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Abstract. This study examines the extent to which interactive communication on political websites affects various forms of citizens’ involvement in politics, and the moderating role of political cynicism in this relationship. Based on the outcomes of a laboratory experiment with a single-factor (interactivity: low vs. medium vs. high interactivity) between-subjects design, we found that interactive political websites have a positive effect on citizen involvement, and this effect is particularly present for websites with high levels of interactivity. We also demonstrate that interactivity effects are, to some extent, contingent on citizens’ political cynicism. For higher levels of political cynicism, deviations in the level of interactivity make less of a difference in their impact on political involvement.
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Digital media have altered the way citizens communicate about and participate in politics. Nowadays, citizens get political information from blogs and websites, and connect with political actors via social media. Through online media, politicians and parties also increasingly try to directly connect and engage with citizens. Thus, the Internet offers both citizens and politicians an interactive platform to communicate directly with one another, while bypassing gatekeepers (Blumler & Gurevitch, 2001; Golbeck, Grimes, & Rogers, 2010). The use of online media has become common practice, especially during election times.

The interactive nature of digital media is mostly perceived as an inherently good thing. It has often been argued that online platforms activate citizens into political life (Boulianne, 2009, 2015; Oh & Sundar, 2015). More importantly, adopting the online interactive communication possibilities was shown to have a small but positive impact on political involvement (see, e.g., Kruikemeier, 2014b; Kruikemeier, Van Noort, Vliegenthart, & De Vreese, 2013; Lee & Shin, 2012). This latter notion is especially important as it helps us to understand “what it is about mass media that is producing effect[s]” (Eveland, 2003, p. 396, emphasis added). Interactivity is the most distinct characteristic of online media (Sundar, Kalyanaraman, & Brown, 2003), and researchers realize that interactivity might play an important role in understanding why online media and its contents affect citizens (Spierings & Jacobs, 2014). Still, evidence showing that interactive use of online political platforms engages citizens remains limited (also for social media; Brewer et al., 2016) and the examination of underlying mechanisms and conditional factors has been generally neglected. The current study addresses these gaps.

The first aim is to extend our knowledge on interactivity effects in the context of political communication by examining the impact on political involvement. In line with previous studies, we understand political involvement as a multifaceted phenomenon encompassing political knowledge, political attitudes, and behavioral intentions (Aarts & Semetko, 2003). More specifically, we focus here on one attitudinal aspect (perceived responsiveness of politics) and one politically crucial intentional aspect (voting preference).

The second aim is to explore the theoretical explanation for interactivity effects, as it remained unclear why interactivity leads to increased political involvement. Previous research in related fields suggested flow (Van Noort, Voorveld, & Van Reijmersdal, 2012), perceived interactivity (e.g., Wu, 2005), and social presence (Fortin & Dholakia, 2005) as underlying mechanisms. This study extends this research by examining two processes that are more central to the field of political communication; feeling nearer to politics and arousal of political interest.

Third, evidence regarding the conditional impact of Internet use, in general, and interactivity, in particular, is scarce (Bucy & Tao, 2007). Therefore, the third aim of this study is to fill this void by examining for whom interactivity effects on political involvement occur. More specifically, we examine the moderating role of political cynicism. This characteristic is often used as a dependent variable when investigating communication effects (Elenbaas...
In the present study, we adopt the different ways (for an overview, see Bucy & Tao, 2007). There is little consensus about what interactivity precisely entails, and previous research has conceptualized interactivity in many different ways (for an overview, see Bucy & Tao, 2007). In the present study, we adopt the structural approach of interactivity.

Conceptualization and Effects

The opportunity for direct and interactive communication makes online media profoundly different from traditional media. Although content analyses have been conducted to show that interactivity is an important characteristic of online (political) communication (Jackson & Lilleker, 2009; Lilleker et al., 2011; Schweitzer, 2008; Trammell, Williams, Postelnicu, & Landreville, 2006), little consensus exists about what interactivity precisely entails, and previous research has conceptualized interactivity in many different ways (for an overview, see Bucy & Tao, 2007).

In the present study, we adopt the structural approach of interactivity.

