the issue is currently of interest to the *leaders* of this organization | 4.0 |
| Internal responsiveness | e. the issue is among the stated preferences of some of our *institutional contributors* (e.g. private foundations) | 2.8  |
| Internal responsiveness | f. the issue is among the stated preferences of *large donor contributors* (i.e. members who contribute in excess of membership dues)  | 2.7  |
| Capacity | g. the issue is one that can be effectively addressed given existing in-house *staff experience*. | 3.5 |
| Capacity | h. our financial *resources* allow us to adequately address the issue | 3.0  |
| Niche | i. the issue is one that *other like-minded organisations are dealing with*, and that this organisation believes can be addressed more effectively with further attention  | 3.7 |
| Niche | j. the issue is one that *other like-minded organisations are not dealing with*, and this organisation believes needs attention | 3.5 |
| POS | k. the issue is one that is being addressed by this organisation’s organisational opponents, and thus needs to be addressed so its point of view is heard | 3.3  |
| POS | l. we have *allies within government* to help this organisation “win” on the issue+ | 3.0  |
| POS | m. we have *opponents within government* who work against us on the issue  | 2.8  |
| POS | n. the *likelihood of victory* on the issue is high | 3.0  |
| Salience | o. the issue is currently on the *governmental agenda* (i.e. it is being given considerable attention by the government) | 3.8 |
| Salience | p. a *recent event* such as a crisis or a disaster highlights the importance of the issue | 3.6 |
| Salience | q. the issue is currently on the *public agenda* (i.e. it is being given considerable attention by the public at large) | 3.5 |
| Salience | r. the issue is currently on the *media agenda* (i.e. it is being given considerable attention by the media) | 3.4  |

\*For brevity this item is labelled ‘constituency’ in the models that follow.

+ The term “government” refers to the executive, e.g. in the Australian case the Cabinet.

Note: The n varies between 350 and 356 for all items, except for questions “e” (institutional contributors; n=173) and “f” (large donor contributors; n=286), as groups were asked to skip these survey items if they were not applicable to them. Subsequent analysis in this paper drops these two items.

**Table A2. Overview interviews**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ID | Type |
| 1 | Citizen group |
| 2 | Citizen group |
| 3 | Citizen group |
| 4 | Professional group |
| 5 | Professional group |
| 6 | Professional group |
| 7 | Professional group |
| 8 | Citizen group |
| 9 | Business association |
| 10 | Business association |
| 11 | Citizen group |
| 12 | Professional group |
| 13 | Business association |
| 14 | Trade union |
| 15 | Business association |
| 16 | Trade union |
| 17 | Professional association |

**Table A3. Seemingly Unrelated Regression with Issue Prioritization Measures as Dependent Variables (categorical variable competition member funding)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   | Response | Capacity | Niche | PoS | Salience |
| Policy  | Generalist | **0.026\*\*** | -0.001 | 0.013 | 0.023 | **0.043\*\*\*** |
|  |  | (0.012) | (0.018) | (0.014) | (0.015) | (0.015) |
|  | Access | 0.156 | 0.279 | **0.393\*\*\*** | **0.285\*** | -0.085 |
|  |  | (0.117) | (0.172) | (0.140) | (0.149) | (0.148) |
| Competition for member funding | No competition | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  |  | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) |
|  | Little | -0.041 | -0.025 | 0.052 | 0.070 | -0.098 |
|  |  | (0.096) | (0.142) | (0.115) | (0.122) | (0.121) |
|  | Moderate | 0.076 | 0.031 | **0.232\*\*** | 0.134 | -0.018 |
|  |  | (0.096) | (0.142) | **(0.115)** | (0.122) | (0.122) |
|  | A lot | -0.017 | -0.099 | **0.312\*\*** | 0.006 | -0.143 |
|  |  | (0.110) | (0.162) | (0.132) | (0.140) | (0.139) |
| Org. Features | Mem involvement | **0.208\*\*\*** | -0.043 | 0.033 | 0.054 | -0.070 |
|  |  | (0.072) | (0.106) | (0.086) | (0.091) | (0.091) |
|  | Staff size | **0.063\*\*** | **0.181\*\*\*** | -0.015 | 0.026 | **0.147\*\*\*** |
|  |  | (0.031) | (0.046) | (0.038) | (0.040) | (0.040) |
| Group Type | Business group | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  |  | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) |
|  | Citizen group | **0.181\*** | -0.030 | **0.203\*** | 0.070 | 0.122 |
|  |  | (0.098) | (0.144) | (0.117) | (0.124) | (0.124) |
|  | Prof. group | 0.073 | 0.110 | **0.221\*\*** | -0.111 | 0.049 |
|  |  | (0.079) | (0.116) | (0.094) | (0.100) | (0.099) |
|  | Service group | -0.210 | **-0.432\*** | -0.176 | -0.013 | -0.025 |
|  |  | (0.167) | (0.245) | (0.199) | (0.212) | (0.211) |
|  | constant | 3.859\*\*\* | 3.049\*\*\* | 3.307\*\*\* | 2.865\*\*\* | 3.305\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.109) | (0.160) | (0.130) | (0.138) | (0.138) |
|  | R-sqr | 0.128 | 0.107 | 0.097 | 0.055 | 0.094 |
|   | N | 263 | 263 | 263 | 263 | 263 |

