Digitizing Government Relations: Increasing Community Amongst Advocates with Electronic

Advocacy Tools to Enhance Lobbying

Prepared by Christopher Smillie

For Professor Dave Scholz, MA

MCM 740

McMaster University

April 9, 2017

Abstract

This study examined participation in online advocacy portals for government relations purposes and studied the related propensity to take political action by participants. In addition, this study examined opinion formation regarding political leaders and issues informed by portal participation. This study undertakes to answer a number of questions aimed at determining if advocacy organizations are well served by using these tools as part of their government relations programs. An online email survey was sent to all portal users of www.workersbuildcanada.ca, an online advocacy portal operated by Canada's Building Trades Unions to augment traditional government relations activities. Participation in an online portal increases propensity of advocates to take political action overall and helps to shape opinion on political issues and elected officials for the users. Advocates also experience an increased sense of connectedness to other members of the portal creating an increased sense of community. There are important evidenced differences in the voting and political behaviours of advocates based on partisan attachment levels. Those who identify as politically partisan are more likely to take political action in an online advocacy portal than those who identify as not politically attached. This partisan split also revealed differing levels of perceived importance placed on values and traits sought in elected officials. Member based organizations can improve overall satisfaction levels and feelings of connectedness of members to the organization by offering these kinds of advocacy tools. Organizations should make these tools available to identified partisan supporters to optimize participation in lobbying activities.

Introduction

Advocacy, communications, public relations, and lobbying are all essential interrelated components of a vibrant democracy. Open and free access to government by citizens and organizations is essential to a vibrant democracy. Lobbying is as old as governing itself and transcends democracies, dictatorships, and even personal relationships. The role of government in the modern age is to set the rules of the game in business, in social policy, and to provide collective security of citizens. Beyond voting, citizens and organizations can get involved in shaping the rules and even referee governments by lobbying and engaging in government relations. Schepers (2010) argues "Lobbying is simply seeking to influence public authorities to take account of private views and interest while deciding the public interest..." (p.477). Schepers outlines three functions for the modern state:

1. The provision of law and order, internally and externally

2. Redistribution of welfare and the provision of a minimum living standard

3. The organization of the economic market.

Technology is changing and fundamentally altering communication patterns between citizens and governments, giving way to new kinds of advocacy campaigns and the digitization of public affairs and government relations. Campaign organizations and governments are using digital platforms and social networking platforms to reach audiences in communication and electioneering activities. Groups of citizens and advocacy organizations are grouping large numbers of citizens together for political purposes and communicating with government using technology to amplify messages and reach of advocacy efforts.

Personal values and personality traits of individual citizens impact propensity to vote, take political action, and ultimately influence political values sought in political leaders in a democracy.   Organizations need to understand values, traits and partisan attachment tendencies of the community of advocates when approaching governments and other influencers in advocacy campaigns. Vote intention and partisan attachment is a highly personal and complicated process. Traditionally, the body of scholarly research has attributed the process to political knowledge, socioeconomic status, income, education level information (election) campaigns and issue motivation of voters. More recent research has focused on individual personality structure, personal values, and personality traits as foundational to political choice. Recent research work focuses attention on psychology's Big Five personality traits as conduits for predictable and repeatable behaviours and attitudes by individuals. It is proposed by some recent scholars, voting is driven by the personalities of the electors and candidates, as many or most candidates are centrist – voters have little or no other distinguishing characteristics to divide candidates in otherwise overlapping centrist countries. Why do individuals turn to political parties? For citizens, decision making in politics is difficult. Recent literature hypothesizes voters turn to political parties for assistance and certainty when individuals lack the proper information to make a decision.

Literature Review

Government relations and lobbying are certainly distinct from Public Relations in founding theory. The volume of founding literature in PR is relatively silent on lobbying and government relations. Grunig's work "Two Way Symmetrical Public Relations: Past Present and Future" (2001) goes as far as to acknowledge that it is essentially autonomous from the PR

function entirely.   Grunig's Public Information Model is the most applicable PR theory to the

majority of lobbying activity in the developed world.   The principles of this model provide

grounding in reality for most advocacy issues and reflect the real power balance between

organizations and government in North America.   Bennedsen and Felman (2005) call the

Public Information model "informational lobbying". Generally, as confirmed by Victor (2007)

"groups select targets and tactics strategically…and the probability that an individual legislator

will help them achieve their goals (p829). Schepers goes as far as to say that companies or

organizations may have highly developed Corporate Social Responsibility models developed to

protect the perceived public interest yet in a private setting, lobby governments for opposite

outcomes for organizational gain.   The underlying premise in all these activities is the

assumption the policies sought (or changed) will attract votes. Weber (1996) says "lobbyists are

successful in affecting the political process because they are successful in becoming an important

part of the process" (p.255).   Ostas (2007) says lobbying "can be defined as a deliberate attempt

to effect or to resist change in the law through direct communications with public policy makers"

(p.33). There is a calculation on the bargain struck between the lobbyist and the elected official

on vote gain and policy change. The elected official projects the change will be appealing to

enough voters in the next election and the change is made. Voting and the promise of a vote

drives most political behaviour.

So, what kind of lobbying can organizations undertake? Victor (2007) says organizations

and lobbyists spread their resources widely "by responding strategically to legislative contexts"

(p.826). There are essentially two tactics employed by groups and individual lobbyists –what

Victor calls either direct lobbying or indirect lobbying.   In direct lobbying, meetings with

elected officials and the presentation of information either for or contra a Bill are the most

common methods employed. For indirect lobbying, organizations run advertisements, engage

coalitions and or speak with the media about an issue to affect the opinion of the elected official.

Most organizations employ a host of these tactics in campaigns and the decision-making process

is complex to arrive at a mix of methods. Victor (2007) argues groups spend limited resources

strategically based on environmental and contextual situations. Galer-Unti (2010) says while

"traditional methods of advocacy such as letters to editors, public service announcements, and

visits with policy makers are proven and worthwhile…it is also wise to develop new methods for

advocacy" (p.785). Galer-Unti outlines five electronic methods of communication as emerging

lobbying tools.   Most influential amongst these five according to Galer-Unti is "real-time

communication (which) has the potential to change and enhance advocacy work" (p.785). The

study cites email lists blasts, Twitter, blogs, YouTube and BlogTalkRadio as effective real time

communication tools.

Driving Forces in Voting Behaviour and Voting Intention

Political advertising, information campaigns, and electoral campaigns all impact voting

behaviour and voting intention. The impact of advertising is changing politics. In fact, the

fundamental nature of advertising is changing and thus a study of voter behaviour requires a

number of basic questions establishing what kind of advertising, if any, impacts vote decision.

Yoon and Pinkleton (2005) argue in recent elections in the United States, more than half of

political campaign advertising budgets are devoted to negative advertising. According to Yoon,

Prime Minister Tony Blair successfully used negative advertisements to handily defeat

opposition candidates in the United Kingdom.   Negative political advertising becomes more

influential when credible sources endorse candidates and enhance the credibility of the

candidate. Yoon (2005) says even if voters dislike the negative advertising behaviour, "a highly

credible source might increase the effectiveness of negative political advertising (p.96).   Yoon argues there is evidence of "negativity effects" in perceptions and behaviour including increased voter turnout.   There is also a body of evidence outlining decreased political participation as a result of increased cynicism with negative campaigns and reduced voter turnout. According to Yoon, this is especially true when voters have low engagement in the political process before being exposed to negative campaigns.

