# Appendix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1a Exit polls for the leader selection of the PD: questionnaires distribution at regional level | | | | |
| Regions | 2009 | 2013 | 2017 | 2019 |
| Abruzzo | n.a. | 71 | 75 | 59 |
| Basilicata | n.a. | 77 | 53 | 32 |
| Calabria | 130 | 167 | 117 | 114 |
| Campania | 372 | 339 | 268 | 239 |
| Emilia-Romagna | 240 | 436 | 518 | 296 |
| Friuli-Venezia Giulia | n.a. | 62 | 59 | 35 |
| Lazio | 348 | 356 | 332 | 240 |
| Liguria | 118 | 96 | 106 | 68 |
| Lombardia | 550 | 409 | 468 | 312 |
| Marche | n.a. | 97 | 124 | 64 |
| Molise | n.a. | 19 | 23 | 20 |
| Piemonte | 182 | 182 | 205 | 126 |
| Puglia | 245 | 196 | 204 | 222 |
| Sardegna | 120 | 114 | 74 | 65 |
| Sicilia | 319 | 230 | 185 | 157 |
| Toscana | 237 | 342 | 527 | 297 |
| Trentino-Alto Adige | n.a. | 24 | 38 | 19 |
| Umbria | n.a. | 85 | 91 | 56 |
| Val d’Aosta | 82 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Veneto | 303 | 201 | 230 | 120 |
| *Total* | *3,246* | *3,505* | *3,699* | *2,541* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2.a – Details on variable and question wording | | |
| Variable name | Question wording | Note |
| Vote intention in general elections | *Question: In case your candidate does not win this primary competition, what will you do in the next general election?*  Answers: ‘I will support my party no matter the result of primary elections’, ‘I will vote for another party/candidate’, ‘I am still unsure about how to react’. | The variable was then recoded into a dichotomous one, where:  1= Loyal  2= Undecided/disloyal |
| Vote in leadership selection | *Question: Could you please repeat the vote you just cast?*  Respondents could choose among the list of candidates running in each of the selection analysed. While the questionnaire was designed to be administrated as face-to-face, for this last question respondents were required to fill directly the paper questionnaire without any interference from the interviewer. Respondents were indeed provided with a pen, and they could replicate their ballot autonomously and privately. After that, they are asked to insert the questionnaire into a ballot box. | According to the leadership selection outcome, we recoded this variable into a dichotomous one, where:  1 = vote for the winning candidate  0 = vote for one of the losing candidates |
| Ideological self-placement | *Question: Many people use the terms left and right when talking about politics. Thinking about your political beliefs, where would you place yourself?*  Respondents were asked to locate their ideological placement on a continuous scale where letters from A to L are listed, where A corresponded to the left and L to the right of the ideological spectrum. Letters were recoded into numbers from 1 to 10 (A=1; L=10) during the data entry. | The self-ideological placement of the respondent was used for computing a measure of the ideological distance between the respondent and the party. While as concerns the ideological self-placement we could rely on data collection, the ideological placement of the PD was computed as the average placement of all selectors. Finally, the ideological distance between each selector and the party was defined as the difference in absolute value between the self-placement of the selector and a constant value corresponding to the the party ideological placement. |