The structural approach asserts that the degree of interactivity is reflected in the technological attributes that are included in the platform “which allows users to talk to other users, engage with or manipulate media, or influence the content, as the unit of measure” (Bucy & Tao, 2007, p. 651). Such attributes correspond closely with the often-applied conceptualization introduced by Liu and Shrum (2002; and frequently applied by more recent studies, see Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2011). They theorize that interactivity contains three important aspects: two-way communication (allows user to talk online to each other – reciprocal or interpersonal communication), synchronicity (receiving immediate feedback), and active control (customizing the content and jump from one location to another one – information selection, see also Bucy and Tao, 2007). Another important approach that builds on the two-way communication and synchronicity features, and matches the structural approach, is that of Stromer-Galley (2004). She argues that website interactivity can be divided into two distinct concepts (Stromer-Galley, 2004). The first concept, interactivity-as-product, relates to the technical features of a website. This focuses on the way users interact with the website, for instance by clicking on hyperlinks, filling out an online registration form, or watching a YouTube campaign video (which relates to the two-way communication component of interactivity). The second concept, interactivity-as-process, focuses on horizontal and vertical communication between citizens, and between citizens and politicians (which relates to the active control component of interactivity). Taking on the structural approach of interactivity and focusing on both product and process features, we examine to what extent the level of interactive attributes in the medium (i.e., a political website) affects political involvement. Examples of these attributes are hyperlinks, comments and sharing functions, and mobilization features (see also Table B1 in Appendix B).

Turning to the effects of interactivity in (political) communication research generally shows positive effects on citizens. For instance, website interactivity leads to positive candidate evaluations, agreement with policy statements (Sundar et al., 2003), increased levels of political efficacy, positive attitude toward voting (Tedesco, 2007), increased recall, time spent on a website (Warnick, Xenos, Endres, & Gastil, 2005), positive feelings toward politics and increased political interest (Kruikemeier et al., 2013). Moreover, for social media it is demonstrated that politicians responding to voters’ comments are evaluated positively (Utz, 2009), interactive communication on Twitter positively affects electoral support (Kruikemeier et al., 2014b), and interactivity on a candidates’ Facebook page (comments and likes) leads to favorable perceptions and subsequently to more support for the candidate (Brewer et al., 2016).

Underlying Processes: Getting Closer?

Several studies have explored the process for interactivity effects and suggested multiple mediators. Within computer-mediated communication (CMC) research, it has often been argued that feeling closer or nearer to others (a communicating partner) in a computer-mediated environment explains positive interactivity effects on citizens (Biocca, Harms, & Burgoon, 2003; Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976; Tanis, 2003). Closeness (also social presence) finds its origins in interpersonal communication literature and it basically entails “a sense of being together” in a computer-mediated environment (Biocca et al., 2003, p. 460). Thus, social presence increases when the mediated environment (and its features) mimics interpersonal communication. When a medium contains high levels of interactivity, which involves reciprocal communication and active control, it will engender higher levels of social presence, which in turn affects political involvement. More specifically, when social presence is operationalized as “perceived closeness” and “connectedness in mediated communication,” citizens are more positive about politics (Lee & Shin, 2012, p. 516). In this way, interactive communication functions as an information shortcut in the evaluation of politics (Brewer et al., 2016). Lee and Shin (2012) empirically tested this assumption and revealed that interactivity on Twitter leads to positive feelings of having a direct conversation with a politician (i.e., social presence) for people who usually avoid social interactions, which in turn had a positive effect on voting intentions. On the basis of the aforementioned studies, we expect that interactivity makes citizens feel closer to politics (because interactivity creates intimacy), which in turn, positively affects citizens’ involvement in politics.
Following previous work, we also expect that interactivity arouses citizens’ political interest, and thereby increases political involvement in the longer run. An appealing website arouses political interest (Lupia & Philpot, 2005), and interactivity is a means to make a (political) website more appealing (Song & Bucy, 2007). Moreover, interactivity positively arouses citizens’ political interest (Kruikemeier et al., 2013). These empirical findings are in line with others who argue that “[t]he promise of political interactivity lies in its capacity to promote … heightened level of interest and engagement while leaving the user with the overall impression that time online was constructively spent” (Song & Bucy, 2007, p. 48). Thus, we expect that higher levels of website interactivity arouses citizens’ political interest, which may, in turn, increase political involvement. We hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Higher levels of interactivity engender higher levels of feeling closer to politics (i.e., nearer) and more interest in politics (i.e., arousal of political interest), and consequently, results in higher levels of political involvement (i.e., increased perceived responsiveness of politics and voting preferences).

