
Appendix


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A.1**. Descriptive statistics of selected variables: National elections | | | | | | | |
|  | N | Mean | St. Dev. | Min |  |  | Max | |
| Turnout | 19,970 | 0.896 | 0.305 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Congruence | 19,970 | -1.167 | 2.338 | -9 |  |  | 0 | |
| Closest party in national government | 19,970 | 0.339 | 0.473 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Closest party: Regionalist | 19,970 | 0.152 | 0.359 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Extreme ideology | 19,970 | 0.133 | 0.339 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Regional welfare competences (x100) | 19,970 | 13.342 | 4.150 | 4.370 |  |  | 22.140 | |
| Regional budget per capita (x100€) | 19,970 | 41.197 | 13.201 | 5.052 |  |  | 84.435 | |
| Age | 19,970 | 47.358 | 17.505 | 18 |  |  | 99 | |
| Age² | 19,970 | 2,549.181 | 1,777.858 | 324 |  |  | 9,801 | |
| Gender | 19,970 | 0.500 | 0.500 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Higher education | 19,970 | 0.196 | 0.397 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Unemployed | 19,970 | 0.139 | 0.346 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |

**Table A.2.** Descriptive statistics of selected variables: Regional elections

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
|  | N | Mean | St. Dev. | Min |  |  | Max | |
| Turnout | 50,229 | 0.845 | 0.362 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Congruence | 50,229 | -1.413 | 2.649 | -9 |  |  | 0 | |
| Closest party in national government | 50,229 | 0.308 | 0.462 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Closest party: Regionalist | 50,113 | 0.279 | 0.449 | 0.000 |  |  | 1.000 | |
| Extreme ideology | 50,229 | 0.132 | 0.339 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Regional welfare competences (x100) | 50,229 | 12.735 | 4.255 | 5.020 |  |  | 22.140 | |
| Regional budget per capita (x100€) | 50,229 | 42.713 | 12.653 | 5.052 |  |  | 86.317 | |
| Age | 50,229 | 47.759 | 17.480 | 18 |  |  | 99 | |
| Age² | 50,229 | 2,586.508 | 1,791.557 | 324 |  |  | 9,801 | |
| Gender | 50,229 | 0.494 | 0.500 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Higher education | 50,229 | 0.183 | 0.387 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |
| Unemployed | 50,229 | 0.133 | 0.339 | 0 |  |  | 1 | |



**Figure A.1.** Citizens perceived distance to closest party by electoral participation in national elections. Observations with ideological congruence from -5 to 0.



**Figure A.2.** Citizens perceived distance to closest party by electoral participation in regional elections. Observations with ideological congruence from -5 to 0.

Table A.3. Determinants of individual turnout in national (models 1 and 3) and regional (models 2 and 4) elections. Observations with ideological congruence from -5 to 0.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **National**  **(1)** | **Regional**  **(2)** | **National**  **(3)** | **Regional**  **(4)** | |
| Congruence (-5 to 0) | 0.25\*\*\* | 0.23\*\*\* | 0.30\*\*\* | 0.24\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.03) | (0.02) | (0.05) | (0.03) | |
| Extreme ideology |  |  | 0.34\*\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | |
|  |  |  | (0.10) | (0.06) | |
| Closest party in national government |  |  | -0.26\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* | |
|  |  |  | (0.07) | (0.04) | |
| Closest party: Regionalist |  |  | 0.01 | 0.16\*\*\* | |
|  |  |  | (0.09) | (0.04) | |
| Conguence X extreme ideology |  |  | 0.08 | -0.01 | |
|  |  |  | (0.07) | (0.04) | |
| Congruence X closest party in national government |  |  | -0.15\* | -0.08\* | |
|  |  |  | (0.06) | (0.03) | |
| Congruence X closest party regionalist party |  |  | 0.00 | 0.13\*\*\* | |
|  |  |  | (0.08) | (0.04) | |
| Age | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.06\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.06\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.00) | |
| Age² | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | |
| Gender (Female) | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.05 | |
|  | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) | |
| Higher education | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.36\*\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) | |
| Unemployed | -0.32\*\*\* | -0.36\*\*\* | -0.33\*\*\* | -0.37\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) | |
| (Intercept) | 0.46\* | 0.15 | 0.49\*\* | 0.07 | |
|  | (0.18) | (0.11) | (0.18) | (0.11) | |
| AIC | 11313.24 | 35692.24 | 11294.54 | 35457.15 | |
| BIC | 11375.84 | 35761.98 | 11404.09 | 35579.16 | |
| Log Likelihood | -5648.62 | -17838.12 | -5633.27 | -17714.58 | |
| Num. obs. | 18483 | 45138 | 18483 | 45022 | |
| Num. groups: election | 68 | 53 | 68 | 53 | |
| Var: election (Intercept) | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.16 | 0.09 | |
| Comments: Multilevel logistic regression models with random intercepts at the election level. The dependent variable is coded “1” if the individual voted in the last national (Models 1 and 3) or regional (Models 2 and 4) elections and “0” otherwise; standard errors in parenthesis. In all models, observations are grouped by region and year of the election. \*\*\*p < 0.001, \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05 | | | | |
|  | | | | |