| Party membership | *Question: Are you a PD party member?*  Answers: ‘Yes’; ‘No’. | Then this dichotomous variable was combined with the one referring to party membership in order to distinguish between different kind of selectors according to their relationship with the party so that:  0 =independent (those who were not party members nor they have voted for the PD)  1=sympathizers (those who were not party members but they have voted for the PD)  2= party members (those who were formally affiliate to the party. It should be noticed that combining the two variable a fourth theoretical case, referring to party members who defected from their own party – given the limited number of cases we did not defined a further category. |
| Vote in last general elections | Question: *Which political party did you vote in last parliamentary elections?*  Respondents were provided with the detailed list of parties running in previous general elections.  The variable was then recoded into a dichotomous one, where:  1= I vote for PD  2 = I did not vote for PD |
| Candidates evaluation | *Question: On a scale from 1 to 10, how much do you like each of the candidate running in this primary election? Where 1 means ‘I dislike him/she very much’ while ‘10 means I like him/she very much’*  Respondents were asked to evaluate each candidate running for the leadership selection on a continuous scale ranging from 1 to 10. | This set of questions were used for computing the ‘Evaluation of the new selected party leader’. It has been calculated as the difference between the evaluation for the candidate supported in primary elections and the evaluation for the new party leader. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3a. Typology of primaries’ selectors according to their party involvement | | |
|  | Which party you voted for in the last parliamentary election? | |
| Are you currently a member of the PD? | PD | Another party, abstension |
| Yes | Members | Members |
| Not | Sympathisers | Independents |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Table 4a Descriptives of the variables used in the empirical analyses* | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 2009 | | | | | 2013 | | | | |
| Variables | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Vote intention in general elections | 3,132 | 0 | 1 | .69 | .46 | 3,502 | 0 | 1 | .59 | .49 |
| Vote in leadership selection | 3,132 | 0 | 1 | .53 | .49 | 3,386 | 0 | 1 | .68 | .47 |
| Ideological distance | 3,091 | 0 | 7 | 1.11 | 1.07 | 3,456 | 0 | 7 | 1.16 | 1.05 |
| Relationship with the party | 3,130 | 0 | 2 | 1.12 | .66 | 3,502 | 0 | 2 | 1.06 | .695 |
| Evaluation of the new party leader | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 3,351 | -9 | 7 | -1.11 | 2.25 |
| Age | 3,103 | 16 | 91 | 49.07 | 17.41 | 3,495 | 16 | 90 | 52.58 | 17.04 |
| Gender | 3,072 | 0 | 1 | .54 | .49 | 3,492 | 0 | 1 | .59 | .49 |
| Education | 3,109 | 1 | 4 | 3.05 | .88 | 3,491 | 1 | 4 | 3.05 | .87 |
|  | 2017 | | | | | 2019 | | | | |
| Variables | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Vote intention in general elections | 3,516 | 0 | 1 | .61 | .488 | 2,541 | 0 | 1 | .76 | .42 |
| Vote in leadership selection | 3,409 | 0 | 1 | .70 | .458 | 2,439 | 0 | 1 | .66 | .47 |
| Ideological distance | 3,511 | 0 | 7 | 1.22 | 1.09 | 2,441 | 0 | 6 | 1.19 | .94 |
| Relationship with the party | 3,554 | 0 | 2 | 1.15 | .64 | 2,534 | 0 | 2 | 1.07 | .69 |
| Evaluation of the new party leader | 3,367 | -9 | 9 | -1.02 | 2.25 | 2,396 | -9 | 6 | -.71 | 1.72 |
| Age | 3,528 | 16 | 96 | 56.91 | 17.45 | 2,516 | 16 | 91 | 56.39 | 17.2 |
| Gender | 3,554 | 0 | 1 | .57 | .49 | 2,528 | 0 | 1 | 1.57 | .49 |
| Education | 3,542 | 1 | 4 | 3.06 | .91 | 2,522 | 1 | 4 | 3.22 | .82 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5a. Independent variables and vote intention for the PD in the next parliamentary election, bivariate relationships | | | | |
