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BRIEF DESCRIPTION
Interaction is described as a way to persuade citizens through direct contact allowing for a dialogical encounter between political actors and citizens (Magin, Podschuweit, Haßler, & Russmann, 2017). Although the new online environment can facilitate direct communication between politicians and citizens, empirical findings indicate that, to date, a unidirectional communication style between voters and politicians predominates (Jackson & Lilleker, 2010; Lilleker & Koc-Michalska, 2013; Stromer-Galley, 2000). To a large extent, politicians still employ the broadcasting style for campaign communication (Graham, Broersma, Hazelhoff, & van .t Haar, 2013) and retain communication strategies from the mass media era (Margolis & Resnick, 2000), as few voters visit their websites on a regular basis (Gibson & McAllister, 2011) or follow politicians’ profiles on social media (Vaccari & Nielsen, 2013). However, research in campaign communication also shows that the Web 2.0 provide new opportunities for politicians to address an expanded, new electorate and engage them. As an example, studies show that posts that are frequently liked, commented, or shared can reach a much wider circle of users known as secondary audience or second-degree followers (Jacobs & Spierings, 2016; Vaccari & Valeriani, 2015). Interaction through social media channels furthermore enables face-to-face-like communication with individual voters, with whom politicians can also exchange ideas and negotiate campaign strategies (Magin et al., 2017).

FIELD OF APPLICATION/THEORETICAL FOUNDATION
In recent years, interaction has been recognized as a central aspect of dialogical communication in the field of public relations (Sweetser & Lariscy, 2008; Taylor & Kent, 2004). The theory states that symmetrical and dialogical two-way communication between an organization and its audience can sustainably support relationship building and their maintenance (Zhang & Seltzer, 2010). By applying this approach to the field of online political communication, it is possible to understand the interactions between politicians and citizens as a form of strategic communication and how they attract and persuade voters.

REFERENCES/COMBINATION WITH OTHER METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION
Interaction in the last twenty years has been mostly studied in the context of the online environment either by looking at structural features of candidates’ online tools that enable interactions with users (e.g., Druckman, Kifer, & Parkin, 2007, 2009; Schweitzer, 2008); or by studying actual interactions between candidates and citizens on social media (e.g., Graham et al., 2013; Klinger, 2013). Both quantitative manual and automated content analyses thereof have been employed to in research on social media interactions). Quantitative content analysis have been also been combined and compared with qualitative interviews with campaign managers (e.g., Magin et al., 2017).

EXAMPLE STUDIES
see Table 1
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Table 1. Overview exemplary studies measuring interaction, discussion, participation, and related constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Druckman et al. (2007); Druckman et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Candidate websites</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>Web sites were scrutinized in light of their ability to create some form of interaction by e.g. enabling users to personalize information, arrange information, add information, and/or communicate with other voters and/or the candidate</td>
<td>Additive index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schweitzer (2008)</td>
<td>Candidate websites</td>
<td>Interactivity provision strategies</td>
<td>Possibility to comment on news; Agenda can be updated by visitors; A channel on video sharing websites; Possibility to comment (a video sharing website); Life webcam; Online photo gallery; Possibility to comment (online photo gallery); Easy contact; Online polls; Profile on SNS; Online forum or chat (among visitors); Online forum or chat (with politicians); Possibility to share content of the website; Possibility to share content on social media; Information about political program (interactive format)</td>
<td>Additive index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magin et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Facebook posts</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Index including (1) number of parties’ comments, (2) the number of users’ comments per 1,000,000 eligible voters, and (3) the share of posts in which the parties encourage the voters to discuss politics on the parties’ Facebook page (reciprocity).</td>
<td>Combined index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Operationalization</td>
<td>Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham et al. (2013), Graham, Jackson, and Broersma (2016)</td>
<td>Twitter posts</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Tweets including: Debating/position taking; Acknowledging; Organizing/mobilizing; Advice giving/helping; and/or Consulting Furthermore @Tweets were scrutinized with whom politicians interacted: Public; Politician/candidate; journalist/media; Party activist; Lobbyist; Expert; Celebrity; Industry; and/or Authority</td>
<td>(0) Not present (1) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukamto and Carson (2016)</td>
<td>Twitter comments, @ mentions, and retweets (RTs)</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Measures quantity of one-way and two-way messages between members of parliament (MPs) and citizens and who they interact with: ‘citizen to politician’; ‘politician to citizen’; or ‘politician to politician’</td>
<td>Count variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bene (2017)</td>
<td>Facebook posts</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Engagement content is coded if the post contains either requests for likes, comments, and/or sharing or whether it poses a question. All of these individual elements were also coded on their own and analyzed in specified models with all dependent variables</td>
<td>(0) Not present (1) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klinger (2013)</td>
<td>Facebook &amp; Twitter posts</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Posts including calls for discussion, appeals to collect signatures and mobilize other people to participate and to vote as well as general community-building</td>
<td>(0) Not present (1) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller and Kleinen-von Königslöw (2018)</td>
<td>Facebook &amp; Twitter posts</td>
<td>Pseudo discursive style</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0) Not present (1) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham et al. (2013), Graham et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Twitter posts</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Tweets including: Debating/position taking; Acknowledging; Organizing/mobilizing; Advice giving/helping; and/or Consulting @Tweets were also scrutinized with whom politicians interacted: Public; Politician/candidate; journalist/media; Party activist; Lobbyist; Expert; Celebrity; Industry; and/or Authority</td>
<td>(0) Not present (1) Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>