**Appendix A: Information about the dataset and data cleaning report**

Original Number of respondents in the SWG survey

For the Wave 1, Swg sent 7563 invitations; 1,923 valid interviews have been completed according to the necessary quotas (4221 survey recipients did not open the invitation link; 612 participants did not complete the survey, or they have been excluded because they did not express their consent to the privacy; 1007 interviews have been dropped because they exceeded the quotas). The original completion rate for Wave 1 was thus 38,7%. As far as the longitudinal design concerns, 1,763 individuals filled in the second wave of the study and 1,714 panelists completed Wave 3; 1646 interviewed participated in all the surveys (retention rate 91,7% between Wave 1 and Wave 2; 85,6% for the whole study).

Wave 1 = 1,923 individuals

Wave 2 = 1,763 individuals

Wave 3 = 1,714 individuals

Panelists (wave 1, 2, 3) = 1,646 [Retention Rate 85%]

**Data Cleaning process:**

1. **Time of completion of the survey.** Following Baker et al. (2010) and Martini et al. (2021) approach, we dropped from the analysis all those respondents (254 observations) who completed the interview in less than (or equal to) the 50% of the rounded median response time in Wave 1. Therefore, all those respondents who took 9 minutes or less to complete the first wave of the panel study have been dropped from the dataset. For the other 2 waves, we followed the same criterion and we treated as missing cases all those respondents who completed the survey in less than (or equal to) the 50% of the rounded median response time in Waves 2 and 3. In this way, we treated as missing values for the whole Wave 2 69 observations and 73 cases in Wave 3.
2. **Anomalies by gender.** We crossed the information reported by the respondents during the 3 waves of the panel with regards to their gender, as well as the information reported by the respondents at the time of inscription to the panel (SWG variable). If we detect any inconsistency in the whole study, we dropped that respondent from the dataset. In this way, we detected and excluded 33 observations, after having dropped from the dataset all those problematic cases with regards to the rounded time of completion of the survey in Wave 1 (see Point 1).
3. **Anomalies by year of birth**. As for gender, we dropped from the analysis all those respondents who reported two (or more) different year of birth across the survey. In this way, we detected and dropped from the analysis 60 observations, out of those we had already excluded by the time of completion of the survey (see Point 1) and the inconsistencies with regards to the gender (see Point 2). 14 observations had a problem both in gender and year of birth.
4. **Anomalies by educational level.** In this case, the issue was more controversial and harder to address, as over-time changes in the educational level is a possible and plausible outcome (for instance, young people who achieve the University degree during the panel study, or who passed from primary to secondary education, or who started the University but then they abandoned the studies). In this way, we detected 207 cases of people who had at least one change in the educational level variable across the three waves, of which:

* 176 cases presented only one change across the study. We kept them, as it was people that in his/her first wave was in high school but then he/she started the University degree, or people who was in the last year of the secondary school but then he/she accessed into the high school.
* 31 cases presented at least two changes with regards to the educational level. As for those who presented just one change in the educational level variable, also in this case we checked the information given by the respondents across the survey and then we checked, case-by-case, whether such change in the educational category was due to the “normal” educational process or there has been a serious inconsistency. In this way, we kept 18 observations and we dropped from the dataset 13 cases (people who gave inconsistent responses across the survey, for instance primary education in one wave and university degree in another wave).

The final sample is as follows:

Wave 1 = 1,563 respondents

Wave 2 = 1,353 respondents

Wave 3 = 1,299 respondents

The number of panelists who participated in the whole panel study (waves 1, 2 and 3) was 1204 [Retention Rate 77%] The completion rate of Wave 1 of the definitive version of the dataset is therefore 34%; the retention rate between Wave 1 and Wave 2 is 86,6% and 77% represents the retention rate of the whole study.

While the quality of the dataset has been improved with the data-cleaning procedure, Table A2 shows that the sample in Wave 1 still complied with all the quotas, with a deviation from the theoretical sample that, on average, is equal to or less than +/- 2,5% with regards to gender, age, education, working condition and area of residence. Only the age groups 25-34 (-3,4%); 35-44 (-4,16%), 55-64 (+2,8%) 65-74 (+2,6%) and the lower educated people (-4,4%) were slightly above or below the +/- 2,5% threshold, but still in a very acceptable range.