The Role of Political Cynicism

Although it is often argued, and occasionally demonstrated, that interactivity effects are dependent on characteristics of the person who is using the interactive medium, the literature on interactivity largely neglected conditional effects. Scholars argue that individual differences are crucial in explaining the political effects of new media (Xenos & Moy, 2007). Especially with regard to the larger debate about reinforcing spirals and normalization effects, it is argued that online media positively influence and engage politically sophisticated citizens only (Avery, 2009; Norris, 2000). Calls have been made to study individual differences that affect interactivity, as it helps researchers to further understand and isolate interactivity effects on (political) involvement, but few attempts have been made (Bucy & Tao, 2007). Some researchers focused on the moderating role of personal traits (Lee & Shin, 2012), motivations, and affective state (Liu & Shrum, 2002), but individual differences related to political attitudes seem to be disregarded.

With respect to political attitudes, political cynicism is a serious threat to democracy (De Vreese, 2008), as scholars have often linked cynicism to a decrease in voter turnout (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997). Political cynicism – which is a general mistrust toward (elected) politicians, parties, and the political system as a whole (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997) – might play a crucial role in the acceptance and interpretation of (online) communication. In political communication literature, cynicism is often studied as an outcome variable. For example, it is argued that certain media frames potentially increase levels of cynicism more than others (e.g., Elenbaas & De Vreese, 2008). Recent research suggests, however, that political cynicism can also be studied as a personal characteristic and might act as a moderator of communication effects. An experimental study found that more cynical people are more susceptible to the effects of a populist communication strategy (Bos et al., 2013). The provided explanation is that the populist style better fits the predispositions about politics of cynical citizens (see also Jagers & Walgrave, 2007). In a similar vein, more cynical citizens might be less receptive to higher levels of interactive communication and more resistant to the intended effects by the communicator, withholding attempts to communicate with politicians. After all, it has been demonstrated that more politically cynical citizens are more negative toward campaigns and media (Pinkleton & Austin, 2002). “Those who are cynical of politics and disengaged will select themselves out of any potential influence” because they mistrust media and political content (Avery, 2009, p. 413), except when it is framed in a very particular anti-elitist manner (Bos et al., 2013). Cynics might regard interactivity as insincere, and this could instigate resistance toward the interactive communication, which will weaken the effects of interactive communication on political involvement. Thus, we expect that (see also Figure 1):

Hypothesis 2 (H2): The mediated effect of interactivity on political involvement is contingent on political cynicism, such that the effects of interactivity will be stronger for less cynical individuals and weaker for more cynical individuals.

Method

Participants and Research Design

In order to test our hypotheses, we rely on a laboratory experiment with a single-factor (interactivity: low vs. medium vs. high) between-subjects design, in which participants interacted with a website from the Dutch political party D66, a social-liberal party that is in the middle of the political spectrum. Participants were recruited using flyers in university buildings and online advertisements on the student website of the University of Amsterdam. In total, 197 respondents participated in our study. Five participants were not included because of technical problems (i.e., they either deleted the website without seeing it, looked up the actual, not manipulated, website of D66, or did not fill out all questions in the evaluation form). Thus, 192 students (female = 76.0%, M_age = 22.36, SD_age = 3.26) are included in our study and each condition contained 64 respondents.

1 Participants accessed the website via a link in the questionnaire. However, in rare cases they opened the website and immediately closed the website. In that way, they were not actually exposed to the website, or in other words, they could not be affected by it.
analyze whether or not—in general—the interactive
features were used. These checks on the interaction with
the website are in our opinion an important improvement
compared with previous interactivity effect studies.

After interacting with the website, respondents answered
questions about their political feelings of nearness to
politics, arousal of political interest, perceived responsiv-
ness, and voting preferences. Lastly, respondents’ voting
intention for D66 and demographics were assessed. Finally,
respondents were debriefed and thanked for their participa-
tion. They received €5 or participation credits for their
participation.

**Manipulation Check**

In a pilot study (N = 26), we measured whether the three
conditions varied in terms of perceived interactivity.
This was measured in line with previous research, with
12 items on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree,
7 = strongly agree) that related to the three dimensions
of interactivity: two-way communication, synchronicity,
and active control (i.e., based on Voorveld et al., 2011;
Cronbach’s α = .91, M = 3.52, SD = 1.22). Analyses of
variance showed that the levels of interactivity were
successfully manipulated (M_{low	ext{ interactivity}} = 2.46, SD = .70;
M_{medium	ext{ interactivity}} = 3.39, SD = .38; M_{high	ext{ interactivity}} = 4.85,
SD = 1.06), F(2, 23) = 21.77, p < .001, η^2_p = .654.

