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I. Additional information on data quality

The survey data used was conducted as an online survey (N = 1,001). It was administered by Demetra opinioni.net Italy between 30 August and 13 September 2017, using predetermined quotas for age/sex combinations, level of education, and geographical region (see De Sio 2019). Albeit there have been tremendous improvements, quota samples based on online access panels still face the danger of being less representative than data collected with other modes and methods. Fortunately, this is not the case with our data at hand. In this section, we present some comparison based on the face-to-face (F2F) pre-election survey conducted by the German Longitudinal Elections Study GLES (Roßteutscher et al. 2018) in terms of party vote recall. In fact, the data used in this analysis is only slightly less representative than the GLES data. Taking into account that the GLES survey is based on more than double the number of respondents and constitutes the most high quality data available, this makes us very confident regarding the validity of our findings.

The following table (Table A1) holds information on how well our online survey and the GLES survey each represent the electoral results of the 2013 Federal election based on their recall question for the second ballot (party vote). We only use information on the six major parties which nevertheless accounts for close to 94 percent of all votes cast. Hence, proportions have been recalibrated summing up to 100 per cent. Number for the GLES F2F survey are only weighted to account for sampling design while the online survey data is unweighted as unweighted figures are the only valid indicators of the degree of representativeness.
Table A1: Comparing survey quality based on vote recall

| Party/Group | Actual vote share | GLES F2F survey vote share | GLES F2F survey | Online survey vote share | Online survey |
|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
|             |                   | diff                        |                 |                          |               |
| CDU/CSU     | 44.29             | 43.40                       | 0.89            | 37.11                    | 7.18          |
| SPD         | 27.43             | 26.18                       | 1.25            | 27.45                    | 0.02          |
| AfD         | 5.01              | 2.22                        | 2.80            | 5.32                     | 0.30          |
| FDP         | 5.12              | 7.36                        | 2.24            | 5.12                     | 0.20          |
| The Left    | 9.18              | 7.11                        | 2.07            | 13.31                    | 4.13          |
| Greens      | 8.96              | 13.7                        | 4.74            | 5.32                     | 2.52          |

Note: Data for the GLES F2F survey is presented with weights accounting for sampling design while the online data is unweighted.

Looking to the columns presenting the absolute deviations between the surveys and the actual election result, we see differences regarding specific parties between the two surveys. However, there is no clear pattern. The GLES survey is clearly performing better when it comes to the CDU/CSU and to a certain degree when it comes to the Left. For the remaining four parties, the online survey outperforms the face-to-face survey. Calculating the Duncan Index of Dissimilarity results in more or less identical values (GLES survey: 6.99; online survey: 7.18).

Assuming that the GLES face-to-face survey which applied textbook sampling and survey strategies is representative, there is no reason to doubt our online survey. As all calculations of aggregated values using our survey data make use of a post-stratification weight combining socio-demographic characteristics (sex, age, geographical area, education) and past vote recall, there is even less of a problem. In fact, calculating the Duncan Index for the weighted online data and the actual 2013 election results leaves us with a tiny value of mere 0.79.

II. Additional robustness checks for our main model (Model 3)

As outlined in the main text, issue selection and the validity of questionnaire formulations are crucial to the validity of our results. To ensure that our results regarding the third expectation are not driven by peculiarities of one of the 27 positional and valence issues covered in this study, we ran some additional tests.

First of all, Table A2 compares the results of our main model for estimations with regular and cluster-corrected standard errors. In the latter model, cluster-corrected refers to the 27 issues and the fact that errors might not be independent for the six parties regarding the same issue. The last column on the right presents these cluster-corrected standard errors. Fortunately,
there are no substantive differences to the original model with uncorrected standard errors. As expected, standard errors for issue yield and systemic issue salience increase in size. However, both coefficients remain statistically significant below p = 0.05.

*Table A2: Comparing regular and cluster-corrected standard errors*

| Coefficient  | Regular SE  | Cluster-corrected SE |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
| General yield | 0.062       | 0.010***             | 0.013***             |
| Systemic issue salience | 0.028       | 0.009***             | 0.014**             |
| Base category: AfD CDU/CSU | -0.021     | 0.016               | 0.014               |
| SPD          | -0.039      | 0.017**              | 0.016**             |
| FDP          | 0.005       | 0.015               | 0.012               |
| Left         | -0.009      | 0.016               | 0.016               |
| Greens       | -0.014      | 0.016               | 0.015               |
| Constant     | -0.097      | 0.030***             | 0.041**             |
| sigma Constant | 0.054       | 0.003***             | 0.006***             |

| Observations | 162 |
| VarExp       | 0.264 |

Tobit regression. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01.

