## Supplementary material for

## *Retrospective voting in the Italian 2013 election. A sub-national perspective*

Tab. 1 Parties, degree of incumbency, and the number of provinces in which they had candidates

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2013 | prov | 2008 | prov |
| Incumbents  1 | Autonomie Liberté Démocratie (ALD)  Civic choice (SC)  Democratic Centre (CD)  Democratic Party (PD)  Future and Freedom (FLI)  Union of the Centre (UdC)  Union Valdôtaine Progressiste (UVP) | 1  109  107  109  107  110  1 | Autonomie Liberté Démocratie (ALD)  Democratic Party (PD)  Socialist Party (PS)  Union of the Centre (UdC) | 1  109  109  109 |
| Partially  0.5 | Great South (GSud)  The People of Freedom (PdL)  Vallée d’Aoste (VdA)  Südtiroler Volkspartei (SVP) | 59  109  1  2 | Italy of Values (IdV)  Movement for Autonomy (MpA)  Südtiroler Volkspartei (SVP)  The People of Freedom (PdL)  Vallée d’Aoste (VdA) | 109  46  2  110  1 |
| Non incumbents  0 | Amnesty Justice Freedom (AGL)  Brothers of Italy (FdI)  Civic Revolution (RC)  Five Star Movement (M5S)  Left Ecology Freedom (SEL)  Northern League (LN) | 59  108  109  110  109  110 | League Autonomy and Pensioners (LA)  Northern League (LN)  The Left – The Rainbow (SA) | 6  64  109 |

Tab. A.2 Descriptive statistics of the additional variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Log population | 110 | 12.88 | 0.75 | 10.96 | 15.20 |
| Log contiguous popul. | 110 | 12.95 | 0.40 | 11.65 | 14.01 |
| Incumbent index 2008 | 110 | 65.14 | 7.45 | 44.02 | 76.22 |
| Incumbent index 2013 | 110 | 49.70 | 4.48 | 38.29 | 61.71 |

Tab. A.3 Determinants of the incumbent index 2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | | (2) | | (3) | | (4) | |
|  | coef | se | coef | se | coef | se | coef | se |
| Incumbent index 2008 | 0.94\*\* | (0.34) | 1.49\*\* | (0.29) | 1.57\*\* | (0.26) | 1.61\*\* | (0.26) |
| Monti’s responsibility | -0.06\* | (0.02) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment |  |  | -0.02\*\* | (0.01) |  |  | -0.01 | (0.01) |
| Contiguous unempl. |  |  |  |  | -0.03\*\* | (0.01) | -0.02\*\* | (0.01) |
| Difference in turnout | 0.67 | (1.17) | -1.06 | (0.70) | -1.50\* | (0.69) | -1.61\*\* | (0.61) |
| Constant | -0.25 | (0.23) | -0.79\*\* | (0.15) | -0.81\*\* | (0.14) | -0.83\*\* | (0.14) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 110 | | 110 | | 110 | | 110 | |
| AIC | 0.978 | | 0.977 | | 0.976 | | 0.994 | |
| BIC | -497.56 | | -497.70 | | -497.72 | | -493.03 | |

Fractional regression coefficients with clustered standard errors in parentheses, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, + p<0.1  
Contiguity matrix and spatial lag variables computed using the spmat package for Stata (Drukker et al 2013).

Tab. A.4 Incumbents’ vote share in 2013, and internal and contiguous unemployment

(coefficients for Figure 2 in the text)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (5) | | (6) | |
|  | coef | se | coef | se |
| Shares incumbents 2008 | 2.41\*\* | (0.32) | 2.56\*\* | (0.32) |
| Unemployment | 0.06 | (0.07) |  |  |
| Log population | 0.06 | (0.07) |  |  |
| Unemployment # Log population | -0.01 | (0.01) |  |  |
| Contiguous unemployment |  |  | 0.23 | (0.14) |
| Log Contiguous population |  |  | 0.33\* | (2.70) |
| Contiguous unemployment # Contiguous pop |  |  | -0.02+ | (0.01) |
| Difference in turnout | -1.07 | (1.05) | -0.86 | (1.25) |
| Constant | -2.13\* | (0.98) | -5.54\*\* | (2.12) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 110 | | 110 | |
| AIC | 0.970 | | 0.970 | |
| BIC | -488.24 | | -488.29 | |

Fractional regression coefficients with clustered standard errors in parentheses, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, + p<0.1

Contiguity matrix and spatial lag variables computed using the spmat package for Stata (Drukker et al 2013).

Tab. A.5 Incumbent index 2013, and internal and contiguous unemployment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (7) | | (8) | |
|  | coef | se | coef | se |
| Incumbent index 2008 | 1.56\*\* | (0.28) | 1.86\*\* | (0.26) |
| Unemployment | 0.08 | (0.07) |  |  |
| Log population | 0.10 | (0.07) |  |  |
| Unemployment # Log population | -0.01 | (0.01) |  |  |
| Contiguous unemployment |  |  | 0.25\* | (0.11) |
| Log Contiguous population |  |  | 0.34\*\* | (0.12) |
| Contiguous unemployment # Contiguous pop |  |  | -0.02\* | (0.01) |
| Difference in turnout | -1.57 | (0.71) | -1.40 | (0.71) |
| Constant | -2.14\* | (0.95) | -5.46\*\* | (1.59) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 110 | | 110 | |
| AIC | 1.013 | | 1.012 | |
| BIC | -488.33 | | -488.37 | |

Fractional regression coefficients with clustered standard errors in parentheses, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, + p<0.1

Contiguity matrix and spatial lag variables computed using the spmat package for Stata (Drukker et al 2013).



Fig. A.1 Marginal effects of unemployment (left panel) and contiguous unemployment (right panel) on the Incumbent index 2013 for different sizes of the provinces



Fig. A.2 Marginal effects of unemployment (left panel) and contiguous unemployment (right panel) on the incumbents’ votes share 2013 for different sizes of the provinces, keeping constant the effect of, respectively, nearby and internal conditions.