Table A.4. Determinants of individual turnout in national (models 1 and 3) and regional (models 2 and 4) elections. Observations with ideological congruence from -5 to 0. Historic regions not included in the analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **National**  **(1)** | **Regional**  **(2)** | **National**  **(3)** | **Regional**  **(4)** |
| Congruence (-5 to 0) | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.33\*\*\* | 0.26\*\*\* |
|  | (0.04) | (0.02) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Extreme ideology |  |  | 0.42\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.14) | (0.09) |
| Closest party in national government |  |  | -0.29\*\*\* | -0.23\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.08) | (0.05) |
| Closest party: Regionalist |  |  | -0.33 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  | (0.19) | (0.07) |
| Conguence X extreme ideology |  |  | -0.05 | -0.02 |
|  |  |  | (0.09) | (0.06) |
| Congruence X closest party in national government |  |  | -0.19\* | -0.10\* |
|  |  |  | (0.07) | (0.04) |
| Congruence X closest party regionalist party |  |  | -0.21 | 0.11 |
|  |  |  | (0.17) | (0.07) |
| Age | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Age² | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Gender (Female) | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.04) |
| Higher education | 0.42\*\*\* | 0.33\*\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.32\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.05) | (0.09) | (0.05) |
| Unemployed | -0.34\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* | -0.34\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.05) | (0.08) | (0.05) |
| (Intercept) | 0.51\* | -0.01 | 0.59\*\* | 0.03 |
|  | (0.22) | (0.14) | (0.22) | (0.14) |
| AIC | 7684.37 | 18784.10 | 7660.33 | 18723.93 |
| BIC | 7744.28 | 18848.79 | 7765.18 | 18837.14 |
| Log Likelihood | -3834.18 | -9384.05 | -3816.16 | -9347.97 |
| Num. obs. | 13221 | 24017 | 13221 | 24017 |
| Num. groups: election | 52 | 38 | 52 | 38 |
| Var: election (Intercept) | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.05 |
| Comments: Multilevel logistic regression models with random intercepts at the election level. The dependent variable is coded “1” if the individual voted in the last national (Models 1 and 3) or regional (Models 2 and 4) elections and “0” otherwise; standard errors in parenthesis.In all models, observations are grouped by region and year of the election. \*\*\*p < 0.001, \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05 | | | | |
|  | | | | |