In a second robustness check, we reran the original model 27 times while each time leaving out one of the issues. In doing so, the number of cases drops from 162 to 156 but it allows us to investigate whether one of the issues has a very strong effect on our results. We decided to present the results graphically. Figure A1 depicts the coefficients and the t-values for issue yield (top panel) and systemic issue salience (bottom panel) for all 27 Tobit regression models. The horizontal line refers to the minimal t-value for statistical significance at p = 0.05 for a model with 148 degrees of freedom. The two dashed vertical lines present the range of the respective coefficient from the original model including all 27 issues. The range is defined as the 95% confidence interval.
Leaving out any of the 27 issues has no impact on the substantive interpretation of our results. All coefficients remain statistically significant and they are all very close to the original coefficients as none even threatens to cross any of the vertical lines. We also see that our finding that issue yield is more important than systemic issue salience is robust as the coefficients for issue yield are all much larger than those for systemic issue salience. In sum, we conclude that our results are not driven by single peculiar issues but are very robust to additional and more demanding model specifications.
## III. Additional tables

### Table A3: The 17 selected positional issues

| Dimension | Issue               | Left/GAL position                                                                 | Right/TAN position                                                                 |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cultural  | Energy Politics     | Building more wind turbines in order to manage the change towards producing sustainable energy | Stop building wind turbines in order to protect the landscape                     |
| Cultural  | Diesel Car Ban      | Diesel cars should be banned.                                                      | No cars should be banned.                                                         |
| Cultural  | Nuclear Phase Out   | Keep the decision of nuclear power phase-out and the end of coal powered electricity | Withdraw the decision of nuclear power phase-out and the end of coal powered electricity |
| Cultural  | EU membership       | Stay in the EU                                                                     | Leave the EU                                                                       |
| Economic  | Euro                | In order to maintain the Euro, Germany should transfer money to poorer countries.  | Germany should not pay any money to poorer countries within the Eurozone.          |
| Cultural  | EU/Refugees         | The EU has to enforce refugee quotas in all member states.                         | Each member state of the EU should decide on its own on refugee quotas.           |
| Cultural  | Refugees            | Accept more refugees                                                               | Limit the number of refugees                                                      |
| Cultural  | Immigration         | Keep current immigration rules                                                     | Make immigration rules more restrictive                                           |
| Cultural  | Integration         | Require foreigners in Germany to fully adapt to national culture                  | Allow foreigners in Germany to preserve their own culture                         |
| Cultural  | Gender Quota        | Politics should implement gender quota in order to guarantee that all important jobs are equally given to women and men | Politics should not enforce gender quotas                                           |
| Cultural  | Gay Marriage        | Keep gay marriages                                                                 | Repeal gay marriages                                                              |
| Cultural  | Referenda           | Introduce possibilities for binding referenda                                       | Only keep the current possibilities for non-binding referenda                       |
| Economic  | Taxes vs. Spending  | The current budget surplus should be used for reducing taxes.                     | The current budget surplus should be used for investing in infrastructure and education. |
| Economic  | Pensions            | Lower pension age                                                                  | Increase pension age                                                              |
| Economic  | Income Distribution | Reduce income differences                                                          | Don't reduce income differences                                                   |
| Economic  | Minimal Wage        | Minimal wages should be increased to a minimum of 10 EUR.                          | Minimal wages should be abolished.                                                |
| Economic  | Labour Market       | Deregulate the job market, especially regarding working hours and job protection   | Keep current regulations in the job market, especially regarding working hours and job protection |
### Table A4: The ten selected valence issues

| Valence Issue                                   | CDU/CSU | SPD | AfD | FDP | Left | Greens |
|------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|------|--------|
| Protect environment                             | 0.14    | 0.36| 0.06| 0.13| 0.22 | 0.27   |
| Terrorism                                       | 0.08    | 0.32| 0.09| 0.07| 0.37 | 0.06   |
| Family and children                             | 0.14    | 0.43| 0.05| 0.07| 0.41 | 0.24   |
| Fighting against crime                         | 0.17    | 0.40| 0.03| 0.10| 0.36 | 0.17   |
| Social justice                                  | 0.08    | 0.24| 0.05| 0.08| 0.30 | 0.11   |
| Affordable homes                                | 0.22    | 0.23| 0.26| 0.06| 0.10 | 0.26   |
| Fighting poverty of elderly people              |         |     |     |     |      |        |
| Infrastructure                                  |         |     |     |     |      |        |
| Unemployment                                    |         |     |     |     |      |        |
| Economic growth                                 |         |     |     |     |      |        |