**Variables**

To examine how interactivity affects political involvement,
we included two different variables to tap into political
involvement: perceived responsiveness of politics (based
on Kruikemeier et al., 2013) and vote preference (Lee &
Shin, 2012). These variables were considered separately
in the statistical analyses.

**Perceived responsiveness of politics** entails the belief
that it is easy to come in contact with politics. The construct
originates from the perceived interactivity and human voice
literature (Kelleher & Miller, 2006; McMillan & Hwang,
2002; Voorveld et al., 2011). It was assessed using four
items (i.e., “Politics is open for opinions of citizens,”
“Politics responds to citizens,” “Politics is prepared to
listen,” “It is easy to come into contact with politics”).
Conceptually, this construct is closely related to external
political efficacy (e.g., Aarts & Semetko, 2003) and
measurement is also comparable, although efficacy is more
abstract and institutional in nature, relying on items such as
“People like me have no say over who gets to be president”
(Kenski & Stroud, 2006) or “People like me have absolutely
no influence on governmental policy” (Aarts & Semetko, 2003).
The items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; Cronbach’s α = .88, M = 3.43, SD = 1.25).

**Voting preference** captures the intention to vote for the
party or party leader mentioned in the stimulus material
(Lee & Shin, 2012), and was measured using two items
(i.e., “Are you more inclined to vote for D66 [party] in
the next elections?” and “Are you more inclined to vote

---

**Stimulus Materials**

We used the actual website of D66 as a basis to develop the
stimuli materials. We first downloaded the website of D66
and deleted information and added texts that were
specifically developed for this study. In this way, we could
realistically manipulate the level of interactivity. The levels
of interactivity (i.e., low, medium, and high) were manipu-
lated based on previous research and are in line with current
studies (Oh & Sundar, 2015), and involved features related
to both interactivity-as-process (communication involving
human interaction, such as user comments and tweets)
and interactivity-as-product (focusing on users’ interactions
with technology, such as inclusion of share features and
hyperlinks, and mobilization features such as donating
button; see, e.g., Stromer-Galley, 2004). Only the number
of interactivity features differed between conditions, the
textual content was kept constant (see Appendix A for an
example of the stimulus materials and an overview of the
interactivity features in the different conditions).

**Procedure**

Upon arrival in the laboratory, students received basic
instructions and filled out an online questionnaire. The
questionnaire started with questions about participants’
political background. Next, participants were asked to visit
a website. The website was embedded in the online
questionnaire and participants were randomly assigned to
one of the conditions. Participants were asked to evaluate
the usability of the website, while visiting the website, using
a paper-and-pencil evaluation form. This form contained
questions about the clarity and readability of the informa-
tion and the use of mobilization features. This evaluation
form was an instrument to make sure that respondents
actually interacted with the website, because pilot studies
showed that respondents do not browse the (complete)
website in a laboratory setting. Additionally, mouse-
tracking software (i.e., Mouseflow) confirmed that in each
condition respondents interacted with the website. However,
because these data were aggregated, it was not possible to
link them to individual participants, and we could only
analyze whether or not—in general—the interactive

---

**Figure 1.** Depiction of the hypothesized relations.
for Alexander Pechtold [party leader] in the next elections?” measured on a 7-point scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Again, a mean score was used to measure voting preference (inter-item correlation = .96, \( p < .001 \), \( M = 2.09 \), \( SD = 1.34 \)).

To gauge the mediating effect, we measured feelings of nearness and arousal of political interest. Nearness entails the feeling that one feels closer to politics, finds its origins in social presence theory (Biocca et al., 2003; Fortin & Dholakia, 2005; Short et al., 1976), and was gauged using four items (i.e., “The website decreases the distance between citizens and politics,” “The website gives me the feeling I am closer to politics,” “The website gives me the feeling that politicians are concerned about citizens,” and “The website ensures a connection between politics and citizens”). The items were also measured on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .92 \), \( M = 3.32 \), \( SD = 1.33 \)).

Arousal of political interest entails the perceived arousal of political interest and was measured using two items (i.e., “The website was interesting” and “The website arouses my interest in politics,” deployed by Kruikemeier et al., 2013). The items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; inter-item correlation = .82, \( p < .001 \), \( M = 3.35 \), \( SD = 1.55 \)).