The way in which groups of voters receive information is foundational to how the information is interpreted. Clark (2008) says the rapid pace of change in communication technology has increased the likelihood individuals with similar interests are sharing information. People with similar interests are more connected on social media to the exclusion of less similar individuals. According to Clark (2010) social networking sites have fundamentally changed the way in which political advertising targets voters. It has also altered the way in which voters interact with elected officials between elections. In the United States in 2009, Obama for America used a database of more than 13 million citizens to fundraise, mobilize and communicate with voters. Clark (2010) states observers of the 2008 Canadian Federal election "saw impressive advances of web-based campaign tactics…" (p.2).   Clark indicates however, there have been no appreciable increases in voter turnout during elections or political knowledge in Canada or the United States as direct result of changes in technology. In addition, traditional sources of information for voters during election campaigns remain unchanged.   New technology is being used by the individuals with already high levels of political knowledge to consume more information about an issue or event. Baek (2014) studied social networking sites in Korea and determined individuals who were non-voters in the past and who participate in a social networking site are more likely to vote because of their peers

encouraging the behaviour, not necessarily merely the information received over the social networking site.   The mobilization effect was contextual and was not empirically large. Baek also noted the information on social networking site is by nature short and not detailed. The research insinuates voters recruited by social networking sites "could be less informed and less balanced" than traditional highly engaged voters (p.18). Baek found political social networking sites or networking sites used to disseminate political information initiated voting behaviour amongst individual who had not previously voted and did not impact the propensity of past voters when messages were sent to them.

There are certain traits which people see as essential in their leaders. Leadership desirability traits play an important role in communication cues with voters. Organizational leadership theory is useful in the analysis of studying political leadership. According to Cottrell and Nichols' 2014 study in The Leadership Quarterly, "If organizations consider what subordinates want in their leader, in addition to past performance, the success of leadership selection, development, and promotion is likely to increase" (p.712). The linkages to politics here is natural. What kind of leader do voters want? What kind of leaders should political parties elect to appeal to voters in a broader campaign? Cottrell and Nichols concluded for (high level leaders like the President of the United States and other political leaders) people desired leaders who show higher than average levels of trustworthiness, intelligence, emotional stability, cooperativeness, ambition, cooperativeness and (surprisingly) physical health. These traits did differ in the research for lower level leaders like low level managers or teachers.

Politically skilled individuals are defined by Ferris & Treadway et al (2005) as people who "combine social astuteness with the capacity to adjust their behavior to different and changing situational demands in a manner that appears to be sincere, inspires support and trust, and effectively influences and controls the resources of others (p.127-8)". In addition, the study defines self-confidence (without being arrogant or self-absorbed) with an outward focus towards others not self-directed per se. Ferris et al. developed a political skill inventory which comprised four major components : 1. social astuteness, 2. interpersonal influence, 3. networking ability and 4. apparent sincerity. All four of these categories are significant for measuring political leaders and meshes well with the work of Cottrell and Nichols in terms of what individuals desire in leaders. The study concluded "it (emotional intelligence) was not highly correlated with political skill…but a significant correlation exists" (128-9).

Some early studies in psychopathology tried to link psychological traits to leaders and political personalities. Little success was realized in early psychology science to connect specific personality traits and leadership success in politicians. Emerging literature (similar to Max Weber's charismatic leadership study) argues it is not a requirement for political leaders to actually possess traits but is sufficient for the leader to convince the followers to believe they do. Diego Garzia (2011) says that politics has changed in Western democracies and leaders are taking centre stage in the process because technology and communication methods are becoming more personalized. The fundamental consequence of this change is the way voters evaluate and judge political leaders is altered. Voters now judge political leaders as persons and this has forced political leaders to symbolically and necessarily create closeness to the masses. Garzia says this "everyman" leader is now a requirement of modern democracies. Voters choose leaders

who act and talk similar to themselves. No longer are modern voters demanding leaders with an aura of superiority.   This fundamentally means the way political leaders (and parties) attract voters has been radically altered. Garzia argues "the personalization of politics lies indeed in the growing impact of leaders' personality on individuals vote behaviour (p.698)". For Garzia, the major traits necessary for electoral success are honesty and trustworthiness.

So, what impacts voting, vote intention and the propensity to take political action? Traditional voting theory teaches voting intention has a great deal to do with political knowledge and information presented to voters at election time.   Singh and Roy (2013) say "those who are most informed and most able to make sense of complex political environments are more likely to think in ideological terms or base their vote in ideological criteria…" (p.91).   Emerging research shows those who do not have the breadth of political knowledge or information use cues to process the decision and "may in the end arrive at the same choice they would have had they been fully informed" (Ibid.). For example, a candidate's party affiliation or projected social information about that candidate might fill in the knowledge gaps for certain segments of uninformed voters. Singh finds a positive relationship between political knowledge and the breadth of information sought in the voting process.   Others argue voting is primarily concerned with personal feelings and emotions associated with pleasure in the process. Bischoff and Neuhaus (2013) liken voting to cheering at a sporting event, something which yields a level of usefulness or utility. They argue as long as the spectator does not perceive his or her cheer to be persuasive, he or she chooses the most expressive choice. In turn, this kind of voting does not produce collective policy choices per se, Bischoff and Neuhaus say it encourages elected officials to create policy which makes people feel "good".

Groups of voters which share common demographic and even racial traits can show similarity in voting behaviour. This is why studying union groups is so illustrative. According to Clark and Masters (2001) union groups are relatively cohesive economic cohorts but widely distinct in other regards. Union members are more likely in the United States to register and vote on Election Day than non-union members. According to Clark and Masters (2001) "the evidence suggests that union members differ in their political preferences and may be influenced by union electioneering" (p.106). In a study of the 2004 Presidential Election, Donald Beachler (2007) examined campaign issues and voting behaviour of union members in the United States. He concludes union voters are more likely to vote against their economic interest if other wedge issues are used by candidates. Union voters were more likely to vote for a republican candidate if the voters owned a gun. Beachler ultimately found religious belief was a better vote determinant than union membership, although union voters were more likely to vote for a democratic candidate if they were not evangelical Christians. Factors such as geographic region, ethnicity and age also affect voting patterns. For example, African American voters in the 2004 Presidential Election in the United States overwhelmingly supported John Kerry. According to Wallace and Abjuk-Khaliq (2009) voting results are polarized based on ethnicity and party affiliation. So, cohesive economic groups of voters like union members (if no ethnic and wedge issues are present) tend to vote in a similar fashion and vote in higher numbers than the general population.

Voting patterns and ultimately, the decision of individuals to claim political attachment have significant grounding in the personality structure of individuals. According to John & Srivastava (1999), there are five major personality traits studied at length by the academic community; agreeableness, openness, emotional stability, conscientiousness and extraversion.

This personality structure is largely comprised by values and traits of individuals.   Caprara, Schwartz, Capanna, Vecchione, & Barbaranelli, (2006) argue personality traits and values are increasingly affecting voting behaviour in Western democracies. This study hypothesized center-left voters in Italy would score higher valuing traits of friendliness and openness and centre-right voters had a higher propensity to value traits of power, achievement, conformity and tradition. Caprara and Schwartz et al. discovered personality mattered more in political choice than those individuals who also happen to belong to other traditional voter groups. Carpara et al. say a "personalization process" has evolved as parties converged on the political centre in Italy as many parties compete for a finite number of voters. The authors argue political parties "could segment the public based on fine-grained value priorities, not traditional group memberships" (p.2). This is an important finding.

Gerber, Huber, Doherty & Dowling (2012) study personality characteristics and the strength of partisan identification. This study is important and makes a significant contribution to the body of literature on personality and political behaviour in regards to political parties. The authors study personality, partisan party identification and the inherent intensity of that identification. They hypothesize "certain big five traits are likely to make those affective and cognitive benefits of partisan affiliation more attractive" (p.655). In particular, the authors find extraversion, agreeableness and openness are the best predictors of strength of partisan identification. Individuals oftentimes use partisan attraction to make sense of the political world and political stimuli. Individuals tend to "sort into" partisan identification and then "adjust (convert) their policy attitudes to be congruent with the party line" (p.658). Individuals who score higher on openness measures show a lower propensity to strongly affiliate whereas those who score higher on consciousness (a trait associated with high need for structure) do find

partisan attachments more attractive.   Those who score higher on agreeableness and extroversion are more likely to have partisan attachment. The authors flag future research lines which are particularly interesting for political movements or upstart political parties. They assert (using the Tea Party in the USA as a case study) "the relationships between Big Five Traits and support for this type of group depend on the ideological orientation of the movement"(p.674). Personality traits determine an individual likelihood to identify themselves as partisan.