Table A.5. Determinants of individual turnout in national (models 1 and 3) and regional (models 2 and 4) elections, including cross-level interactions with regional competences on welfare and regional budget per capita.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **National**  **(1)** | **Regional**  **(2)** | **National**  **(3)** | **Regional**  **(4)** |
| Congruence | 0.10\*\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* | 0.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.01) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
| Extreme ideology | 0.28\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.28\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.05) | (0.09) | (0.05) |
| Closest party in national government | 0.04 | -0.54\*\*\* | 0.14 | -0.43\*\*\* |
|  | (0.19) | (0.10) | (0.19) | (0.11) |
| Closest party: Regionalist | -0.14 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.04 |
|  | (0.27) | (0.11) | (0.29) | (0.11) |
| Regional welfare competences | -0.02 | -0.01 |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Conguence X extreme ideology | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.01) | (0.03) | (0.01) |
| Congruence X closest party in national government | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Congruence X closest party regionalist party | 0.14\* | 0.20\*\*\* | 0.14\* | 0.20\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.03) | (0.07) | (0.03) |
| Congruence X regional welfare competences | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) |  |  |
| Regional welfare competences X closest party regionalist | 0.02 | 0.02\* |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Regional welfare competences X closest party in national government | -0.02 | 0.04\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Regional budget per capita |  |  | -0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Congruence X regional budget per capita |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Regional budget per capita X closest party regionalist |  |  | 0.00 | 0.01\* |
|  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.00) |
| Regional budget per capita X closest party in national government |  |  | -0.01 | 0.01\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Age | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.06\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.00) |
| Age² | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Gender (Female) | 0.05 | 0.06\* | 0.05 | 0.06\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Higher education | 0.38\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* | 0.38\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) |
| Unemployed | -0.36\*\*\* | -0.38\*\*\* | -0.37\*\*\* | -0.38\*\*\* |
|  | (0.06) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.04) |
| (Intercept) | 0.67\* | 0.04 | 0.51 | -0.11 |
|  | (0.26) | (0.17) | (0.26) | (0.18) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AIC | 12713.05 | 40904.22 | 12714.52 | 40917.70 |
| BIC | 12855.28 | 41063.01 | 12856.76 | 41076.49 |
| Log Likelihood | -6338.52 | -20434.11 | -6339.26 | -20440.85 |
| Num. obs. | 19970 | 50113 | 19970 | 50113 |
| Num. groups: election | 68 | 53 | 68 | 53 |
| Var: election (Intercept) | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.16 | 0.08 |
| Comments: Multilevel logistic regression models with random intercepts at the election level. The dependent variable is coded “1” if the individual voted in the last national (Models 1 and 3) or regional (Models 2 and 4) elections and “0” otherwise; standard errors in parenthesis. In all models, observations are grouped by region and year of the election. \*\*\*p < 0.001, \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05 | | | | |
|  | | | | |

Table A.6. Determinants of individual turnout in national (models 1 and 3) and regional (models 2 and 4) elections, including cross-level interactions with regional competences on welfare and regional budget per capita. Observations with ideological congruence from -5 to 0.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **National**  **(1)** | **Regional**  **(2)** | **National**  **(3)** | **Regional**  **(4)** |
| Congruence (-5 to 0) | 0.36\*\*\* | 0.24\*\*\* | 0.43\*\*\* | 0.19\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.06) |
| Extreme ideology | 0.35\*\*\* | 0.39\*\*\* | 0.34\*\*\* | 0.39\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.06) |
| Closest party in national government | -0.07 | -0.60\*\*\* | 0.06 | -0.52\*\*\* |
|  | (0.20) | (0.10) | (0.20) | (0.11) |
| Closest party: Regionalist | -0.19 | -0.07 | -0.02 | -0.16 |
|  | (0.28) | (0.11) | (0.30) | (0.12) |
| Regional welfare competences | -0.03 | -0.01 |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Conguence X extreme ideology | 0.08 | -0.01 | 0.07 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) |
| Congruence X closest party in national government | -0.15\* | -0.07\* | -0.14\* | -0.08\* |
|  | (0.06) | (0.03) | (0.06) | (0.03) |
| Congruence X closest party regionalist party | 0.01 | 0.13\*\*\* | 0.01 | 0.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.04) | (0.08) | (0.04) |
| Congruence X regional welfare competences | -0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  | (0.01) | (0.00) |  |  |
| Regional welfare competences X closest party regionalist | 0.01 | 0.02\* |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Regional welfare competences X closest party in national government | -0.01 | 0.04\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Regional budget per capita |  |  | -0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Congruence X regional budget per capita |  |  | -0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Regional budget per capita X closest party regionalist |  |  | 0.00 | 0.01\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.00) |
| Regional budget per capita X closest party in national government |  |  | -0.01 | 0.01\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Age | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.06\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.06\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.00) |
| Age² | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Gender (Female) | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
|  | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Higher education | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.35\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) |
| Unemployed | -0.32\*\*\* | -0.37\*\*\* | -0.33\*\*\* | -0.37\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) |
| (Intercept) | 0.80\*\* | 0.16 | 0.61\* | 0.01 |
|  | (0.27) | (0.17) | (0.27) | (0.18) |
| AIC | 11297.08 | 35435.96 | 11297.15 | 35441.44 |
| BIC | 11437.92 | 35592.83 | 11438.00 | 35598.31 |
| Log Likelihood | -5630.54 | -17699.98 | -5630.58 | -17702.72 |
| Num. obs. | 18483 | 45022 | 18483 | 45022 |
| Num. groups: election | 68 | 53 | 68 | 53 |
| Var: election (Intercept) | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.08 |
| Comments: Multilevel logistic regression models with random intercepts at the election level. The dependent variable is coded “1” if the individual voted in the last national (Models 1 and 3) or regional (Models 2 and 4) elections and “0” otherwise; standard errors in parenthesis. In all models, observations are grouped by region and year of the election. \*\*\*p < 0.001, \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05 | | | | |

