**Online Appendix for:**

**Roads to Rome: How visions of elitism and pluralism shake up the goal repertoire of electoral competition**

**Appendix A - CSES survey items for elitism and pluralism**

Regarding elitism, we generated an index based on 5 questions asking the respondents whether they strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

1. Most politicians do not care about the people;
2. Most politicians are trustworthy;
3. Politicians are the main problem in [Country];
4. The people, and not politicians, should make our most important policy decisions;
5. Most politicians care only about the interests of the rich and powerful.

As for pluralism, we relied on two questions asking the respondents whether they strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

1. What people call compromise in politics is really just selling out on one's principles;
2. Having a strong leader in government is good for [Country] even if the leader bends the rules to get things done.

**Appendix B - Background expectations about party placements on pluralism and elitism**

To give some background expectations on expert party placements on pluralism and elitism, it is worth briefly introducing the Italian political parties and their relationship with the populist and technocratic government experiences that unfolded in the 2018-2022 legislative term. The Partito Democratico (PD) and Verdi-Sinistra have their roots in the lineage of traditional left-wing parties, with the latter aligning itself with a progressive agenda that prioritizes environmental concerns. Both of them – with the former being a prime example of a mainstream party – supported the second (Conte II, populist-mainstream) and third (Draghi, technocratic) governments of the term. In contrast, the Movimento 5 Stelle (M5S) is a party that transcends conventional political boundaries, embodying the characteristics of a classic post-ideological populist party; it supported all three governments of the legislature (including the first, Conte I, populist). Moving forward, +Europa, Azione, and to some extent Italia Viva, distinguished themselves by their unwavering support for Mario Draghi's technocratic governance style (confirmed by their support of his government); Italia Viva also supported the Conte II government, but then represented the key force that – by withdrawing support – led to the fall of this government. Forza Italia, initially a torchbearer of mainstream center-right politics, has evolved over time. Once under the leadership of Silvio Berlusconi, who played a pivotal role in introducing populist discourse, the party has struck a more centrist note; in the 2018-2022 term, it supported only the third (Draghi) government. Lega and Fratelli d’Italia, on the other hand, fall under the banner of populist right-wing politics. They advocate for nationalist and anti-immigration policies, resonating strongly with right-leaning constituents. Lega was a key partner of the populist Conte I government, and also supported the Draghi government; while Fratelli d’Italia was the only relevant party that did not support the Draghi government, nor any other government during the term. Lastly, Italexit represents an extremely right-wing and populist party, particularly concerning issues related to Italy's role within the European Union. Its founder left the Five Star Movement to found this party after withdrawing support to the Conte II government, and the party did not support the Draghi government.

**Appendix C - ITANES Survey items for policy dimensions**

Attitudes towards immigration are measured using the following survey question: “Alcuni dicono che riceviamo troppi immigrati. Altri dicono che va bene come è adesso. Altri ancora dicono che potremmo accoglierne di più. Lei dove collocherebbe la sua opinione?” (“*Some say that we receive too many immigrants. Others say that it's fine as it is now. Yet others say that we could welcome more. Where would you place your opinion?*”). The variable is measured on 7-point scale.

Attitudes towards the EU are measured using the following survey question: “Secondo Lei il fatto che l’Italia appartenga all’Unione Europea è un bene, un male, o né un bene né un male?” (“*In your opinion, is the fact that Italy belongs to the European Union a good thing, a bad thing, or neither a good nor a bad thing?*”). The variable is measured on 3-point scale.

Attitudes towards income redistribution are measured using the following survey question: “Quale è il suo grado di accordo con le seguenti affermazioni? Il governo dovrebbe prendere delle misure per ridurre le differenze di reddito nel nostro paese” (“*What is your level of agreement with the following statements? The government should take measures to reduce income inequality in our country*”). The variable is measured on a scale ranging from 1=Completely agree to 4=Completely agree.

Attitudes towards same-sex marriages are measured using the following survey question “Quale è il suo grado di accordo con le seguenti affermazioni? La legalizzazione dei matrimoni omosessuali è un fatto positivo” (“*What is your level of agreement with the following statements?* *The legalization of same-sex marriages is a positive thing*”). The variable is measured on a scale ranging from 1=Completely agree to 4=Completely agree.

**Appendix D - Robustness check: Prediction of vote choice**

The following table shows the results of conditional logit regressions (McFadden’s choice model) of vote choice on the various policy distances and controls. The dependent variable is a binary choice indicator in a stacked data matrix (voter\*party).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M1b | M2b | M3b | M4b | M5b | M6b |
| Pluralism |  |  | -4.63 | \*\* |  |  | -3.03 | \*\* | -2.96 | \*\* | -1.86 | + |
|  |  |  | (0.85) |  |  |  | (0.89) |  | (0.89) |  | (1.01) |  |
| Elitism |  |  |  |  | -2.51 | \*\* | -2.05 | \*\* | -1.80 | \*\* | -1.99 | \*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.41) |  | (0.43) |  | (0.43) |  | (0.50) |  |
| Immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -4.60 | \*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.71) |  |
| EU |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.06 | \*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.77) |  |
| Redistribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -5.12 | \* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (2.27) |  |
| Same-sex marriage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.07 | \* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1.04) |  |
| Controls (sex, age, education, region) |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |
| Fixed effects (respondent, party) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 4,384 | 4,384 | 4,384 | 4,384 | 4,384 | 4,384 |
| AIC | 1,666 | 1,621 | 1,600 | 1,586 | 1,535 | 1,361 |
| BIC | 1,711 | 1,672 | 1,651 | 1,643 | 1,618 | 1,469 |
| Standard errors in parentheses. Estimates are obtained through conditional logit with party dummies.\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, + p<.1 |