Political attachment exists and facilitates the process of complex decision making. Vecchione, Gonzalez, and Caprara (2011) say political preference is related to personality similarity between voters and elected officials. This study concentrates on the personalization of politics and the significance of the political leader's effect on voting behaviour. The relevance of the political leader in election campaigns is increasing because "leaders are presented in more familiar terms" (p.260).   The study also found voters were most likely to see themselves as similar of the party of their preferred choice. Vecchione, Gonzalez and Carprara say "voters could do this in order to make sense of the world around them and in an effort for environmental control in complex situations" (Ibid). The Similarity-Attraction hypothesis is important for understanding voting behaviour in all democracies. The authors agree with Caprara et al. (2006) which indicates personality traits of voters matters more than on sociodemographic factors, income and education. The psychological advantages associated with familiarity "as well as a kind of egocentric favoritism that leads to liking those who are perceived similar to ones self" (p.267). There is acknowledgment of the difficulties with determining if similarities are real or a result of purposeful projection from campaigns.

Mondak & Halperin (2008) conclude variances in personality may be linked to "virtually all" aspects of political behaviour. The traditional literature indicates demographics, information

acquisition and group membership are the driving forces in vote choice and other political behaviour. However, underpinning all these behaviour patterns "are expected to vary systematically as a function of personality" (339). Mondak and Halperin present findings which show personality as a driver of specific situations which drives political behaviour. In high information environments personality has a lesser effect on political behaviour than situations where individuals have low information. Interestingly, results indicate economic perceptions do not tend to be linked to personality measures except a positive correlation between emotional stability and economic fairness. There is a strong link between extroversion and political participation except in voting which is a solitary exercise. This study finds "extroverts have relatively high levels of political discussion but relatively low levels of political knowledge" (p.357). Individuals with high levels of the trait "openness to experience" seem to be the most engaged, have the most political knowledge and are the most opinionated. This article is especially important not because of definitive findings but findings which indicate personality (and the Big Five traits) matter in the study of political behaviour. Different kinds of people react differently to different stimuli in politics as well as psychology. Alford & Hibbing (2007) test for the degree to which personal, interpersonal and political temperaments are related. The contention is that all three are distinct and have very little impact on each other. The authors consider politics a social endeavor which requires other people and "operates on a mass scale" (197). They argue politics is about the organization and constructs of society which affects everyone in a society, near or far from the individual. For Alford and Hibbing, personal behaviour is different than that ascribed for society as a whole. So, it may be acceptable for individuals to act one way without this behaviour affecting how that individual's political behaviour or expectations of society at large. Their study finds "weakness of the correlations

between personality and ideology" as they argue it may be a nonlinear relationship" (p.205). For example, high intelligence is associated in this study with high levels of conservatism and liberalism.

Human behaviour is a mix of nurture and nature. The study of politics is a study of the environment voters occupy and personality of voters across democracies. Mondak, Hibbing, Canache, Seligson & Anderson (2010) are particularly concerned with "which aspects of situations (specifically) affect which behaviours?" (p.91). They propose the central investigation should be on which trait affects depend on aspects of the situation. In addition, they study the effects of personality on civic engagement. They discover "openness to experience" is the only Big Five trait dimension to be statistically connected to the political activity as tested in their research. These authors moved beyond testing vote propensity and measured political activity like campaigns, lawn signs, influencing others to vote and donating money. This is an important contribution to the body of literature. People scoring high in conscientiousness tended to "fare poorly in terms of levels of civic engagement…" (p.96). The authors find there is situational activation of personality effects, the environment and mediating factors connecting personality and political behaviour. Gerber, Huber, Doherty, Dowling, & Ha (2010) studied personality and the connection to political attitudes of white and black Americans. This article explains and argues fundamental behaviours across unrelated facets of life can be explained by five foundational personality types: agreeableness, openness, emotional stability, conscientiousness and extraversion. The authors argue personality traits are genetic and can predate social and political exposure thus enabling scientific examination of these traits and the impact on political and social behaviours. The Big Five traits are good predictors of ideology and propensity to vote. The article is important because it compares two distinct groups of the population and determines

the traits which tend to drive political values. It also shows that political tendencies are driven

by the Big 5 personality traits "that condition (political) stimuli response" (p.122). In general, the

study finds Agreeableness is associated with economic liberalism and social conservatism while

Openness is associated with liberal political thinking in the United States. Conscientiousness is

congruent with conservatism in their results.

Research Problem

Organizations interested in shaping public policy and influencing elected officials use

many methods of communication. Technology and the internet have changed the way

government and citizens interact. Organizations with limited resources can now act like large

corporations or organizations with vast resources when interacting and communicating with

government. The dialogue between governments and citizens has been altered by electronic tools

providing platforms for large numbers of advocates to be organized and rallied to action. Elected

officials are now using webcasts and electronic town halls to communicate directly with voters.

So, how do these tools and platforms influence behavior and political activities of individuals at

both election time and in between?

How do organizations rally large numbers of individuals to support their cause? What

tools do they employ and how do organizations make sure their messages are heard by elected

officials in a way which matters and spurns action? Constituency based advocacy tools assist

organizations in government relations by grouping supporters together in a database.

Communication with advocates is essential to garner organizational support. Do members of the

advocacy portal have a sense of community with each other? Are they likely to take political

action more often with elected officials by the mere fact they belong to a group of likeminded

individuals? Can these individuals be influenced to take action more often to meet organizational

goals? Can these portals influence the way in which groups of individuals vote at election times? Do information campaigns have any influence over vote preference and selection?

The findings of this study will be useful to organizations looking to improve how they communicate with their advocates. It will also serve as useful to organizations who do not use electronic advocacy tools to rally large number of supporters for their political or legislative cause through these tools.   This study seeks to prove advocates do feel a sense of community and have a higher propensity to take political action when they belong to an advocacy portal. The study intends to prove regular communication and information campaigns to a group of advocates can increase the propensity of similar individuals to take political action where they might not otherwise if the electronic tool did not exist. This is important to the field at large because government relations is about showing government the issue is important to large numbers of people. Government decision making is about making choices and reviewing the best possible information to inform decision making. It is up to actors in democracy to provide information and opinion blocks relevant to this process.

Research Questions

RQ1: Do electronic advocacy tools increase the likelihood individuals will take action in a Government Relations campaign or advocacy mobilization effort? Why? How?

RQ2: Does a sense of "community" amongst already relatively similar individuals increase the likelihood to take action? How?

 RQ3: Do information campaigns which inform and educate advocates on an issue impact the likelihood to contact elected officials via an advocacy portal?

RQ4: Do advocates feel more or less connected to government or elected officials after taking action on an electronic advocacy portal?

RQ5: Does an online advocate group tend to have more cohesive vote intention than the general public? Can the portal shape this intention?

Hypothesis

The portal will be influential in creating connectedness and will increase propensity for the advocates to take action. The portal will also create a sense of community amongst the advocates. Advocates will differ based on partisan attachment. The portion of respondents who identify as politically attached will have greater connectedness to each other and be more likely to take action than the unattached cohort of respondents. In addition, the cohort which identifies as politically attached will be more likely to take political action on their own using social media than those who don't identify strongly with a political party.