Cynicism toward politics was measured with three items (i.e., “Politicians consciously promise more than they can deliver,” “Ministers and Secretaries of State are primarily self-interested,” “To become Member of Parliament, friends are more important than abilities”), measured on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). This measure is a shorter version of a measure deployed in previous studies (e.g., Adriaansen, van Praag, & De Vreese, 2010; Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .62 \), \( M = 4.38 \), \( SD = 98^{2} \)). The conditions were successfully randomized with regard to political cynicism, \( F(2, 189) = .26, p = .769 \).

### Control Variables

We included several control variables in our analyses, such as age and sex. The experimental groups did not significantly differ from each other regarding gender, \( X^2(2) = .40, p = .819 \); and age, \( F(2, 189) = .68, p = .509 \). We also gauged whether people are inclined to vote D66 in the first place; likelihood of voting D66 (measured on a 11-point scale, where 1 = not voting for D66 and 11 = definitely voting for D66, \( M = 6.71 \), \( SD = 2.86 \)). The experimental groups did not significantly differ from each other regarding likelihood to vote for D66, \( F(2, 189) = .40, p = .668 \) (see Table 1 for a correlation matrix). We also recorded how long participants were reading (or interacting) with the websites (in seconds). We examined the extent to which differences between the experimental groups exist using an ANOVA analysis. The groups did not significantly differ from each other regarding reading or interacting time, (\( M_{\text{high interactivity}} = 264.18, SD = 103.14 \), \( M_{\text{medium interactivity}} = 275.70, SD = 90.87 \), \( M_{\text{low interactivity}} = 281.97, SD = 101.46 \), \( F(2, 189) = .54, p = .586 \).

### Results

First, we examined the main effect of interactivity on citizens’ political involvement (i.e., perceived responsiveness and voting preference). A MANOVA analysis showed a significant main effect of interactivity, Wilk’s \( \Lambda = .866 \), \( F(4, 376) = 7.00, p < .001 \), \( \eta^2_p = .069 \). To examine the distinct effect of interactivity on the political involvement measures, we conducted two univariate analyses of variance with Bonferroni post hoc analysis. As expected, we found that participants who visited the high interactive website (\( M_{\text{high interactivity}} = 4.03, M_{\text{medium interactivity}} = 3.09, M_{\text{low interactivity}} = 3.16 \)) believed it was easier to come in contact with politics compared with participants who visited the medium interactive \( p < .001 \) and low interactive website \( p < .001 \), \( F(2, 189) = 12.54, p < .001 \), \( \eta^2_p = .117 \). The analyses also revealed that participants who viewed the highly interactive website were more inclined to vote for D66 (\( M_{\text{high interactivity}} = 2.45, M_{\text{medium interactivity}} = 2.04, M_{\text{low interactivity}} = 1.77 \)) than participants who visited the low interactive website \( p = .012 \), \( F(2, 189) = 4.32, p = .015, \eta^2_p = .044 \). We found no significant effect for the participants in the medium interactive condition compared with the high and low interactive condition. Taken together, these findings show that interactivity in websites has a positive effect on citizen involvement, but that this effect is limited to websites that contain high levels of interactivity compared with websites of low and medium interactivity.

Next, we examined the mediation hypothesis. We expected that higher levels of interactivity engender higher levels of feeling closer to politics (i.e., nearer) and more interest in politics (i.e., arousal of political interest), and consequently, results in higher levels of political involvement (i.e., believing to have more opportunities to get in contact with politics and voting preferences). To do so, we performed a mediation analysis using PROCESS. We deployed bootstrapping of 5,000 resamples and 95% confidence intervals (Model 4, Hayes, 2013). To fully capture all the different effects, we carried out the mediation analyses four times. First, we examined the (a) effect of the high interactive condition compared with the medium and (b) low interactive condition on our perceived responsiveness measure. Second, we examined the (c) effect of the high interactive condition compared with the medium and (d) low interactive condition on the voting preference measure. Specifically, in every mediation analysis, we included one dummy variable as the independent variable (e.g., high interactivity) and the other dummy variable as the covariate (e.g., medium interactivity).
The last dummy variable was left out to function as the reference category (e.g., low interactivity). Thus, only two dummy variables were included in every analysis. We then get a single test of the indirect effect (e.g., high interactivity compared with low interactivity, while controlling for medium interactivity). Both mediating variables (i.e., nearness and arousal of political interest) were included in one analysis to avoid omitted-variable bias. Thus both mediating variables were included as parallel mediators in each mediation analysis. The results of the analyses can be found in Table 2. The results show, in general, that the effect of interactivity on perceived responsiveness is mediated by nearness. When we compared the high interactive condition with the low interactive condition, a significant positive indirect effect was observed (indirect effect = .30, SE = .13, 95% BCBCI [.06, .59]). A similar significant indirect effect was found when we compared the high interactive condition with the medium interactive condition (indirect effect = .52, SE = .14, 95% BCBCI [.29, .84]). Specifically, exposure to a high interactive website makes participants feel that they are closer to politics (compared with the low and medium interactive websites, respectively, \( b = .54, p = .019 \) and \( b = .94, p < .001 \)), which positively affects participants’ belief that it is easier to come in contact with politics (respectively \( b = .56, p < .001 \)). We found no significant indirect effect of interactivity on perceived responsiveness through arousal of political interest.

