

Online Appendix for the Article “The Gendered Representational Costs of Violence against Politicians”

Sandra Håkansson (Sandra.hakansson@statsvet.uu.se)
Department of Government, Uppsala University

Contents

1. Methods description	2
Qualitative methods	2
<i>Interview themes</i>	3
Quantitative methods.....	4
2. Tables	5
<i>Table A1: Interviewee characteristics</i>	5
<i>Table A2: Descriptive statistics of survey sample representativeness</i>	6
<i>Table A3: Descriptive statistics on consequences of violence</i>	7
<i>Table A4: Gender and leaving politics due to violence, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure</i>	8
<i>Table A5: Gender and considering leaving politics, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure</i>	9
<i>Table A6: Gender and leaving specific roles, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure</i>	10
<i>Table A7: Gender and considering leaving specific roles, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure</i>	11
<i>Table A8: Gender and changing decisions, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure</i>	12
<i>Table A9: Gender and avoiding statements, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure</i>	13
<i>Table A10: Logit estimations of quantitative gendered representational costs of violence against politicians</i>	14
Appendix References	15

1. Methods description

Qualitative methods

Interviews are randomly denoted with numbers to ensure anonymity. See characteristics of interviewees in Table A1. The same number of women and men were interviewed in order to ascertain that I could compare their perspectives. Respondents were recruited in order to capture a range of perspectives (party identification, age, and degree of media visibility). Women and men were recruited as comparable pairs on these pre-known characteristics, but comparisons between women and men are made at the group level. Many attempts were made to recruit respondents from the Sweden democrats, but I only managed to interview one woman and one man from this party. Respondents from the rest of the parties largely correspond to their seat shares. I grouped together smaller parties according to their ideological orientations, based on the assumption that they are likely to attract the same kinds of opponents and perpetrators based on their party identifications. Media visibility has been identified as highly correlated with violence exposure in previous research. I coded politicians' visibility based on the number of hits per year during the last 5 years in the news media database Retriever. Since men politicians overall receive more media attention than women, I oversampled visible women.

Violence can be considered a sensitive topic, warranting specific ethical reflection and consideration. The interviews followed the Swedish Research Council's guidelines for research ethics (The Swedish Research Council 2017). Informed consent was obtained in writing for the majority of interviews, and verbally for a few which were carried out digitally. The informed consent included information about the fact that participation was voluntary, that respondents could choose to end the interview at any time without providing an explanation, and that the respondent could decline answering any question without explaining. No respondents ended the interview early or indicated a problem with carrying out the interview. Many asked to see the results and expressed an interest for the research project. Furthermore, the power asymmetries between me as a junior researcher and politicians as elites is not to their disadvantage (Aberbach and Rockman 2002; Harvey 2011). The risk that they would experience pressures to participate in the research project are hence comparatively small. Moreover, they are used to being interviewed, have received media training, and are highly skilled at avoiding answering questions that they do not wish to answer. This reduces the risk of pressuring respondents into discussing personally distressing experiences against their wishes.

Interviews typically lasted around 40-60 minutes. Since the purpose was to discuss consequences of violence, rather than the violence itself, I did not prompt respondents to reflect on specific types of violence. I asked open questions about situations when people had tried to threaten, intimidate, verbally assault or harass them, or been unnecessarily aggressive towards them. I also asked if they at any point had felt weighed down by their work, considered leaving, avoided debates, and what had made them think or feel this way. Questions were about citizen contacts at large, and problematic contacts in particular (see themes and sample questions listed below). In the beginning, interviews specifically asked about violence from citizens, other politicians, and family members and private contacts. Since most testimonies were about aggression from citizens, and survey data shows that this is most common (Håkansson 2021), in the majority of interviews I asked about aggression in general and only explicitly named citizens as potential perpetrators. However, for example asking whether they had received support from

their party in cases of violence could provide an opening to discuss violence coming from within the party.

Semi-structured interviews as a method entails that not all questions were asked to each respondent. The themes listed below were given different priority in different interviews according to respondents' time restrictions as well as how much they elaborated on a certain theme. Most interviews covered all of the themes but in a varying degree of depth, and some covered a smaller set of themes. The themes would also not always be addressed in the same order, but follow the flow of what the respondent talked about.