Research Method

Audience Definition

This study will be undertaken by gathering the attitudes of users of an advocacy portal www.workersbuildcanada.ca. These are volunteer members of a portal which has no sign-up approval process or screening. There is no demographic information collected from these users other than their home address, telephone number and postal code. There is no collection of gender, race or any other identifying information. The 10,500 users receive semi-regular emails from the owner organization of the portal and can opt out of participation at any time. The users can be broadly defined as a group of skilled trades workers and their representatives belonging to Canada's middle class demographic.

Data Collection

The survey population for this research are members of Canada's Building Trades Unions. The sampling frame is the 10,500 members of the advocacy portal www.workersbuildcanada.ca and the final sample consisted of 419 English respondents.

Methodology

Case Study Method

In the social sciences, research methods vary from the natural sciences. The case study method is a way to examine complex social, political, and organizational phenomena (Yin 2009). Specifically, "how" and "why" questions in the context of real life situations (over which the investigator has little control) are more effectively examined using this method. Politics, advocacy and the study of political behaviour are certainly well serviced in the case study methodology. Yin (2009) argues the preferred methodology in case studies is to follow theoretical propositions. It allows researchers to make predictions, assumptions and build hypothesis. This study will be a single revelatory case. Yin outlines a revelatory case as one wherein "the investigator has access to a situation previously inaccessible…and is therefore worth conducting because the descriptive information alone will be revelatory" (Yin, p.49,2009).

Research Method

This research was web based using an online survey tool which collects, compiles and expertly allows sorting and cross referencing of results. An email was sent to all portal users which contained a web link for survey completion. The web link offered a survey and

introductory comments content in English. Of the 10,500-registered portal users there were 419

respondents. Of those 419 respondents, the survey enjoyed an 81% completion rate.   This is a

cross sectional survey which Stacks (2011) says takes a "sample from the population once and

provide a glimpse of how that set of respondents thinks, feels, or behaves at that particular time"

(p.225). Professor Dave Scholz, MA and Professor Alexandre Sevigny, PHD reviewed and

approved both the survey and research concept before the survey was sent to participants

November 19, 2016. The survey remained open for information collection until December 6,

2016. No survey reminder emails were sent to the portal users during this time.

Data Collection

The survey population for this research are members of Canada's Building Trades

Unions. The sampling frame is the 10,500 members of the advocacy portal

www.workersbuildcanada.ca and the final sample consisted of 419 survey respondents.

Data Analysis and Results

The relatively large response to the survey has facilitated a very interesting data set. Each

question witnessed a more than an 80% response rate on average.

Portal engagement and feelings of community

Overall, 39% of respondents answered they felt more connected to their colleagues as a

result of participation in the portal. 22% indicated neither more or less connected.   However, of

those who identified as politically attached more than 51% indicated they felt more connected to

their colleagues. Only 36% of those who identified as not politically attached answered

positively for Question 1. 47% of total respondents indicated they felt more connected to

Canada's Building Trades Unions through portal participation. This increases to 62% of

DIGITAL TOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ENHANCING LOBBYING

respondents who identify as politically attached and 44% for the non-politically attached. For

example, when asked to assess the likelihood of taking political action as requested by the portal

as a result of connectedness to Canada's Building Trades Unions, 63% of total respondents

indicated the connectedness would increase likelihood of action and increased to 78% for the

politically attached cohort. In the non-attached cohort only 60% said it positively impacted the

likelihood.

Table 1		
Question 1 **Do you feel more or less connected to your building trades colleagues as a result of your workersbuildcanada.ca portal participation?** **(No Connection 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Connected)**		
Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
1	14.9%	62
2	8.4%	35
3	12.2%	51
4	22.1%	92
5	19.2%	80
6	8.9%	37
7	10.6%	44
Prefer not to say	3.8%	16
answered question		**417**
skipped question		**2**

Table 2

Question 2
Do you feel more or less connected to Canada's Building Trades Unions through participation in the portal?
(No Connection 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Connected)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	11.5%	47
2	6.6%	27
3	10.8%	44
4	22.3%	91
5	19.4%	79
6	15.7%	64
7	12.0%	49
Prefer not to say	1.7%	7
answered question		**408**
skipped question		**11**

Table 3

Question 3
To what degree does this sense of connection increase the likelihood you will take action as requested in the portal?
(Significantly Decreases 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 Significantly Increases)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	4.4%	17
2	4.9%	19
3	5.9%	23
4	18.5%	72
5	24.9%	97
6	18.2%	71
7	20.0%	78
Prefer not to say	3.3%	13
answered question		**390**
skipped question		**29**

Member satisfaction. political issues and propensity to take action

Question 4 assesses the portal's impact on satisfaction with the services provided by

CBTU. 50% of respondents indicated the portal has a positive impact while 27% said it neither

decreased or increased satisfaction. 60% of the politically attached respondents said it had a

positive impact on satisfaction while there was no difference in the non-attached group from the

total cohort.

Table 4		
Question 4 **To what extent does this portal increase or decrease your satisfaction with the services CBTU provides to its members?** **(Significantly Decreases 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 – 7 Significantly Increases)**		
Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
1	5.6%	21
2	4.0%	15
3	9.1%	34
4	27.2%	102
5	20.8%	78
6	18.1%	68
7	10.9%	41
Prefer not to say	4.3%	16
answered question		**375**
skipped question		**44**

Table 5

Question 5
To what extent does the portal influence your political opinions about issues and elected officials?
(No Impact 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 – 7 Significant Impact)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	12.2%	45
2	7.6%	28
3	7.1%	26
4	16.6%	61
5	20.7%	76
6	19.8%	73
7	13.3%	49
Prefer not to say	2.7%	10
answered question		**368**
skipped question		**51**

Question 5 asks respondents about the impact of the portal on influencing political opinions regarding issues and elected officials.   54% of total cohort respondents said it had a significant impact, 68% of politically attached cohort indicated significant impact whereas only 47% of the non-attached cohort indicated significant impact. 46% of the total cohort indicated the portal significantly impacted the way in which they interact with elected officials. 58% of politically attached cohort indicated the portal has changed the way they interact with elected officials and 46% of the non-attached it did not change their interactions.

DIGITAL TOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ENHANCING LOBBYING

Table 6 Question 6 To what extent has the portal changed the way in which you interact with elected officials? (No Impact 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 Significant Impact)		
Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
1	18.5%	67
2	8.3%	30
3	9.1%	33
4	16.3%	59
5	17.9%	65
6	16.3%	59
7	12.1%	44
Prefer not to say	1.7%	6
answered question		**363**
skipped question		**56**

More than 62% of respondents indicated they are more likely to take some kind of political action because of the involvement in the portal. Of those considered politically attached this number increases to 73% and those not politically attached witnessed a 60% inclination. 56% of the politically attached cohort indicated they were more likely to take political action on their own using social media after using the portal. The total cohort and non-attached group was more split at 44% and 41% respectively. The non-attached group was almost evenly split on this question while 16% was neutral. Question 9 is concerned with feelings of connection to government and elected officials as a result of the portal. 42% of the total cohort indicated they felt more connected to government and elected officials and 27% felt less connected. 52% of the politically attached cohort indicated they felt more connected to government and elected officials after portal participation. The non-attached cohort was more evenly split. 32% said they felt less connected, 37% said they felt more connected and 31% responded neither more or less connected after portal participation.