Additionally, the results also show that interactivity positively affects voting preferences via arousal of political interest when we compare the high interactive website with the medium interactive websites (indirect effect = .20, \( SE = .11, 95\% \text{ BCBCI [.02, .46]} \)). Specifically, exposure to a highly interactive website makes participants feel more interested in politics (compared with the medium interactive website; \( b = .55, p = .046 \)), which, in turn, positively affects participants’ voting preference (respectively \( b = .37, p < .001 \)). This effect was not significant when we compared the high interactive with the low interactive website. We also found no significant indirect effect of interactivity on voting through feelings of nearness toward politics. In sum, it seems that arousal of political interest partly explains the positive effect of interactivity on voting. In addition, feeling nearer to politics explains why interactivity positively affects perceived responsiveness of politics. However, it should be noted that in our analyses, the main effects remained significant, especially for the high versus medium interactive condition. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is partly supported.

### Table 1. Correlation table of main variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual evaluations</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness (1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearness (2)</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal (3)</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting (4)</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism (5)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>–0.97</td>
<td>–0.09</td>
<td>–0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. *Correlation is significant at the \( p < .001 \) level, \( N = 192 \).

### Table 2. The indirect effect of interactivity on political involvement via nearness and arousal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High vs. low interactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Nearness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Arousal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting via Nearness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting via Arousal</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium vs. low interactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Nearness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Arousal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting via Nearness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting via Arousal</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vs. medium interactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Nearness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived responsiveness</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Arousal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting via Nearness</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting via Arousal</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Turning to the moderated mediation or, in other words, the conditional indirect effects (H2), the analyses found marginal support for the moderating role of cynicism. We again used PROCESS, and deployed bootstrapping of 5,000 resamples and 95% confidence intervals (Model 7, Hayes, 2013). Because our independent variable is a categorical variable, we carried out the mediation analyses several times. First, we examined the moderating effects of cynicism on the indirect effect of the high interactive condition (compared with the low interactive condition—the medium interactive condition was not included) on our perceived responsiveness and voting preference measure. In these analyses, both mediating variables (i.e., nearness and arousal) were included to avoid omitted-variable bias. Second, we examined the moderating effect of cynicism on the indirect effect of the high interactive...
Second, we found that interactive communication gives citizens the feeling that politics is closer to them. As a consequence, citizens believe that it was easy to come in contact with politicians and they were more inclined to vote for the party (the source of the website). These findings contribute to "a growing body of literature that shows that interactivity [...] is often the driving force behind the positive effects of new [online] media" (Kruikemeier, 2014a, p. 110). Thus, although the consequences of interactivity are often investigated in marketing research (e.g., see Jiang, Chan, Tan, & Chua, 2010; Van Noort et al., 2012), this study shows that interactive practices are influential (Bucy & Tao, 2007). This is important as the debate about the mobilizing potential of the Internet is still unresolved.

We observed two interesting findings. First, in line with the findings from previous studies (e.g., see Kruikemeier et al., 2013; Song & Bucy, 2007; Sundar et al., 2003; Warnick et al., 2005), we found that participants who visited a highly interactive website (compared with the medium and low interactive websites) believed that it was easy to come in contact with politicians and they were more inclined to vote for the party (the source of the website). These findings contribute to "a growing body of literature that shows that interactivity [...] is often the driving force behind the positive effects of new [online] media" (Kruikemeier, 2014a, p. 110). Thus, although the consequences of interactivity are often investigated in marketing research (e.g., see Jiang, Chan, Tan, & Chua, 2010; Van Noort et al., 2012), this study shows that interactivity on political websites also affects engagement, indicating that interactivity effects are not context dependent.