### Table A5: Issue Yield for all economic issues and parties

| Issue Description                               | CDU/CSU | SPD | AfD | FDP | Left | Greens |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|------|--------|
| Surplus to reduce taxes/invest                  | 0.14    | 0.36| 0.06| 0.13| 0.22 | 0.27   |
| Do not/reduce income differences                 | 0.08    | 0.32| 0.09| 0.07| 0.37 | 0.06   |
| Increase/keep minimum wage                      | 0.14    | 0.43| 0.05| 0.07| 0.41 | 0.24   |
| Decrease/keep job market regulations            | 0.17    | 0.40| 0.03| 0.10| 0.36 | 0.17   |
| Keep/increase pension age                       | 0.08    | 0.24| 0.05| 0.08| 0.30 | 0.11   |
| Pay/do not pay money to save €                   | 0.22    | 0.23| 0.26| 0.06| 0.10 | 0.26   |

Note: Figures represent issue-yield scores. Gray boxes refer to right economic positions while all remaining figures refer to a higher issue yield of left stances.
Table A6: Issue Yield for all cultural issues and parties

| Issue                                                 | CDU/CSU | SPD | AfD | FDP | Left | Greens |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|------|--------|
| Leave/stay in the EU                                   | 0.64    | 0.54| 0.21| 0.35| 0.19 | 0.32   |
| Yes/no gender quotas                                    | 0.14    | 0.28| 0.11| 0.35| 0.17 | 0.23   |
| Keep/shut down nuclear plants                          | 0.28    | 0.28| 0.11| 0.08| 0.16 | 0.43   |
| Keep/abolish gay marriage                              | 0.15    | 0.43| 0.09| 0.10| 0.29 | 0.42   |
| Keep/abolish gay marriage                              | 0.15    | 0.43| 0.09| 0.10| 0.29 | 0.42   |
| Keep/restrict immigration laws                          | 0.27    | 0.13| 0.34| 0.19| 0.07 | 0.22   |
| Yes/no referenda                                        | 0.10    | 0.15| 0.14| 0.16| 0.23 | 0.18   |
| State/EU decides refugee quota                         | 0.37    | 0.22| 0.24| 0.13| 0.06 | 0.12   |
| Ban/do not ban diesel cars                             | 0.25    | 0.16| 0.16| 0.15| 0.09 | 0.43   |
| More/no more wind turbines                             | 0.12    | 0.20| 0.08| 0.09| 0.08 | 0.46   |
| Full/no assimilation                                   | 0.29    | 0.12| 0.37| 0.17| 0.14 | 0.29   |
| More/limit refugees                                    | 0.29    | 0.11| 0.34| 0.17| 0.18 | 0.24   |

Note: Figures represent issue-yield scores. Gray boxes refer to TAN cultural positions while all remaining figures refer to a higher issue yield of GAL stances.
Table A7: Additional Tobit Regressions for Figure 4

|                      | (4) Interaction with party dummies | (5) Interaction with issue types |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Issue yield          | 0.167*** (0.027)                   | 0.080*** (0.015)                |
| Systemic issue salience | 0.014 (0.021)                      | 0.037* (0.021)                 |
| **Base category: AfD** |                                    |                                 |
| Union                | 0.082 (0.088)                      | -0.026 (0.016)                 |
| SPD                  | -0.033 (0.095)                     | -0.043** (0.017)               |
| FDP                  | -0.035 (0.096)                     | -0.003 (0.015)                 |
| Left                 | -0.039 (0.094)                     | -0.012 (0.015)                 |
| Greens               | -0.028 (0.094)                     | -0.014 (0.015)                 |
| Union # Issue yield  | -0.146*** (0.033)                 |                                 |
| SPD # Issue yield    | -0.125*** (0.035)                 |                                 |
| FDP # Issue yield    | -0.152*** (0.046)                 |                                 |
| Left # Issue yield   | -0.083** (0.037)                   |                                 |
| Greens # Issue yield | -0.096*** (0.037)                 |                                 |
| Union # Systemic issue salience | -0.000 (0.030) |                                 |
| SPD # Systemic issue salience | 0.026 (0.030) |                                 |
| FDP # Systemic issue salience | 0.042 (0.032) |                                 |
| Left # Systemic issue salience | 0.023 (0.030) |                                 |
| Greens # Systemic issue salience | 0.021 (0.029) |                                 |
| **Base category: valence** |                                    |                                 |
| Positional           | 0.031 (0.081)                      |                                 |
| Positional # Issue yield | -0.025 (0.018)                  |                                 |
| Positional # Systemic issue salience | 0.006 (0.024) |                                 |
| Sigma                | 0.049*** (0.003)                   | 0.052*** (0.074)               |
| Constant             | -0.113* (0.065)                    | 0.052*** (0.003)               |
| Observations         | 162                                | 162                             |
| VarExp               | 0.378                              | 0.298                           |

Tobit regression with standard errors in parentheses. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01.
IV. Additional figures

Figure A2: Distribution of positions regarding all 17 positional issues

Note: Subplots represent histograms. 'L' refers to the most 'Left/GAL' position while 'R' refers to the most 'Right/TAN' position.
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