Table 7

Question 7
Are you more or less likely to take some kind of political action due to your involvement in the workersbuildcanada.ca portal?
(Not Likely 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Likely)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	10.8%	39
2	3.3%	12
3	6.1%	22
4	15.6%	56
5	22.8%	82
6	21.7%	78
7	18.1%	65
Prefer not to say	1.7%	6
answered question		**360**
skipped question		**59**

Table 8

Question 8
After using the portal are you more or less likely to take political action in the future on your own using social media?
(Not Likely 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Likely)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	18.1%	64
2	6.8%	24
3	7.9%	28
4	19.8%	70
5	20.3%	72
6	15.3%	54
7	9.0%	32
Prefer not to answer	2.8%	10
answered question		**354**
skipped question		**65**

DIGITAL TOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ENHANCING LOBBYING

Table 9

Question 9
Does participation in the portal make you feel more or less connected to government and elected officials?
(Less Connected 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Connected)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	9.2%	33
2	6.4%	23
3	11.7%	42
4	28.8%	103
5	19.6%	70
6	14.5%	52
7	7.5%	27
Prefer not to say	2.2%	8
answered question		**358**
skipped question		**61**

Values and traits and political decision making

Table 10

Question 10
To what degree do each of the following influence your decision to vote for a particular political party or candidate? (No Influence 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Influence)

Answer Options	1 Response Count	2	3	4	5	6	7	Prefer not to say	Response Count
Personal Values	10	8	13	34	56	80	136	7	344
Election Campaigns	41	44	40	84	52	37	34	8	340
Attack Ads	132	60	42	44	19	14	20	11	342
Positive Ads	28	22	19	56	72	72	62	10	341
Conversations with family and friends	21	21	41	65	76	67	37	10	338
Always voted for a political party	80	37	24	34	41	32	81	15	344
Membership in a political party	160	29	21	38	19	20	34	21	342
answered question									**347**
skipped question									**72**

Table 11

Question 11
Which values are most important in your everyday life?
(Not Important 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Important)

Answer Options	1 Response Count	2	3	4	5	6	7	Prefer not to say	Response Count
Achievement (personal and professional goals/results to win, success, wealth)	7	14	22	48	75	79	91	10	346
Stimulation/Energy (happiness, excitement, seeking pleasure, likeability, an exciting life)	9	6	17	43	78	97	86	9	345
Self - Direction (independent thought and action, creating and exploring new things)	7	3	11	37	73	98	107	10	346
Tradition (respect and commitment to ideas that customs and culture provide)	12	17	23	55	67	83	78	10	345
Conformity (no actions or impulses likely to harm or upset others or society)	50	41	59	57	52	41	32	13	345
Security (safety, harmony, stability of relationships, national security, family security)	13	7	20	37	57	77	119	13	343
answered question									**347**
skipped question									**72**

Each of the vote influence questions and value and trait questions witnessed a more than 80% completion rate. Overall, 79% of all respondents indicated "Personal Values" were positive in influencing political vote decisions. A majority of respondents (69%) indicated "Attack Ads" had a negative impact on their vote decision. Respondents were split on the influence of election campaigns and voting history. Overall, 61% said membership in a political party did not have influence on voting for a party or candidate. 60% of respondents said positive advertisements influenced their vote choice. This cohort was almost evenly split on whether personal voting history had an influence on future votes. 41% said it had a negative impact and 44% had a positive impact on vote decision.

The survey asked a number of questions focused on values viewed as "important" in the respondent's everyday life. This cohort was extremely positive on all values presented in the questionnaire as important in everyday life. For example, 80% of respondents indicated Self-Direction was an important quality, as was Stimulation/Energy and Security at 75% and 74% respectively. Conversely, only 36% of respondents said Conformity was important in everyday life.

Question 12 focused on traits important in the respondent's everyday life. Friendliness(83%), Openness (90%), Energy/ Extraversion (72%) and Conscientiousness (77%) all were indicated as more important by respondents. Openness garnered 89% of respondents. Power was split with 37% saying it was important and 36% saying it was not important. Question 13 and 14 dealt with the values and traits seen as important in a political candidate when voting. Self-Direction (76%), Security (72%) and Tradition (62%) were the top three values this cohort see as more important in a political candidate. Achievement (51%) and Stimulation/Energy (54%) were less important but Conformity (37%) was considered the least

important to the respondents. Question 14 asked respondents when voting which traits are most important in a political candidate. Overwhelmingly, this cohort chose Openness (85%) Conscientiousness (83%) as most important. 76% of respondents indicated Energy was an important trait followed by Friendliness at 74%. Only 42% answered Power as an important trait in a political candidate.   Question 15 was used to determine political attachment amongst the cohort. 45% of respondents identified more strongly with a political party and 37% did not. See tables 11-16.

In order to determine if political attachment or non-political attachment made a difference in the previous answers to the everyday and political importance of values and traits, the data was sorted by answers to Question 15 (values 1,2,3) as less political attachment and Question 15 (values 5,6,7) indicating more political attachment. See tables 7-15 for the detailed results.

Strong political attachment vs no political attachment?

Respondents from the cohort who indicated more political attachment rated Personal Values as positive for influencing a decision to vote for a particular party or candidate (87%). Those who indicated no strong attachment rated Personal Values at 74%. Conversations with friends and family were very influential for more political attachment cohort (71%) whereas only 45% of the non-attachment group rated this category as important. Each cohort valued positive ads but the non-attachment group answered more negatively about Attack Ads (78% vs 67%). The attachment group indicated their vote history mattered and had influence in how they voted (65%). 69% of the non-attachment group indicated their voting history had a negative influence. The non-attached group overwhelmingly indicated membership in a political party had nothing to do with influencing their vote (89%) while 38% of the attached group said it made a difference. 43% of this group said membership in a party did not influence their vote. Election

campaigns seem to matter more for the attached group at 42% saying the campaign influences their vote whereas only 33% of non-attached respondents indicated a campaign mattered. 47% percent of non-attached said campaigns had no effect.

Respondents from the attached group have elevated values scores when compared to the non-attached in Question 11. Specifically, positive results in in Self Direction (88% vs. 78% in non-attached), Security (83% vs. 69%), Stimulation/Energy (79% vs 77%), Achievement (79% vs. 65%), Self-Direction (88% vs. 78%), Tradition (77% vs. 56%), Conformity (41% vs. 30%). Respondents in the non-attached group had stronger negative reaction to Conformity in Question 11, (54% vs. 37%).

Question 12 asked respondents on traits most important in their lives and witnessed similar results to Question 11 in the politically attached group when compared to the non-attached group. Openness in this group of respondents rated as the most important at 97% vs 87%, Friendliness 93% vs 74%, Conscientiousness 89% vs. 68%, Energy/Extroversion 81% vs. 70% of the non-attached group. Power received the lowest positive values from the non-attached group at 27% vs. 47% for the attached group. Only 5% of the attached group scored Energy/Extroversion as not important traits in their everyday life.

Table 12 Question 12 Which traits are most important in your everyday life? (Not Important 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Important)									
Answer Options	1 Response Count	2	3	4	5	6	7	Prefer not to say	Response Count
Friendliness (sympathetic, kind and interested in others)	3	8	9	27	73	94	115	11	340
Openness (informed, modern, innovative, open to learning and experiences)	1	3	4	19	60	117	125	10	339
Power (success, control, results and being in charge)	37	34	49	81	68	35	21	13	338
Energy and Extroversion (happy, determined, energetic, active)	5	12	11	54	83	96	66	12	339
Conscientiousness /Self-Regulation (scrupulous, precise, neat, hardworking, rule following)	7	8	15	31	52	110	98	15	336
answered question									341
skipped question									78

Question 13 and Question 14 asked respondents to rank information about values and traits aspired to political leaders when voting. The politically attached group score all tested "values" as more important than traits when voting than the non-attached group. Achievement scores 63% vs. 41%, Stimulation/Energy 64% vs. 47%, Self-Direction 87% vs. 70%, Tradition 80% vs 44%, Conformity 46% vs. 32%, Security 82% vs. 67%.

Question 14 results followed the same pattern as Question 13. The attached cohort identified as all traits being more influential in a voting decision than the non-attached cohort.