Table A2: Comparative table – Theoretical quotas (Weighted ISTAT quotas) and effective quotas in the dataset (in percentage with respect to the total). In parentheses the difference (in percentage terms) between the theoretical and the effective quotas in the dataset.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stratification Variables | Weighted quotas – Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) 2018[[1]](#footnote-1) | I Wave (Original SWG Version) | I Wave (Post data-cleaning version) | II Wave (Post data-cleaning version) | III Wave (Post data-cleaning version) | I Wave – Only panelists - (Post data-cleaning version) |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 51,16 % | 49,95 %  (-1,71 %) | 48,88 %  (-2,28 %) | 50,48 %  (-0,68 %) | 50,42 %  (-0,74 %) | 51,25 %  (+0,09 %) |
| Female | 48,84 % | 50,55 %  (+1,71 %) | 51,12 %  (+2,28 %) | 49,52 %  (+0,68 %) | 49,58 %  (+0,74 %) | 48,75 %  (-0,09 %) |
| **Total** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** |
| **Age (in categories)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 11,64 % | 11,28 %  (-0,36 %) | 11,52 %  (-0,12 %) | 9,68 %  (-1,96 %) | 9,47 %  ( -2,17 %) | 9,63 %  ( -2,01 %) |
| 25-34 | 18,51 % | 16,80 %  (-1,71 %) | 15,10 %  (-3,41 %) | 15,23 %  (-3,28 %) | 14,55 %  (-3,96 %) | 14,78 %  (-3,73 %) |
| 35-44 | 22,27 % | 21,42 %  (-0,85 %) | 18,11 %  (-4,16 %) | 17,89 %  (-4,38 %) | 18,24 %  (-4,03 %) | 17,69 %  (-4,58 %) |
| 45-54 | 24,01 % | 24,08 %  (+0,07 %) | 26,30 %  (+2,29 %) | 26,16 %  (+2,15 %) | 25,48 %  (+1,47 %) | 26,83 %  (+2,82 %) |
| 55-64 | 15,88 % | 17,26 %  (+1,38 %) | 18,68 %  (+2,80 %) | 19,81 %  (+3,93 %) | 21,17 %  (+5,29 %) | 19,85 %  (+3,97 %) |
| 65-74 | 7,69 % | 9,15 %  (+1,46 %) | 10,30 %  (+2,61 %) | 11,23 %  (+3,54 %) | 11,09 %  (+3,40 %) | 11,21 %  (+3,52 %) |
| **Total** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** |
| **Educational level** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low level of education | 29,93 % | 26,42 %  (-3,51 %) | 25,53 %  (-4,40 %) | 25,35 %  (-4,58 %) | 23,71 %  (-6,22 %) | 24,58 %  (-5,35%) |
| Middle level of education | 49,16 % | 50,91 %  (+1,75 %) | 51,38 %  (+2,22 %) | 50,18 %  (+1,02 %) | 51,04 %  (+1,88 %) | 51,16 %  (+2%) |
| High level of education | 20,91 % | 22,67 %  (+1,76 %) | 23,10 %  (+2,19 %) | 24,46 %  (+3,55 %) | 25,25 %  (+4,34 %) | 24,25 %  (+3,34%) |
| **Total** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** |
| Working status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working | 61,14 % | 59,85 %  (-1,29 %) | 58,99 %  (-2,15 %) | 59,65 %  (-1,49 %) | 61,35 %  (+0,21 %) | 59,88 %  (-1,26%) |
| No working | 38,85 % | 40,15 %  (+1,30 %) | 41,01 %  (+2,16 %) | 40,35 %  (+1,50 %) | 38,65 %  (-0,20 %) | 40,12 %  (+1,27%) |