During the interviews, I used careful judgement to ensure that the interview situation and the questions asked did not make respondents uncomfortable. Interviewees seldom became emotional during interviews. Although experiencing violence as a politician can make individuals highly distressed, it is a fairly common experience. At the same time as affirming that violence against politicians is unacceptable, interviewees described seeing it as a part of political life. While violence can entail a stigma in relation to colleagues and voters (as I demonstrate in the manuscript), it is not seen as something shameful to talk about in a context where they remain anonymous. Furthermore, I did not ask respondents to elaborate in detail about violent incidents. I sometimes asked superficial questions about the incidents themselves for context (e.g. "Without going into details, can you describe what kind of message that was?"), but the questions mainly focused on the consequences of violence against politicians rather than the violence itself. Respondents would often describe events even if I did not ask them to do so (e.g. as a reply to a question of whether someone had at any point tried to scare them), indicating that they saw it as important to tell their stories. Many emphasized the urgency of the topic, in order to increase support for those that are badly affected.

The interview data was coded in NVivo and sorted into categories of costs to representation. While it was pre-defined that the interviews investigated impacts on descriptive, substantive and symbolic representation as well as on representatives' working environment more broadly, coding the material contributed to drawing the analytical lines between the categories. The coding focused on thematic consequences that frequently reoccurred in the material, and on themes that had gendered implications.

I sometimes indicate semi-quantitative information regarding the frequency of some themes that came up in the interviews. This is mainly done for themes that respondents brought up spontaneously without being prompted to do so. The purpose is to highlight that a certain theme seemed to be highly prevalent, or only mentioned by a few. I also sometimes indicate that a certain theme seemed to be prevalent among a subset of respondents e.g. women, based on many women and few men bringing it up spontaneously. Nevertheless, I avoid providing absolute numbers in relation to the prevalence of a theme among interviewees. Presenting precise numbers might give an incorrect impression, as the fact that some respondents did not mention a certain theme might be because the direction the interview took or because of time constraints.

Interview themes

- Citizen contacts (e.g. "are you often approached by citizens with direct contacts?", "How do you reason regarding what you respond to and not?")
- Personal experiences of violence (e.g. "have you experienced situations when people have tried to threaten, intimidate, verbally assault or harass you, or been unnecessarily aggressive towards you?")

- Consequences (e.g. “has this affected your work somehow?”, “Do you think about your security?”, “Is there anything you hesitate about doing with consideration to risks, such as taking on an assignment or expressing your views?”)
- Handling violence (e.g. “did you receive any kind of support from your party when this happened?”, “Did you tell your colleagues about this (why not?)?”)
- Future political career (e.g. “have you considered leaving politics and what has made you think along those lines?”)

Quantitative methods

The quantitative data used in this study is individual level information obtained from The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (<https://bra.se/bra-in-english/home/publications/archive/publications/2021-10-28-the-politicians-safety-survey-2021.html>). I am under contractual obligation not to disseminate these data to other individuals. Interested readers can apply for permission to purchase the data directly from the National Council for Crime Prevention (<https://bra.se/bra-in-english/home/about-bra.html>), granted permission from the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (see <https://etikprovningsmyndigheten.se/en/>).

2. Tables

Table A1: Interviewee characteristics

	All		Men		Women	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Party group						
Social Democrats	16	35%	8	35%	8	35%
Left/Green	6	13%	3	13%	3	13%
Centre/Liberals	8	17%	5	22%	3	13%
Moderate/Christian Democrats	14	30%	6	26%	8	35%
Sweden Democrats	2	4%	1	4%	1	4%
Assembly						
Parliament	6	13%	3	13%	3	13%
Municipality	12	26%	6	26%	6	26%
Both	28	61%	14	61%	14	61%
Age						
<40	15	33%	7	30%	8	35%
40-59	21	46%	11	48%	10	43%
60-70	10	22%	5	22%	5	22%
Media visibility						
Low	18	39%	10	43%	8	35%
Medium-low	14	30%	6	26%	8	35%
Medium-high	10	22%	5	22%	5	22%
High	4	9%	2	9%	2	9%
Geographical region						
North	5	11%	3	13%	2	9%
Middle	23	50%	10	43%	13	57%
South	18	39%	10	43%	8	35%