*Notes*: Numbers are coefficient estimates, standard errors are in parentheses. \*\*\*p<.01 (two-tailed test), \*\*p<.05 (two-tailed test), \*.10 (one-tailed test).

**Table A4. Seemingly Unrelated Regression with Issue Prioritization Measures as Dependent Variables (categorical variable member involvement)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   | Response | Capacity | Niche | PoS | Salience |
| Policy  | Generalist | **0.027\*\*** | -0.000 | 0.012 | 0.021 | **0.045\*\*\*** |
|  |  | (0.012) | (0.018) | (0.014) | (0.015) | (0.015) |
|  | Access | 0.141 | 0.266 | **0.408\*\*\*** | **0.288\*\*** | -0.112 |
|  |  | (0.116) | (0.170) | (0.138) | (0.147) | (0.146) |
| Competition for member funding | Competition | 0.063 | -0.007 | **0.234\*\*\*** | 0.051 | -0.013 |
|  |  | (0.068) | (0.101) | (0.082) | (0.087) | (0.087) |
| Mem involvement | Not too involved | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  |  | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) |
|  | Somewhat involved | -0.055 | -0.201 | 0.124 | 0.166 | -0.182 |
|  |  | (0.136) | (0.199) | (0.1629 | (0.172) | (0.171) |
|  | Very involved | 0.148 | -0.238 | 0.153 | 0.185 | -0.247 |
|  |  | (0.140) | (0.205) | (0.167) | (0.177) | (0.176) |
| Staff size | Staff size | **0.062\*** | **0.180\*\*\*** | -0.015 | 0.023 | **0.147\*\*\*** |
|  |  | (0.031) | (0.046) | (0.038) | (0.040) | (0.040) |
| Group Type | Business group | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  |  | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) | (.) |
|  | Citizen group | **0.175\*** | -0.044 | **0.211\*** | 0.072 | 0.111 |
|  |  | (0.098) | (0.144) | (0.117) | (0.124) | (0.124) |
|  | Prof. group | 0.071 | 0.102 | **0.227\*\*** | -0.101 | 0.041 |
|  |  | (0.079) | (0.116) | (0.094) | (0.100) | (0.100) |
|  | Service group | -0.229 | **-0.469\*** | -0.156 | -0.007 | -0.053 |
|  |  | (0.166) | (0.243) | (0.198) | (0.210) | (0.209) |
|  | constant | 3.894\*\*\* | 3.227\*\*\* | 3.219\*\*\* | 2.773\*\*\* | 3.422\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.152) | (0.223) | (0.181) | (0.192) | (0.191) |
|  | R-sqr | 0.125 | 0.108 | 0.097 | 0.054 | 0.092 |
|   | N | 263 | 263 | 263 | 263 | 263 |

*Notes*: Numbers are coefficient estimates, standard errors are in parentheses. \*\*\*p<.01 (two-tailed test), \*\*p<.05 (two-tailed test), \*.10 (one-tailed test).