| **Total** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** |
| **Region of residence** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Piemonte | 7,44 % | 7,02 %  (-0,42 %) | 7,23 %  (-0,2 %) | 7,46 %  (+0,02 %) | 7,01 %  (-0,43 %) | 7,23 %  (-0,21%) |
| Valle d’Aosta | 0,21 % | 0,26 %  (+0,05 %) | 0,32 %  (+0,11 %) | 0,30 %  (+0,09 %) | 0,31 %  (+0,10 %) | 0,33 %  (+0,12%) |
| Lombardia | 17,84 % | 16,90 %  (-0,94 %) | 17,40 %  (-0,44 %) | 17,29 %  (-0,55 %) | 17,24 %  (-0,60 %) | 17,52 %  (-0,32%) |
| Trentino-Alto Adige | 1,86 % | 2,44 %  (+0,58 %) | 1,98 %  (+0,12 %) | 2,07 %  (+0,21 %) | 2,31 %  (+0,45 %) | 2,08 %  (+0,22%) |
| Veneto | 8,38 % | 8,42 %  (+0,04 %) | 7,81 %  (-0,57 %) | 7,17 %  (-1,21 %) | 7,39 %  (-0,99 %) | 7,23 %  (-1,15%) |
| Friuli-Venezia Giulia | 2,15 % | 2,55 %  (+0,40%) | 2,75 %  (+0,60 %) | 2,73 %  (+0,58 %) | 2,85 %  (+0,70 %) | 2,82 %  (+0,67%) |
| Liguria | 2,69 % | 2,60 %  (-0,09 %) | 2,37 %  (-0,32 %) | 2,66 %  (-0,03 %) | 2,39 %  (-0,30 %) | 2,57 %  (-0,12%) |
| Emilia-Romagna | 7,93 % | 7,49 %  (-0,44 %) | 7,04 %  (-0,89 %) | 7,39 %  (-0,54 %) | 7,08 %  (-0,85 %) | 6,98 %  (-0,95%) |
| Toscana | 6,54 % | 6,71 %  (+0,17 %) | 7,04 %  (+0,50 %) | 6,50 %  (-0,04 %) | 7,16 %  (+0,62 %) | 6,89 %  (+0,35%) |
| Umbria | 1,41 % | 1,35 %  (-0,06 %) | 1,28 %  (-0,13 %) | 1,18 %  (-0,23 %) | 1,15 %  (-0,26 %) | 1,25 %  (-0,16%) |
| Marche | 2,54 % | 2,44 %  (-0,10 %) | 2,56 %  (+0,02 %) | 2,44 %  (-0,10 %) | 2,31 %  (-0,23 %) | 2,33 %  (-0,21%) |
| Lazio | 10,09 % | 9,88 %  (-.0,21 %) | 9,98 %  (-0,11 %) | 10,50 %  (+0,41 %) | 10,62 %  (+0,53 %) | 10,22 %  (+0,13%) |
| Abruzzo | 2,14 % | 1,98 %  (-0,16 %) | 2,05 %  (-0,09 %) | 2,07 %  (-0,07 %) | 1,92 %  (-0,22 %) | 1,91 %  (-0,23%) |
| Molise | 0,47 % | 0,57 %  (+0,10 %) | 0,51 %  (+0,04 %) | 0,52 %  (+0,05 %) | 0,62 %  (+0,15 %) | 0,42 %  (-0,05%) |
| Campania | 8,32 % | 8,53 %  (+0,21 %) | 8,38 %  (+0,06 %) | 8,35 %  (+0,03 %) | 8,31 %  (-0,01 %) | 8,55 %  (+0,23%) |
| Puglia | 6,16 % | 6,34 %  (+0,18 %) | 6,46 %  (+0,30 %) | 6,58 %  (+0,42 %) | 5,77 %  (-0,39 %) | 6,40 %  (+0,24%) |
| Basilicata | 0,89 % | 0,94 %  (+0,05 %) | 0,9 %  (+0,01 %) | 0,81 %  (-0,08 %) | 0,85 %  (-0,04 %) | 0,91 %  (+0,02%) |
| Calabria | 2,82 % | 2,96 %  (+0,14 %) | 3,2 %  (+0,38 %) | 3,10 %  (+0,28 %) | 3,31 %  (+0,49 %) | 3,16 %  (+0,34%) |
| Sicilia | 7,26 % | 7,59 %  (+0,33 %) | 7,55 %  (+0,29 %) | 7,61 %  (+0,35 %) | 8,01 %  (+0,74 %) | 7,81 %  (+0,55%) |
| Sardegna | 2,85 % | 3,02 %  (+0,17 %) | 3,2 %  (+0,35 %) | 3,25 %  (+0,40 %) | 3,39 %  (+0,54 %) | 3,41 %  (+0,56%) |
| **Total** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** | **100 %** |
| **N** |  | **1923** | **1563** | **1353** | **1299** | **1204** |