Table A2. Descriptive statistics of survey sample representativeness

	Men		Women		Total N
	Share in PTU	Share in population	Share in PTU	Share in population	
<i>Wave</i>					
2012	0.58	0.57	0.42	0.43	6 676
2014	0.58	0.57	0.42	0.43	7 276
2016	0.60	0.57	0.40	0.43	6 758
<i>Hierarchical level</i>					
Mayors	0.68	0.67	0.32	0.33	476
Committee chairs	0.64	0.63	0.36	0.37	3 660
Rank and file	0.57	0.57	0.43	0.43	16 574
<i>Party</i>					
Left party	0.52	0.52	0.48	0.48	1167
Social democrats	0.54	0.54	0.46	0.47	7297
Green party	0.52	0.51	0.48	0.50	1168
Centre party	0.57	0.57	0.43	0.43	2455
Christian democrats	0.60	0.60	0.40	0.40	902
Liberals	0.57	0.59	0.43	0.42	1341
Moderate party	0.63	0.61	0.37	0.39	4271
Sweden democrats	0.79	0.77	0.21	0.23	1334

Table A3: Descriptive statistics on consequences of violence

Survey item: "Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying ...	Share (average N per year)	Share among men	Share among women
... left all political assignments?"	.01 (90) <i>Municipal councillors: .01</i> <i>MPs: .01</i> <i>Politicians exposed to violence: .03</i>	.01 <i>Municipal councillors: .01</i> <i>MPs: .01</i>	.01 <i>Municipal councillors: .01</i> <i>MPs: .01</i>
... considered leaving all political assignments?"	.06 (496) <i>Municipal councillors: .06</i> <i>MPs: .07</i> <i>Politicians exposed to violence: .17</i>	.06 <i>Municipal councillors: .06</i> <i>MPs: .06</i>	.07 <i>Municipal councillors: .07</i> <i>MPs: .1</i>
... changed assignments or left a specific political assignment?"	.02 (141) <i>Municipal councillors: .02</i> <i>MPs: .02</i> <i>Politicians exposed to violence: .05</i>	.02 <i>Municipal councillors: .02</i> <i>MPs: .01</i>	.02 <i>Municipal councillors: .02</i> <i>MPs: .03</i>
... considered changing assignments or leaving a specific political assignment?"	.07 (537) <i>Municipal councillors: .07</i> <i>MPs: .07</i> <i>Politicians exposed to violence: .18</i>	.06 <i>Municipal councillors: .06</i> <i>MPs: .06</i>	.08 <i>Municipal councillors: .08</i> <i>MPs: .08</i>
... been affected to change a decision?"	.02 (149) <i>Municipal councillors: .02</i> <i>MPs: .01</i> <i>Politicians exposed to violence: .04</i>	.02 <i>Municipal councillors: .02</i> <i>MPs: .01</i>	.02 <i>Municipal councillors: .02</i> <i>MPs: .02</i>
... avoided engagement in or making statements about a certain issue?"	.13 (1 029) <i>Municipal councillors: .13</i> <i>MPs: .23</i> <i>Politicians exposed to violence: .26</i>	.12 <i>Municipal councillors: .12</i> <i>MPs: .18</i>	.15 <i>Municipal councillors: .15</i> <i>MPs: .29</i>

Table A4: Gender and leaving politics due to violence, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Female	-0.003*	-0.001	-0.000	-0.005	0.002	0.003	0.000	0.007
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.000)	(0.013)
Young		0.006	0.003	-0.005		-0.004	0.000	-0.009
		(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.009)		(0.003)	(0.000)	(0.006)
Newcomer		-0.004**	-0.001	-0.008		-0.010**	0.000	-0.014**
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.008)		(0.004)	(0.000)	(0.005)
Foreign background		0.007***	0.003*	0.015*		-0.007*	0.000	-0.012**
		(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.008)		(0.003)	(0.000)	(0.005)
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
FE for 290 municipalities		YES	YES	YES				
Constant	0.012***	0.008**	0.001	0.033**	0.007	0.011	0.000	0.018
	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.013)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.000)	(0.011)
			<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>			<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>
Observations	22,255	22,214	17,152	5,062	497	496	186	310
R-squared	0.000	0.020	0.018	0.081	0.000	0.016		0.026