|  |  | Vote intention for PD in the next parliamentary election in case of defeat of the candidate supported in leadership selections | | |
| Year | Vote in leadership selections(a) | Disloyal/undecided | Loyal | N |
| 2009 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 32.7 | 67.3 | 1,464 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 28.8 | 71.2 | 1,688 |
| *Total* | *30.6* | *69.4* | *3,132* |
| 2013 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 37.6 | 62.4 | 1,094 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 41.3 | 58.7 | 2,296 |
| *Total* | *40.1* | *58.7* | *3,390* |
| 2017 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 52.5 | 47.5 | 1,051 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 32.3 | 67.7 | 2,472 |
| *Total* | *38.3* | *61.7* | *3,523* |
| 2019 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 18.9 | 81.1 | 829 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 26.6 | 73.4 | 1,610 |
| *Total* | *24.0* | *76.0* | *2,439* |
| Year | Relationship with the party(b) | Disloyal/undecided | Loyal | N |
| 2009 | Independent | 65.7 | 34.3 | 510 |
| Sympathiser | 26.1 | 73.9 | 1,699 |
| Full member | 16.4 | 83.6 | 890 |
| *Total* | *29.8* | *70.2* | *3,099* |
| 2013 | Independent | 81.9 | 18.1 | 731 |
| Sympathiser | 33.4 | 66.6 | 1,789 |
| Full member | 20.4 | 79.6 | 952 |
| *Total* | *40.1* | *59.9* | *3,472* |
| 2017 | Independent | 75.7 | 24.3 | 511 |
| Sympathiser | 38.4 | 61.6 | 2,081 |
| Full member | 22.7 | 77.3 | 1,067 |
| *Total* | *39.0* | *61.0* | *3,659* |
| 2019 | Independent | 64.4 | 35.6 | 531 |
| Sympathiser | 14.2 | 85.8 | 1,285 |
| Full member | 12.5 | 87.5 | 718 |
| *Total* | *24.2* | *75.8* | *2,534* |
|  | Ideological distance(c) | Disloyal/undecided | Loyal | N |
| Year | 2009 | 1.36 | 1,00 | 1,11 |
| 2013 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 1.16 |
| 2017 | 1.42 | 1.09 | 1.22 |
| 2019 | 1.30 | 1.16 | 1.19 |
|  | Evaluation of the new party leader (d) | Disloyal/undecided | Loyal | N |
| Year | 2013 | -1.23 | -1.04 | -1.11 |
| 2017 | -1.65 | -0.63 | -1.02 |
| 2019 | -0.64 | -0.74 | -0.71 |
| Note:a = row percentages; b = row percentages; c = mean values; d = mean values. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 6a. Voting behavior in leadership selection and outcome expectations | | | | |
|  | | Expectations on leadership selection outcome | |  |
|  | | Expectation to lose | Expectation to win | Total |
| 2013 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 25,8 | 5,8 | 31,7 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 0,4 | 68,0 | 68,3 |
| *Total* | *26,2* | *2407* | *3262* |
| 2017 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 23,1 | 5,2 | 28,2 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 0,5 | 71,2 | 71,8 |
| *Total* | *23,6* | *76,4* | *3335* |
| 2019 | Vote for one of the losing candidates | 22,1 | 11,0 | 33,1 |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 1,3 | 65,6 | 66,9 |
| *Total* | *23,4* | *76,6* | *2248* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 7a. Alternative Logit Models (dependent variable: Loyal attitude in General Elections) | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *2013* | | | *2017* | | | *2019* | | |
|  | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig |
| Expectations on leadership selection outcome (a) | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| Expectation to win | 0.731 | 0.083 | \*\*\* | 1.280 | 0.146 | \*\* | 0.812 | 0.132 |  |