**Appendix B: question wording and variable coding.**

**Intention to vote in the forthcoming election:** “If there were a general election held tomorrow, which party would you vote for?”. The original variable has been recoded into the following categories: (1) Forza Italia; (2) Lega; (3) Fratelli d'Italia; (4) Partito Democratico; (5) Italia Viva; (6) Movimento 5 Stelle; (7) Liberi e Uguali; (8) Other parties. Partito Democratico is the reference category of the multinomial model. For the logistic regression models, two dummy variables have been computed:

1. Vote for Fratelli d’Italia and Lega (1); Vote for all the other parties except Movimento 5 Stelle (0);
2. Vote for Movimento 5 Stelle (1); Vote for all the other parties except Fratelli d’Italia and Lega (0);

**Conspiracy index related with the COVID-19 pandemic:** An additive index has been created from the sum of correct answers with regards to three out of eight statements related with the Covid pandemic. Correct answers (true when the news was actually true and false when the news was actually a fake news) have been coded as 1. Wrong answers (false when the news was actually true and true when the news was actually a fake news) and “don’t know” answers have been coded as 0. The index ranges from 0 (the respondent gave a false answer to all the statements) to 3 (the responded correctly answered to all the sentences). The three items used in the paper were:

(1) The Coronavirus that generated the Covid-19 pandemic was created in a Chinese laboratory (False, correctly evaluated by 47.8% of respondents)

(2) The spread of the Covid-19 pandemic was facilitated by the installation of 5G antennas (False, correctly evaluated by 86% of respondents)

(3) Immigrants landing in Italy are the main responsible for the increase in the number of COVID-19 infections on fall (False, correctly evaluated by 74% of respondents)

**Likelihood to get the vaccination:** “Once the anti-covid vaccines will be available in Italy, are you willing to get the vaccination?” (0) No, definitely not. (1) I don’t think I will get the vaccination; (2) Probably I will get the vaccination; (3) I will get the vaccination for sure.

**Trust in the reliability of the vaccines:** “Think about the anti-covid vaccines that are in last stage of the test process. Do you think that, once they will be available for the administration…” (0) They will not be reliable at all; (1) There are few chances that they will be reliable; (2) There are good chances that they will be reliable; (3) They will be reliable for sure.

**Frequency of information on social media:** “Over the last 2 months, how often have you used the following sources in order to get informed about political or current issues?… Social media (like Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, etc. etc.)” (0) Never; (1) Only few times per month (2) Once/two times per week; (3) Almost every day; (4) Several times per day

**Trust in newspapers:** “How much do you trust each of the following information-news distributors...The main national newspapers” (0) No trust at all; (1) A little; (2) Sufficiently; (3) A lot; (4) Complete trust.

**Trust in national parliament:** “How much do you trust each of the following political or public institution..The national parliament” (0) No trust at all; (1) A little; (2) Sufficiently; (3) A lot; (4) Complete trust.

**Ideology:** “When talking about politics, people talk about "left" and "right". Can you please tell us where you would position yourself on a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 means "left" and 10 means "right"?” The original variable has been recoded as follows: 1) far-left (0-1); 2) center-left (2-3); 3) center (4-6); 4) center-right (7-8); 5) far-right (9-10); 6) I do not identify myself

**Evaluation of the government management of the economy:** “What do you think about the government management of the following issues over the last two months? To answer this question, please use a 0-10 scale, where 0 means “very negative evaluation” and 10 means “very positive evaluation”. Economy. (0) Very negative evaluation; (10) Very positive evaluation.

**Index of economic uncertainty:** Additive scale made up by individuals’ concerns about (1) Paying off loans from the bank or paying mortgage bills; (2) Paying household bills; (3) Having to reduce the standard of living.