Table A.7. Determinants of individual turnout in national (models 1 and 3) and regional (models 2 and 4) elections, including cross-level interactions with regional competences on welfare and regional budget per capita. Observations with ideological congruence from -5 to 0. Historic regions not included in the analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **National**  **(1)** | **Regional**  **(2)** | **National**  **(3)** | **Regional**  **(4)** |
| Congruence (-5 to 0) | 0.37\*\* | 0.15 | 0.51\*\*\* | 0.16 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.08) | (0.13) | (0.09) |
| Extreme ideology | 0.42\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.42\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* |
|  | (0.14) | (0.09) | (0.14) | (0.09) |
| Closest party in national government | -0.16 | -0.34\*\* | 0.04 | -0.63\*\*\* |
|  | (0.24) | (0.13) | (0.24) | (0.15) |
| Closest party: Regionalist | -0.88 | -0.04 | 0.13 | -0.39 |
|  | (0.49) | (0.18) | (0.80) | (0.25) |
| Regional welfare competences | -0.02 | 0.01 |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Conguence X extreme ideology | -0.05 | -0.03 | -0.06 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.09) | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.06) |
| Congruence X closest party in national government | -0.18\* | -0.09\* | -0.18\* | -0.09\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.04) |
| Congruence X closest party regionalist party | -0.21 | 0.12 | -0.19 | 0.11 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.07) | (0.18) | (0.07) |
| Congruence X regional welfare competences | -0.00 | 0.01 |  |  |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Regional welfare competences X closest party regionalist | 0.04 | 0.01 |  |  |
|  | (0.04) | (0.02) |  |  |
| Regional welfare competences X closest party in national government | -0.01 | 0.01 |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) |  |  |
| Regional budget per capita |  |  | -0.00 | 0.01 |
|  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.00) |
| Congruence X regional budget per capita |  |  | -0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Regional budget per capita X closest party regionalist |  |  | -0.01 | 0.01\* |
|  |  |  | (0.02) | (0.01) |
| Regional budget per capita X closest party in national government |  |  | -0.01 | 0.01\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.00) |
| Age | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Age² | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Gender (Female) | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.04) |
| Higher education | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.32\*\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.32\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.05) | (0.09) | (0.05) |
| Unemployed | -0.34\*\*\* | -0.33\*\*\* | -0.34\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.05) | (0.08) | (0.05) |
| (Intercept) | 0.85\*\* | -0.13 | 0.68\* | -0.27 |
|  | (0.33) | (0.20) | (0.32) | (0.22) |
| AIC | 7664.91 | 18727.18 | 7663.19 | 18711.01 |
| BIC | 7799.73 | 18872.74 | 7798.00 | 18856.57 |
| Log Likelihood | -3814.46 | -9345.59 | -3813.59 | -9337.50 |
| Num. obs. | 13221 | 24017 | 13221 | 24017 |
| Num. groups: election | 52 | 38 | 52 | 38 |
| Var: election (Intercept) | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.04 |
| Comments: Multilevel logistic regression models with random intercepts at the election level. The dependent variable is coded “1” if the individual voted in the last national (Models 1 and 3) or regional (Models 2 and 4) elections and “0” otherwise; standard errors in parenthesis. In all models, observations are grouped by region and year of the election. \*\*\*p < 0.001, \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05 | | | | |