DIGITAL TOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ENHANCING LOBBYING

Friendliness scored 90% vs. 59%, Openness 94% vs. 81, Power 53% vs 31%, Energy 85% vs.

73%, Conscientiousness 93% vs. 78% .

Table 13									
Question 13 **When voting which values which do you feel are most important in a political candidate?** **(Not important 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 More Important)**									
Answer Options	1 Response Count	2	3	4	5	6	7	Prefer not to say	Response Count
Achievement (personal and professional goals/results to win, success, wealth)	31	23	35	62	67	67	38	14	337
Stimulation/Energy (happiness, excitement, seeking pleasure, likability, an exciting life)	21	14	38	66	89	61	33	14	336
Self-Direction (independent thought and action, creating and exploring new things)	9	6	13	38	62	106	86	16	336
Tradition (respect and commitment to ideas that customs and culture provide)	15	15	27	52	72	77	60	17	335
Conformity (no actions or impulses likely to harm or upset others or society)	52	44	41	58	49	40	36	14	334
Security (safety, harmony, stability of relationships, national security, family security)	10	10	17	42	45	89	105	16	334
answered question									**339**
skipped question									**80**

Table 14									
Question 14 **When voting, which traits do you feel are most important in a political candidate?** **(Not important 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 More Important)**									
Answer Options	**1** **Response Count**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**Prefer not to say**	**Response Count**
Friendliness (sympathetic, kind and interested in others)	12	8	13	40	70	90	91	13	337
Openness (informed, modern, innovative, open to learning and experiences)	4	4	8	21	42	104	142	11	336
Power (success, control, results and being in charge)	31	29	47	73	64	43	35	13	335
Energy (happy, determined, energetic, active)	8	8	11	39	69	107	79	13	334
Conscientiousness / Self-Regulation (scrupulous, precise , neat, hardworking, rule following	6	5	7	21	53	94	131	16	333
answered question									**338**
skipped question									**81**

The politically attached cohort has similar visions of values in their personal lives and what they are seeking in political candidates. Results for Self-direction, Tradition, Security and Conformity are almost identical in the positive and negative categories. The only category with significant diversion is the Achievement category wherein 79% of respondents seek achievement in their personal lives and only 63% seek these characteristics in political candidates when voting.

Overall, the politically attached cohort seeks similar traits in life as in political candidates. In voting, Openness is the most sought after trait at 94% whiles Conscientiousness is the second most sought after trait at 93%.   In their personal lives, this cohort seeks Openness at 97% and Friendliness at 93%. Power values are significantly less witnessing Personal life seeking at 47% and candidate seeking at 53%.

The non-attached cohort doesn't have such a similarity in values important in everyday life and values sought in political candidates and voting. Achievement is more important in life (65%) than in voting (41%), Stimulation/Energy is rated more important in life (77%) versus 46% in political candidates in this cohort. Self-Direction is rated as important by 78% in life versus 70% in political candidates in voting. Conformity is even at 30% and 31% ,71% in political candidates. Security is relatively flat for this cohort as well at 69% in everyday life and 67% in political leadership.

The non-attached cohort is not as concerned with Friendliness in political leaders (59%) but more so in everyday life (74%). Conscientiousness is valued in political candidates at 78% and in everyday life at 68%. Power is not sought in everyday life or political candidates witnessing 27% and 31% respectively. Openness scores in the everyday life category were 87% and 81% for political candidates and voting. The Energy category was fairly close at 70% and 72% in life and political candidates.

Table 15

Question 15
How strongly do you identify with a political party?
(Not at all 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Very Strongly)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	14.6%	49
2	12.2%	41
3	10.4%	35
4	14.3%	48
5	20.2%	68
6	14.9%	50
7	10.1%	34
Prefer not to say	3.3%	11
answered question		**336**
skipped question		**83**

Discussion

This study has significant findings and implications for member based organizations

engaged in advocacy, lobbying, member services and political engagement. In addition, there

are results significant for the study of electronic advocacy portals, political participation and the

propensity of individuals to participate in emerging advocacy tools. Values, traits and partisan

tendencies play an important role in politics and evidently the way coalitions are framed and

formed for political action. Also, the traits and values electors seek in elected officials differs

dramatically between self-identified partisan voters and those who do not self-identify as an

attached partisan.   There are also important differences in the propensity to take political action

using an advocacy tool between the two attached and non-attached groups.

Generally, participants in the advocacy portal felt a sense of connectedness to

colleagues and an even stronger connection to the organization hosting the portal. Respondents

indicated this connection will increase the likelihood of taking the requested action. This has important implications for organizations interested in marshalling advocates on public policy campaigns. Respondents identified a sense of increased connectedness to the organization which was more pronounced than the connection to each other. This is an area of future research.   In addition, the portal increased satisfaction with CBTU as a whole amongst rank and file members. More than 49% of participants said the portal increased satisfaction and more than 75% scored either neutral or increases. This is an important finding for member based organizations.

The portal proved influential to a convincing majority of respondents regarding political opinion making, issues and elected officials. This has important consequences for advocacy and governing. Information campaigns of the future could entirely focus on Canadians who group together on social media – and governments could radically alter their preference for traditional polling and focus groups for a "read" of social media conversations.

The results of the respondents are illustrative for the likelihood of future political action. There is a definite preference for participation in the portal for political action versus the likelihood of future action on an individual basis using social media. This is an area of future research. Is this result unique to the demographic who responded? Was this caused by age or the fact the portal created political messages automatically for users and thus filled an important information gap for the user? Would the respondents answer the same way if the portal crafted social media messages for them?

The sense of connection to government and elected officials as a result of participation in the portal is foundational for understanding the advocacy process. It appears sending information on political issues and leaders on a regular basis is sufficient to create a sense of connection and

establishes enough "significance" to convince advocates to take action. This is a potential area of important future research.

The contrast in results between the cohort who is politically attached and the non-attached group is extremely interesting for the study of values, traits and political intentions in Canada. Overall, the politically attached cohort seeks political leaders with the same traits and values they aspire to in their own lives. This data supports the literature in this area in a Canadian context. The non-attached group does differ from this pattern – respondents in this group seem to differ in what is viewed as important in life and what is sought in political leaders. This group attaches less importance to Personal Values, Election Campaigns, Attack Ads, Conversations with friends and family, and Past Voting Behaviour.   The two cohorts do indicate similar values for Positive Political Ads.   This would be consistent with the literature.

The voter profile for this middle class Canadian cohort is complicated. Political preference is evidently driven by personal values for the whole cohort. The values most aspired to by non-attached individuals in this study are Self Direction and Security. Traits most important in political leadership are Openness and Conscientiousness even if Conscientiousness is not considered important in their own lives. This is an interesting area of further study. The non-attached group does not seek power in their personal lives or in a political leader. Friendliness is also not a trait sought out by this group in a political candidate.

Gerber, Huber, Doherty & Dowling (2012) conclude extraversion, agreeableness, openness are the best determinants of the strength of partisan identification. Although not completely aligned with the literature, the data collected reinforce this hypothesis for the politically attached cohort specifically in regards to consciousness scores. The Openness scores for this attached cohort were different than Gerber et al would have predicted. Mondak and

Halpern (2008) predict a strong link between extroversion and political participation. In this case, the literature was predicative of the cohort results. The attached cohort sought extroversion in a positive way in life (80.66%) versus the non-attached at 69.6%. The Alford and Hibbing (2007) correlation between personality and ideology holds true for the non-attached group.

For Gerber, Huber, Doherty, Dowling & Ha it is possible the politically attached cohort would fit the description of conservatism given this high consciousness score. Oddly, this group also displayed high levels of Openness, an indicator in the United States of liberalism. This makes an important distinction of culture. Canadian politics is strikingly different than that in the United States. Politics and even centrist policy is more left leaning in general in Canada. Carpara and Zimbardo (2004) would argue Canadians are more likely to use values and personality traits in voting than Americans who enjoy more distance between conservatives and liberals on the political spectrum.