**Gender:** (0) Male; (1) Female.

**Age**: Age of respondent (continuous)

**Educational level**: “What is the highest level of education you have successfully completed?” Recoded into (0) Low education; (1) Medium education; (2) High education.

**Area of residence**: (1) North-West; (2) North-East; (3) Center; (4) South; (5) Islands

**Working status**: (0) Unemployed; (1) Employed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix C. Weighted Descriptive statistics of the variables employed in the models** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Variable | N | Mean/Proportion | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
|  | | | | | |
| *Dependent variable for the multinomial model* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Partito Democratico* | 190 | 0.21 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Forza Italia* | 32 | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Lega* | 150 | 0.17 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Fratelli d’Italia* | 121 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Italia Viva* | 25 | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Movimento 5 Stelle* | 188 | 0.21 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for *Liberi e Uguali* | 52 | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for other parties | 117 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| *Dependent variables for the logistic regression models* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intention to vote for PP in opposition vs mainstream parties | 773 | 0.35 |  | 1 | 0 |
| Intention to vote for PP in power vs mainstream parties | 604 | 0.31 |  | 1 | 0 |
| *Covariates* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Index of knowledge about the Coronavirus | 1,299 | 1.94 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Likelihood to get the vaccination | 1,137 | 2.00 | 1.03 | 0 | 3 |
| Trust in the reliability of the vaccines | 1,170 | 1.94 | 0.77 | 0 | 3 |
| Frequency of information on social media | 1,274 | 2.28 | 1.45 | 0 | 4 |
| Trust in national newspapers | 1,251 | 1.47 | 0.84 | 0 | 4 |
| Trust in national parliament | 1,261 | 1.22 | 0.85 | 0 | 4 |
| Far-left | 147 | 0.11 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Center-left | 285 | 0.22 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Center | 256 | 0.20 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Center-right | 159 | 0.12 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Far-Right | 139 | 0.11 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Unidentified | 271 | 0.21 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Evaluation of the management of the economy | 1,279 | 4.78 | 2.93 | 0 | 10 |
| Index of economic uncertainty | 1,286 | 0.75 | 1.12 | 0 | 3 |
| Gender (reference category male) Female | 1,299 | 0.50 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Age | 1,299 | 50.07 | 14.40 | 18 | 74 |
| Educational level | 1,299 | 0.98 | 0.63 | 0 | 2 |
| North-East | 255 | 0.19 |  | 0 | 1 |
| North-West | 350 | 0.26 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Center | 276 | 0.21 |  | 0 | 1 |
| South | 270 | 0.20 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Islands | 148 | 0.11 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Working status (ref. Employed) | 1,299 | 0.61 |  | 0 | 1 |
|  | | | | | |