Notes: Survey item: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying left all political assignments?” *Young* is defined as below 35 years of age. *Newcomer* is defined as serving one’s first term as an elected politician. *Foreign background* is defined as being foreign born or having foreign born parents. Fixed effects (FE) for 8 political parties and three years included in models 2-4 and 6-8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2-4. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-4, and at party and year in models 5-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A5: Gender and considering leaving politics, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Female	0.017*** (0.004)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.040*** (0.014)	0.049** (0.022)	0.026 (0.020)	0.074* (0.036)
Young	0.047*** (0.010)	0.019** (0.007)	0.041* (0.022)	0.127* (0.062)	0.089 (0.084)	0.136* (0.077)
Newcomer	-0.014*** (0.005)	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.018 (0.017)	-0.033 (0.041)	-0.020 (0.014)	-0.046 (0.067)
Foreign background	0.034*** (0.007)	0.019*** (0.005)	0.053*** (0.018)	0.016 (0.019)	-0.019 (0.013)	0.020 (0.029)
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
FE for 290 municipalities	YES	YES	YES			
Constant	0.043*** (0.008)	0.021*** (0.006)	0.129*** (0.027)	-0.042** (0.019)	-0.017 (0.013)	-0.042 (0.025)
		<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>		<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>
Observations	22,417	17,242	5,175	497	187	310
R-squared	0.038	0.032	0.093	0.058	0.085	0.073

Notes: Survey item: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying considered leaving all political assignments?” Variables defined as in table A4. Fixed effects (FE) for 8 political parties and three years included in models 2-4 and 6-8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2-4. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-4, and at party and year in models 5-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A6: Gender and leaving specific roles, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Female	0.004*	0.005***	0.003**	0.013*	0.013	0.016	0.008	0.016
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.009)	(0.018)
Young		0.013**	-0.001	0.017		-0.011	-0.005	-0.021
		(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.013)		(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)
Newcomer		-0.005*	0.000	-0.012		0.003	-0.020	0.013
		(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.010)		(0.026)	(0.017)	(0.042)
Foreign background		0.008**	0.002	0.023**		0.020	0.049	0.008
		(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.011)		(0.015)	(0.043)	(0.020)
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
FE for 290 municipalities		YES	YES	YES				
Constant	0.016***	0.008**	0.008**	0.015	0.014**	-0.004	0.007	-0.002
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.014)
			<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>			<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>
Observations	22,309	22,268	17,199	5,069	500	499	187	312
R-squared	0.000	0.018	0.020	0.070	0.002	0.020	0.072	0.031

Notes: Survey item: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying changed assignments or left a specific political assignment?” Variables defined as in table A4. Fixed effects (FE) for 8 political parties and three years included in models 2-4 and 6-8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2-4. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-4, and at party and year in models 5-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A7: Gender and considering leaving specific roles, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Female	0.020*** (0.004)	0.023*** (0.004)	0.012*** (0.003)	0.051*** (0.013)	0.017 (0.022)	0.022 (0.024)	0.003 (0.012)	0.036 (0.041)
Young		0.057*** (0.010)	0.028*** (0.008)	0.057** (0.023)		0.113** (0.051)	-0.006 (0.015)	0.124* (0.064)
Newcomer		-0.012*** (0.005)	-0.000 (0.004)	-0.018 (0.016)		-0.007 (0.042)	-0.018 (0.015)	-0.016 (0.070)
Foreign background		0.032*** (0.006)	0.017*** (0.005)	0.059*** (0.017)		0.016 (0.017)	0.045 (0.045)	-0.010 (0.022)
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
FE for 290 municipalities		YES	YES	YES				
Constant	0.057*** (0.002)	0.036*** (0.008)	0.022*** (0.006)	0.098*** (0.025)	0.060*** (0.012)	0.013 (0.023)	0.003 (0.007)	0.027 (0.034)
			<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>			<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>
Observations	22,567	22,525	17,308	5,217	501	500	187	313
R-squared	0.002	0.035	0.029	0.091	0.001	0.053	0.091	0.055

Notes: Survey item: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying considered changing assignments or leaving a specific political assignment?” Variables defined as in table A4. Fixed effects (FE) for 8 political parties and three years included in models 2-4 and 6-8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2-4. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-4, and at party and year in models 5-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A8: Gender and changing decisions, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Female	0.000 (0.002)	0.002 (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)	0.008 (0.006)	0.008 (0.009)	0.011 (0.009)	0.009 (0.011)	0.010 (0.017)
Young		0.012** (0.005)	0.008 (0.005)	0.011 (0.009)		-0.002 (0.023)	-0.034 (0.035)	0.003 (0.025)
Newcomer		-0.005* (0.003)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.010 (0.008)		0.012 (0.022)	-0.011 (0.011)	0.022 (0.041)
Foreign background		0.007** (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)	0.016* (0.008)		0.021 (0.018)	0.043 (0.037)	0.011 (0.023)
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
FE for 290 municipalities		YES	YES	YES				
Constant	0.020*** (0.001)	0.011*** (0.004)	0.008** (0.004)	0.020 (0.012)	0.011 (0.006)	-0.019 (0.013)	-0.009 (0.008)	-0.019 (0.017)
			<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>			<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>
Observations	22,279	22,238	17,189	5,049	498	497	187	310
R-squared	0.000	0.018	0.020	0.067	0.001	0.048	0.101	0.052