| Ideological Distance | 0.759 | 0.033 | \*\*\* | 0.799 | 0.031 | \*\*\* | 0.837 | 0.054 | \*\*\* |
| Relationship with the party (b) | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| PD sympathizer | 6.487 | 0.769 | \*\*\* | 3.645 | 0.493 | \*\*\* | 9.978 | 1.406 | \*\*\* |
| Pd Member | 14.499 | 1.953 | \*\*\* | 8.744 | 1.270 | \*\*\* | 11.987 | 2.011 | \*\*\* |
| Evaluation of the new leader | 1.103 | 0.024 | \*\*\* | 1.179 | 0.027 | \*\*\* | 1.044 | 0.041 |  |
| Age | 1.019 | 0.003 | \*\*\* | 1.001 | 0.003 |  | 1.022 | 0.004 | \*\*\* |
| Gender (b) | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| Male | 1.160 | 0.099 | \* | 1.323 | 0.107 | \*\*\* | 1.211 | 0.147 |  |
| Education (c) | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| Middle school | 0.914 | 0.195 |  | 0.954 | 0.171 |  | 1.646 | 0.685 |  |
| High School | 0.810 | 0.163 |  | 0.832 | 0.137 |  | 0.928 | 0.346 |  |
| University | 0.753 | 0.154 |  | 0.798 | 0.134 |  | 1.015 | 0.379 |  |
| constant | 0.230 | 0.069 | \*\*\* | 0.549 | 0.149 | \*\* | 0.258 | 0.126 | \*\*\* |
| Number of observations | 3,172 | | | 3,097 | | | 2,097 | | |
| Pseudo r-squared | 0.180 | | | 0.117 | | | 0.207 | | |
| *\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1* | | | | | | | | | |
| *Reference categories: a= Expectation to lose; b= independent; c= female; d= elementary school.* | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 8a. Alternative Logit Models (dependent variable: Loyal attitude in General Elections) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *2009* | | | *2013* | | | *2017* | | | *2019* | | |
|  | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig. | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig | Coef. | St.Err. | Sig |
| Vote in leadership selection (a) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vote for the winning candidate | 1.199 | 0.104 | \*\* | 0.562 | 0.074 | \*\*\* | 1.245 | 0.150 | \* | 0.575 | 0.097 | \*\*\* |
| Ideological Distance | 0.815 | 0.034 | \*\*\* | 0.764 | 0.033 | \*\*\* | 0.809 | 0.030 | \*\*\* | 0.841 | 0.052 | \*\*\* |
| Relationship with the party(b) | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| PD sympathizer | 4.333 | 0.509 | \*\*\* | 6.728 | 0.788 | \*\*\* | 3.696 | 0.482 | \*\*\* | 9.584 | 1.288 | \*\*\* |
| Pd Member | 8.666 | 1.183 | \*\*\* | 15.114 | 2.020 | \*\*\* | 8.578 | 1.202 | \*\*\* | 12.098 | 1.961 | \*\*\* |
| Evaluation of the new party leader |  |  |  | 1.169 | 0.031 | \*\*\* | 1.179 | 0.029 | \*\*\* | 1.133 | 0.049 | \*\*\* |
| Age | 1.018 | 0.003 | \*\*\* | 1.019 | 0.003 | \*\*\* | 1.002 | 0.002 |  | 1.022 | 0.004 | \*\*\* |
| Gender (c) |  | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| Male | 0.990 | 0.087 |  | 1.161 | 0.097 | \* | 1.310 | 0.102 | \*\*\* | 1.219 | 0.142 | \* |
| Education (d) |  | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  | 1.000 | . |  |
| Middle school | 1.280 | 0.295 |  | 0.989 | 0.204 |  | 0.952 | 0.165 |  | 1.351 | 0.553 |  |
| High School | 0.875 | 0.189 |  | 0.878 | 0.171 |  | 0.798 | 0.126 |  | 0.816 | 0.303 |  |
| University | 0.859 | 0.186 |  | 0.811 | 0.159 |  | 0.783 | 0.126 |  | 0.901 | 0.335 |  |
| constant | 0.307 | 0.089 | \*\*\* | 0.252 | 0.075 | \*\*\* | 0.528 | 0.138 | \*\* | 0.372 | 0.177 | \*\* |
| Number of observations | 3,001 | | | 3,295 | | | 3,275 | | | 2,265 | | |
| Pseudo r-squared | 0.127 | | | 0.187 | | | 0.120 | | | 0.214 | | |
| *\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reference categories: a= a=vote for one of the losing candidates; b= independent; c= female; d= elementary school. | | | | | | | | | | | | |