**Appendix D. Multinomial models predicting the intention to vote for the main Italian parties (ref. category Partito Democratico) – Full model**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Dependent variable: | | | | | | | | |  | |
|  | FI | Lega | FdI | | IV | | M5S | LeU | Other | |  | |
| Index of knowledge about the Coronavirus | -0.75\* | -0.72\*\* | -0.83\*\* | | 0.04 | | -0.21 | 0.23 | 0.49 | |  | |
|  | (0.31) | (0.24) | (0.26) | | (0.42) | | (0.20) | (0.36) | (0.26) | |  | |
| Likelihood to get the vaccination | -0.50 | -0.33 | -0.41 | | 0.80 | | -0.73\*\* | 0.37 | -0.06 | |  | |
|  | (0.37) | (0.28) | (0.30) | | (0.51) | | (0.22) | (0.35) | (0.23) | |  | |
| Trust in the reliability of the vaccines | -0.65 | -0.91\* | -0.89\* | | -0.55 | | -0.18 | -0.22 | -0.55\* | |  | |
|  | (0.49) | (0.38) | (0.40) | | (0.48) | | (0.27) | (0.35) | (0.28) | |  | |
| Frequency of information on social media | 0.34 | 0.06 | 0.00 | | 0.01 | | -0.06 | 0.13 | 0.19 | |  | |
|  | (0.20) | (0.14) | (0.15) | | (0.18) | | (0.10) | (0.13) | (0.11) | |  | |
| Trust in newspapers | 0.08 | -0.57\* | -0.13 | | -0.37 | | -0.72\*\*\* | -0.16 | -0.44\* | |  | |
|  | (0.33) | (0.26) | (0.28) | | (0.36) | | (0.20) | (0.26) | (0.20) | |  | |
| Trust in national parliament | -0.51 | -0.39 | -0.37 | | 0.20 | | -0.10 | -0.14 | -0.22 | |  | |
|  | (0.34) | (0.26) | (0.29) | | (0.34) | | (0.18) | (0.24) | (0.20) | |  | |
| Ideology (ref. Center): Far left | -8.78\*\*\* | -3.66\*\* | -3.63\*\* | | 0.25 | | -0.75 | 2.07\*\* | -0.43 | |  | |
|  | (0.01) | (1.29) | (1.32) | | (0.77) | | (0.44) | (0.68) | (0.42) | |  | |
| Center-left | -7.10 | -2.77\*\*\* | -8.33 | | 0.11 | | -0.70\* | 0.74 | -0.98\*\* | |  | |
|  | (7.52) | (0.81) | (14.78) | | (0.69) | | (0.35) | (0.67) | (0.36) | |  | |
| Center-right | 3.15\* | 4.83\*\*\* | 4.74\*\*\* | | -1.86 | | 2.61\* | 2.97 | 2.56\* | |  | |
|  | (1.30) | (1.22) | (1.23) | | (8.83) | | (1.22) | (1.64) | (1.25) | |  | |
| Far right | 1.98\* | 3.32\*\*\* | 3.04\*\*\* | | -2.85 | | -0.54 | -5.58\*\*\* | 0.44 | |  | |
|  | (0.95) | (0.87) | (0.91) | | (9.81) | | (1.06) | (0.00) | (1.10) | |  | |
| Unidentified | 6.82\*\*\* | 7.28\*\*\* | 6.77\*\*\* | | 6.08\*\*\* | | 8.42\*\*\* | 7.08\*\*\* | 6.67\*\*\* | |  | |
|  | (0.70) | (0.49) | (0.59) | | (1.05) | | (0.40) | (1.06) | (0.50) | |  | |
| Evaluation of the management of the | -0.15 | -0.25\*\* | -0.45\*\*\* | | -0.24 | | 0.16\* | 0.04 | -0.22\*\* | |  | |
| economy | (0.10) | (0.09) | (0.09) | | (0.13) | | (0.07) | (0.10) | (0.07) | |  | |
| Index of economic uncertainty | 0.10 | 0.14 | -0.04 | | 0.59\* | | 0.38\*\* | 0.12 | -0.27 | |  | |
|  | (0.24) | (0.18) | (0.20) | | (0.23) | | (0.14) | (0.19) | (0.17) | |  | |
| Gender (ref. Male) Female | 0.59 | 0.47 | 0.47 | | -0.42 | | -0.01 | 0.13 | -0.01 | |  | |
|  | (0.55) | (0.40) | (0.43) | | (0.55) | | (0.29) | (0.36) | (0.29) | |  | |
| Age | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.02\* | |  | |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) | | (0.02) | | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | |  | |
| Educational level | -0.72 | 0.00 | 0.30 | | -0.22 | | -0.06 | 0.26 | 0.16 | |  | |
|  | (0.43) | (0.31) | (0.33) | | (0.44) | | (0.24) | (0.32) | (0.25) | |  | |
| Area of residence (ref. North-West): | 0.28 | -0.02 | -0.12 | | 0.96 | | -0.18 | -0.51 | -0.00 | |  | |
| North-East | (0.74) | (0.54) | (0.59) | | (0.77) | | (0.44) | (0.51) | (0.41) | |  | |
| Center | -1.68 | -0.24 | 0.39 | | 1.27 | | -0.17 | 0.20 | 0.12 | |  | |
|  | (1.18) | (0.56) | (0.60) | | (0.77) | | (0.45) | (0.47) | (0.40) | |  | |
| South | 0.28 | -1.21\* | -0.19 | | 0.44 | | 0.75 | -0.96 | -0.57 | |  | |
|  | (0.71) | (0.59) | (0.61) | | (0.85) | | (0.41) | (0.60) | (0.45) | |  | |
| Islands | -0.29 | -1.72\* | -0.88 | | -4.80 | | 0.96\* | -0.47 | 0.09 | |  | |
|  | (0.87) | (0.76) | (0.80) | | (10.31) | | (0.46) | (0.67) | (0.49) | |  | |
| Employed | -0.46 | -0.46 | -0.85 | | -0.45 | | 0.91\*\* | 0.06 | -0.65\* | |  | |
|  | (0.58) | (0.43) | (0.47) | | (0.54) | | (0.31) | (0.37) | (0.30) | |  | |
| Constant | 2.11 | 5.14\*\*\* | 5.37\*\*\* | | -2.45 | | 2.05 | -3.22 | 3.11\*\* | |  | |
|  | (1.80) | (1.42) | (1.51) | | (2.35) | | (1.09) | (1.67) | (1.13) | |  | |
| AIC | | | |  | | 2,025.84 | | | | | | | |
| BIC | | | |  | | 2,733.80 | | | | | | | |
| Log-likelihood | | | |  | | -858.92 | | | | | | | |
| N | | | |  | | 733 | | | | | | | |
| Note: | \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001 | | | | | | | | |  | |