Limitations and Conclusions

Political scientists, political parties, elected officials all want to seek to understand unattached voters and preferences of this cohort. Much of the data (although robust) comes from a very specific profile of respondents. Most completers had household income of greater than $105,000 and lived in Ontario or Alberta. It would be engaging to sample this group again and endeavour to put together a longitudinal trend survey to measure changes over time. This is one of the primary limitations of this research. The results are a snapshot in time and trends could not be established with the single survey method. The single largest limitation is the non-randomness of the respondents. The advocacy portal creates and attracts large numbers of the same economic cohort of respondents and those who have agreed to participate in the portal on a regular basis. This research is limited by the concentration of male respondents. Only 3.6% of

completers were women. The majority of respondents were between the ages of 45 and 64. No

one from the age group 18-24 responded to the survey and only 5.37% were between the ages of

25 to 34. 69% of completers indicated Trade Certification as highest level of education

completed.   Another limitation to this research is privacy. It is not known if respondents

answered the questions truthfully.

The use of online tools in advocacy and lobbying evidently builds a sense of community

amongst advocates. This sense of community contributes to the propensity of advocates to take

future actions. For organizations interested in engaging with government, the investment in such

advocacy tools seems to be a wise strategic action. These findings are also useful for political

organizations and elected officials. The ability to create online communities could assist in

governing, finding new members for political parties and communicating with voters. Given

advocates were not as likely to take action on their own without the portal it could be incumbent

upon organizations seeking to change government policy, to do more than simply encourage

potential advocates to participate and actually create online environments for their members.

The results of the survey also show overall satisfaction with the member based organization

increases with portal availability and participation. It is evident the process of self-identifying as

politically attached (versus non-politically attached) impacts propensity to take action in the

portal. Organizations (advocacy and also government groups) would be wise to ask a number of

qualifying questions to participants and advocates as to the degree of partisan attachment before

launching advocacy or consultative processes. Partisanship also impact values and traits deemed

important in elected officials and the vote process. So, what drives these differences between

partisan and non-partisan groups? Is it an overarching interest or understanding of politics? Are

partisans making up for a deficit in decision making in political choice? Could elected officials,

governments and advocacy organizations group citizens together with these tools to influence

partisanship and voting behaviour in the future? Could each of these groups be scientifically

measured when political parties are choosing leaders and candidates? Could advocacy

organizations create different kinds of messages for subsections of participants based on their

personalities, traits, and values?   These are important areas of future study.

References

Alford, J. R., & Hibbing, J. R. (2007). Personal, interpersonal, and political temperaments. The

    Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 614(1), 196-212.

Baek, Y. M. (2014.). Political mobilization through social network sites: The mobilizing power

    of political messages received from SNS friends, *44*(Complete), 12–19.*Computers in*

    Human Behaviour.

Barnea, M. F., & Schwartz, S. H. (1998). Values and voting. Political psychology, 19(1), 17-40.

Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., & Fraley, C. R. (2007). Voters' personality

    traits in presidential elections. Personality and Individual Differences, 42(7), 1199-1208.

Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations.

    Personality and social psychology bulletin, 29(10), 1207-1220.

Bennedsen, M. (n.d.). Informational lobbying and political contributions. Journal of Public

    Economics, 90(4-5), 631–656.

Beachler, D. W. (2007). Race, God, And Guns: Union Voting In The 2004 Presidential Election.

    Working USA, 10(3), 311–325.

Bischoff, Ivo. & Neuhaus, Carolin (2013) The Neuroeconomics of Voting: Neural Evidence of

Different Sources of Utility in Voting. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology and*

Economics (n.d.), *6*(4), 215–235.

Blais, A., & St. Vincent, S. L. (2011). Personality traits, political attitudes and the propensity to

vote. European Journal of Political Research, 50(3), 395-417.

Block, J., & Block, J. H. (2006). Nursery school personality and political orientation two decades

later. Journal of Research in Personality,40(5), 734-749.

Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The secret lives of liberals and

conservatives: Personality profiles, interaction styles, and the things they leave behind.

Political Psychology, 29(6), 807-840.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1999). Personality profiles and political

parties. Political Psychology,20(1), 175-197.

Caprara, G. V., Schwartz, S., Capanna, C., Vecchione, M., & Barbaranelli, C. (2006).

Personality and politics: Values, traits, and political choice. Political Psychology, 27(1),

1-28.

Caprara, G., Vecchione, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (2009). Mediational role of values in linking

personality traits to political orientation. Asian Journal of Social Psychology,12(2), 82-

94.

Caprara, G. V., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). Personalizing politics: a congruency model of

political preference. American Psychologist, 59(7), 581.

Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Barbaranelli, C., & Fraley, R. C. (2007). When likeness goes

with liking: The case of political preference. Political Psychology, 28(5), 609-632.

Childers, L. (n.d.). J. Grunig's asymmetrical and symmetrical models of public relations:

contrasting features and ethical dimensions. *Professional Communication, IEEE

Transactions on*, *32*(2), 86–93.

Clark, Paul. "Competing Interest Groups and Union Members' Voting." *Social Science

Quarterly* 82(1): 105–16.

Clarke, A. (2010). Social media. 4, Political uses and implications for representative democracy

Canada. Library of Parliament.

Congleton, R. (1991). Information, special interests, and single-issue voting. *Public Choice*,

69(1), 39–49.

De Neve, J. E. (2015). Personality, childhood experience, and political ideology. Political

Psychology, 36(1), 55-73.

Denny, K., & Doyle, O. (2008). Political interest, cognitive ability and personality: Determinants

of voter turnout in Britain. British Journal of Political Science, 38(02), 291-310.

Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2009). Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys:

The tailored design method (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas,

C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE

POLITICAL SKILL INVENTORY. Journal of Management, 31(1), 126-152.

Galer-Unti, R. (2010). Advocacy 2.0: Advocating in the Digital Age. *Health Promotion Practice*,

11(6), 784–787.

Garzia, D. (2011). The personalization of politics in Western democracies: Causes and

consequences on leader–follower relationships. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(4), 697-

709.

Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., & Ha, S. E. (2010). Personality and

political attitudes: Relationships across issue domains and political contexts. American

Political Science Review,104(01), 111-133.

Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., Raso, C., & Ha, S. E. (2011).

Personality traits and participation in political processes. The Journal of Politics, 73(03),

692-706.

Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2012). Personality and the strength

and direction of partisan identification. Political Behavior, 34(4), 653-688.

Glasford, D. emis E. (2008). Predicting Voting Behavior of Young Adults: The Importance of

Information, Motivation, and Behavioral Skills. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,

38(11), 2648–2672.

Goleman, D. (2006). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam.

Hodson, G., & Busseri, M. A. (2012). Bright minds and dark attitudes lower cognitive ability

predicts greater prejudice through right-wing ideology and low intergroup contact.

Psychological Science, 23(2), 187-195.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and

theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality:

Theory and research (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Johnston, C. D., & Wronski, J. (2015). Personality dispositions and political preferences across

hard and easy issues. Political Psychology, 36(1), 35-53.

Mondak, J. J., & Canache, D. (2014). Personality and Political Culture in the American States.

Political Research Quarterly, 67(1), 26-41.

Mondak, J. J., Hibbing, M. V., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., & Anderson, M. R. (2010).

Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects

on political behavior. American Political Science Review, 104(01), 85-110.

Mondak, J. J., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., & Hibbing, M. V. (2011). The participatory

personality: evidence from Latin America. British Journal of Political Science, 41(01),

211-221.