Notes: Survey item: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying been affected to change a decision?” Variables defined as in table A4. Fixed effects (FE) for 8 political parties and three years included in models 2-4 and 6-8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2-4. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-4, and at party and year in models 5-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A9: Gender and avoiding statements, separate analyses for politicians with and without violence exposure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Female	0.031*** (0.006)	0.019*** (0.005)	0.063*** (0.015)	0.124*** (0.030)	0.053 (0.056)	0.168*** (0.044)
Young	0.119*** (0.013)	0.100*** (0.013)	0.090*** (0.023)	0.052 (0.074)	-0.045 (0.093)	0.049 (0.092)
Newcomer	-0.003 (0.007)	-0.002 (0.007)	0.033* (0.018)	0.010 (0.080)	-0.075 (0.096)	0.046 (0.111)
Foreign background	0.037*** (0.008)	0.023*** (0.007)	0.066*** (0.019)	0.091* (0.052)	0.196 (0.120)	0.050 (0.048)
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
FE for 290 municipalities	YES	YES	YES			
Constant	0.092*** (0.012)	0.075*** (0.012)	0.150*** (0.029)	0.026 (0.060)	0.227 (0.190)	-0.030 (0.057)
		<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>		<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>All municipal councillors</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>	<i>All MPs</i>	<i>not exposed to violence</i>	<i>exposed to violence</i>
Observations	22,542	17,341	5,201	503	190	313
R-squared	0.047	0.037	0.099	0.072	0.126	0.092

Notes: Survey item: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying avoided engagement in or making statements about a certain issue?” Variables defined as in Table A4. Fixed effects (FE) for 8 political parties and three years included in models 2-4 and 6-8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2-4. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-4, and at party and year in models 5-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A10: Logit estimations of quantitative gendered representational costs of violence against politicians

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
		Considered leaving politics				Avoided statements			
Female	0.215*** (0.072)	0.295*** (0.074)	0.775** (0.328)	0.848** (0.346)	0.224*** (0.048)	0.275*** (0.048)	0.671*** (0.182)	0.746*** (0.185)	
Young		0.638*** (0.112)		1.547*** (0.526)		0.837*** (0.074)		0.297 (0.386)	
Newcomer		-0.205** (0.081)		-0.480 (0.592)		-0.008 (0.059)		0.069 (0.465)	
Foreign background		0.488*** (0.085)		0.207 (0.246)		0.293*** (0.060)		0.505* (0.273)	
FE for 8 political parties and 3 years		YES		YES		YES		YES	
Constant	-2.837*** (0.051)	-3.034*** (0.142)	-3.019*** (0.226)	-18.421*** (0.810)	-1.971*** (0.037)	-2.238*** (0.106)	-1.551*** (0.177)	-2.643*** (0.614)	
<i>Sample</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>Municipal councillors</i>	<i>MPs</i>	<i>MPs</i>	
Observations	22,459	22,417	498	497	22,584	22,542	505	503	

Notes: Survey item M1-4: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying considered leaving all political assignments?”; M5-8: “Have you at any point during the previous year, due to exposure and/or worrying, avoided engagement in or making statements about a certain issue?” Variables defined as in Table A4. Fixed effects (FE) for three years and 8 political parties included in models 2, 4, 6 and 8. FE for 290 municipalities are included in model 2 and 6. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at municipality in models 1-2 and 5-6, and at party and year in models 3-4 and 7-8. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Appendix References

- Aberbach, Joel D., and Bert A. Rockman. 2002. "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4): 673–76.
- Håkansson, Sandra. 2021. "Do Women Pay a Higher Price for Power? Gender Bias in Political Violence in Sweden." *The Journal of Politics* 83(2): 515–31.
- Harvey, William S. 2011. "Strategies for Conducting Elite Interviews." *Qualitative Research* 11(4): 431–41.
- The Swedish Research Council. 2017. *Good Research Practice*. Stockholm: The Swedish Research Council. text. 978-91-7307-354-7.