**Appendix E. Logistic regression models predicting the intention to vote for populist government and opposition parties (as opposed to mainstream parties) – Full model**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Populist opposition vs mainstream | Populist government vs mainstream | |  |
| Index of knowledge about the | -0.47\*\*\* | -0.24 | |  |
| Coronavirus | (0.17) | (0.16) | |  |
| Likelihood to get the vaccination | 0.22 | -0.69\*\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.20) | (0.19) | |  |
| Trust in the reliability of the vaccines | -0.56\*\* | 0.08 | |  |
|  | (0.28) | (0.24) | |  |
| Frequency of information on social media | 0.02 | -0.13 | |  |
|  | (0.11) | (0.09) | |  |
| Trust in newspapers | -0.12 | -0.55\*\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.20) | (0.17) | |  |
| Trust in national parliament | -0.17 | 0.08 | |  |
|  | (0.21) | (0.16) | |  |
| Ideology (ref. Center): Far left | -3.08\*\*\* | -0.83\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.86) | (0.40) | |  |
| Center-left | -3.09\*\*\* | -0.38 | |  |
|  | (0.78) | (0.32) | |  |
| Center-right | 2.35\*\*\* | -0.09 | |  |
|  | (0.42) | (0.56) | |  |
| Far right | 2.27\*\*\* | -1.84\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.47) | (0.88) | |  |
| Unidentified | -0.41 | 2.21\*\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.46) | (0.47) | |  |
| Evaluation of the management of the | -0.32\*\*\* | 0.28\*\*\* | |  |
| economy | (0.06) | (0.06) | |  |
| Index of economic uncertainty | -0.14 | 0.37\*\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | |  |
| Gender (ref. Male) Female | 0.25 | -0.01 | |  |
|  | (0.32) | (0.26) | |  |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | |  |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | |  |
| Educational level | 0.37 | -0.05 | |  |
|  | (0.24) | (0.22) | |  |
| Area of residence (ref. North-West): | -0.43 | -0.33 | |  |
| North-East | (0.44) | (0.40) | |  |
| Center | -0.02 | -0.27 | |  |
|  | (0.44) | (0.41) | |  |
| South | -1.27\*\*\* | 0.85\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.44) | (0.37) | |  |
| Islands | -1.71\*\*\* | 1.20\*\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.57) | (0.41) | |  |
| Employed | 0.19 | -1.09\*\*\* | |  |
|  | (0.35) | (0.28) | |  |
| Constant | 1.88\* | 0.07 | |  |
|  | (1.05) | (0.90) | |  |
| AIC | 357,00 | 475,91 | |  |
| Log-likelihood | -156.50 | -215.95 | |  |
| N | 646 | 520 | |  |
| Note: | \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001 | |
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