Mondak, J. J., & Halperin, K. D. (2008). A framework for the study of personality and political

behaviour. British Journal of Political Science, 38(02), 335-362.

Nichols, A. L., & Cottrell, C. A. (2014). What do people desire in their leaders? The role of

leadership level on trait desirability. The Leadership Quarterly, 25(4), 711-729

Nicoll Victor, J. (2007). Strategic Lobbying. *American Politics Research*, *35*(6), 826–845.

Riemann, R., Grubich, C., Hempel, S., Mergl, S., & Richter, M. (1993). Personality and attitudes

towards current political topics. Personality and individual differences, 15(3), 313-321.

Schepers, S. (2010). Business-government relations: beyond lobbying. Corporate Governance, 10(4), 475–483.

Schoen, H., & Schumann, S. (2007). Personality traits, partisan attitudes, and voting behavior. Evidence from Germany. Political psychology, 28(4), 471-498.

Schoen, H., & Steinbrecher, M. (2013). Beyond total effects: Exploring the interplay of personality and attitudes in affecting turnout in the 2009 German federal election. Political Psychology,34(4), 533-552.

Singh, S. P. (n.d.). Political knowledge, the decision calculus, and proximity voting, 34(Complete), 89–99.

Stacks, D.W. (2011). Primer of public relations research (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Stankov, L. (2009). Conservatism and cognitive ability. Intelligence, 37(3), 294-304.

Van Hiel, A., Pandelaere, M., & Duriez, B. (2004). The impact of need for closure on conservative beliefs and racism: Differential mediation by authoritarian submission and authoritarian dominance. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30(7), 824-837.

Van Hiel, A., Kossowska, M., & Mervielde, I. (2000). The relationship between openness to

      experience and political ideology. Personality and Individual Differences, 28(4), 741-

      751.

Vecchione, M., Gonzalez Castro, J. L., & Caprara, G. V. (2011). Voters and leaders in the mirror

of politics: Similarity in personality and voting choice in Italy and Spain. International Wallace,

      D. (2009). African American's Political Attitudes, Party Affiliation, and Voting

      Behavior. Journal of African American Studies, 13(2), 139–146.

Wallace, D. (2009). African American's Political Attitudes, Party Affiliation, and Voting

Behavior. *Journal of African American Studies*, *13*(2), 139–146.

Weber, M. (2009). *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. Routledge.

Xu, X., Mar, R. A., & Peterson, J. B. (2013). Does cultural exposure partially explain the

      association between personality and political orientation?. Personality and Social

      Psychology Bulletin, 0146167213499235.

Yoon, K. (2005). Effects of Negative Political Advertising on Voting Intention: An Exploration

      of the Roles of Involvement and Source Credibility in the Development of Voter

      Cynicism, 11(2), 95–112.

Yin, R.K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

      Publications

Journal of Psychology, 46(4), 259-270.

Zavala, D., Golec, A., Cislak, A., &Wesolowska, E. (2010). Political conservatism, need for

cognitive closure, and intergroup hostility. Political Psychology, 31(4), 521-541.

DIGITAL TOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ENHANCING LOBBYING

Appendix A

Survey Questions

1. Do you feel more or less connected to your building trades colleagues as a result of your workersbuildcanada.ca portal participation?
(No Connection 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Connected)

   Prefer not to say

2. Do you feel more or less connected to Canada's Building Trades Unions through participation in the portal?
(No Connection 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Connected)

   Prefer not to say

3. To what degree does this sense of connection increase the likelihood you will take action as requested in the portal?
(Significantly Decreases 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 Significantly Increases)

   Prefer not to say

4. To what extent does this portal increase or decrease your satisfaction with the services CBTU provides to its members?
(Significantly Decreases 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 – 7 Significantly Increases)

   Prefer not to say

5. To what extent does the portal influence your political opinions about issues and elected officials?
(No Impact 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 – 7 Significant Impact)

   Prefer not to say

6. To what extent has the portal changed the way in which you interact with elected officials?
(No Impact 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 Significant Impact)

Prefer not to say

7. Are you more or less likely to take some kind of political action due to your involvement in the workersbuildcanada.ca portal?
(Not Likely 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Likely)

Prefer not to say

8. After using the portal are you more or less likely to take political action in the future on your own using social media?
(Not Likely 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Likely)

Prefer not to say

9. Does participation in the portal make you feel more or less connected to government and elected officials?

(Less Connected 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Connected)

Prefer not to say

10. To what degree do each of the following influence your decision to vote for a particular political party or candidate?

(No Influence 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Influence) Prefer not to say

Personal Values

Election Campaigns

Attack Ads

Positive Ads

Conversations with friends and family

Always voted for a political party

Membership in a political party

11. Which values are most important in your everyday life?

(Not Important 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Important) Prefer not to say

Achievement (personal and professional goals/results to win, success, wealth)

Stimulation/Energy (happiness, excitement, seeking pleasure, likeability, an exciting life)

Self - Direction (independent thought and action, creating and exploring new things)

Tradition (respect and commitment to ideas that customs and culture provide)

Conformity (no actions or impulses likely to harm or upset others or society)

Security (safety, harmony, stability of relationships, national security, family security)

12. Which traits are most important in your everyday life?

(Not Important 1 - 2 - 3 – 4 – 5 - 6 - 7 More Important) Prefer not to say

Friendliness (sympathetic, kind and interested in others)

Openness (informed, modern, innovative, open to learning and experiences)

Power (success, control, results and being in charge)

Energy and Extroversion (happy, determined, energetic, active)

Conscientiousness /Self-Regulation (scrupulous, precise, neat, hardworking, rule following)

13. When voting which values which do you feel are most important in a political candidate?

(Not important 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 More Important) Prefer not to say

Achievement (personal and professional goals/results to win, success, wealth)

Stimulation/Energy (happiness, excitement, seeking pleasure, likeability, an exciting life)

Self - Direction (independent thought and action, creating and exploring new things)

Tradition (respect and commitment to ideas that customs and culture provide)

Conformity (no actions or impulses likely to harm or upset others or society)

Security (safety, harmony, stability of relationships, national security, family security)

14. When voting which of the following traits do you believe are most important in a political candidate?

(Not important 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 More Important) Prefer not to say

Friendliness (sympathetic, kind and interested in others)

Openness (informed, modern, innovative, open to learning and experiences)

Power (success, control, results and being in charge)

Energy and Extroversion (happy, determined, energetic, active)

Conscientiousness /Self-Regulation (scrupulous, precise, neat, hardworking, rule following)

15. How strongly do you identify with a political party?

(Not at all 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Very Strongly)

Prefer not to say

DIGITAL TOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ENHANCING LOBBYING

Demographic Questions

16.What is your age?

18 to 24?

25 to 34?

35 to 44?

45 to 54?

55 to 64?

65-74?

75-84

Prefer not to answer

12. What is your gender?

Male

Female

__(other____) _

Prefer not to answer

13. What is your approximate annual household income?

Less than 25,000

$25,000 to $34,000

35,000 to 44,000

45,000 to 54,000

55,000 to 64,000

65,000 to 74,000

75,000 t0 84,000

85,000 to 94,000

95,000 to 104,000

Greater than 105,000

Prefer not to answer

14. In which Canadian province or territory do you reside?

Alberta

British Columbia

Ontario

Quebec

Manitoba

Saskatchewan

Nova Scotia

New Brunswick

Newfoundland and Labrador

Yukon

Northwest Territories

Nunavut

Prince Edward Island

Prefer not to answer

15. Highest level of education completed?

High School

University

Post Graduate Degree

Trade Certification

Community College

Prefer not to say

16. Are you a member of a CBTU affiliated union?

Yes

No

Prefer not to say

17. Are you an elected officer in your local union?

Yes

No

Prefer not to say

Thank you for taking this survey. Your answers are a valuable part of this research.