Second, we found that interactive communication gives citizens the feeling that politics is closer to them. As a consequence, citizens believe that it was easy to come in contact with politicians. It thus seems that interactive communication makes politics approachable. Furthermore, we also found that websites can arouse citizens' interest

Table 3. The conditional effects of the moderated mediation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Indirect effect of high (vs. medium) interactivity on perceived responsiveness via nearness</th>
<th>95% BCBCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political cynicism (= moderator)</td>
<td>-1 SD</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1 SD</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of medium (vs. low) interactivity on perceived responsiveness via nearness</td>
<td>Political cynicism (= moderator)</td>
<td>-1 SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1 SD</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. For reasons of clarity, this table only shows the significant moderated mediation analyses. BCBCI = bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval. SE = standard error. LL = lower limit. UL = upper limit.

Discussion

Scholars realize that interactivity might play an important role in explaining why online media affect citizens' involvement in politics (Spierings & Jacobs, 2014), but evidence remains limited. The aim of this study was threefold. We aimed to determine whether and why interactivity affects political involvement. Furthermore, we aimed to examine the moderating role of political cynicism in this effect. By doing so, the findings of this study enhance our knowledge about conditional factors in which interactive practices are influential (Bucy & Tao, 2007). This is important as the debate about the mobilizing potential of the Internet is still unresolved.

In conclusion, the findings from this study contribute to a growing body of literature that shows that interactivity [...] is often the driving force behind the positive effects of new [online] media" (Kruikemeier, 2014a, p. 110). Thus, although the consequences of interactivity are often investigated in marketing research (e.g., see Jiang, Chan, Tan, & Chua, 2010; Van Noort et al., 2012), this study shows that interactivity on political websites also affects engagement, indicating that interactivity effects are not context dependent.

Second, we found that interactive communication gives citizens the feeling that politics is closer to them. As a consequence, citizens believe that it was easy to come in contact with politicians. It thus seems that interactive communication makes politics approachable. Furthermore, we also found that websites can arouse citizens' interest

*Figure 2. Depiction of interaction effects between interactivity and political cynicism (with predictive margins with 95% confidence intervals).*
Political cynicism should be considered more often as a trait and process, and those who do not hold positive attitudes toward the democratic system are relatively more willing to get involved in politics. In that way, it might increase the gap between those who take a cynical stance toward politics and those who are more positive to political communication. This logic would lead us to expect they are also more inclined to use political sources, media, and content. The current findings imply that offering interactive content can further boost political involvement among those citizens. Thus offering interactive content and, in the case of political communication, with like-minded others, discuss political topics, enable them to directly contact politicians and to like, share, and respond to political messages should be part of political communication strategies. Investing in interactive communication is an effective strategy to keep politically interested citizens involved, also in the longer run.

A second implication from the same finding is that interactivity in political communication does not do the whole trick; it does not solve the issue that it is hard to involve cynical citizens in the political debate. Cynics are a hard-to-reach audience even with regard to interactive online political communication. They are likely to tune out because of their mistrust of politics (Norris, 2000). This might have important political consequences, as this could widen the gap between those who are more positive to political communication and involvement in politics (Song & Bucy, 2007).
gap between those who benefit from online communication and those who are left behind (Avery, 2009). Moreover, even if politicians and political parties are able to reach cynics with other media (such as leaflets, TV commercials, flyers, etc.) and are able to convert them to online media (such as websites, a blog post, or a political social media account), interactivity will not affect them and get them involved in the political arena. Thus multi-media and cross-media efforts might reach cynics, but will neither engage nor involve them. Moreover, because cynical citizens are not affected by interactive communication, they become more alienated from politics, which might eventually lead to less participation in political life (Schuck, Boomgaard, & De Vreese, 2013). This means politicians should find other ways than interactive media to engage and involve cynics.
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Appendix A

**Figure A1.** Low interactive website.

**Figure A2.** Medium interactive website.
Figure A3. High interactive website.

Appendix B

Table B1. Operationalization of interactivity in the manipulated websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Low interactivity</th>
<th>Medium interactivity</th>
<th>High interactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlinks on homepage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to give comments</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share features on homepage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact features</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlinks on other pages</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments others</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweets from party leader</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share features on separate pages</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization features</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other website</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>