MODEL 1

The personalization of electoral decision and voter characteristics in a post-communist context

Strategy of analysis

Successive logistic regression models

Moderation: *statistical interaction* (product term of leader evaluation and voter characteristic).

A: predictors: controls + leader liking + voter characteristic

B: predictors: controls + leader liking + voter characteristic + (leader liking x voter characteristic)

Variables:

DV=vote (1, 0)

IV=leader liking

Control IV: gender, age, education, region, left-right, government retrospective evaluation

Moderator IV – voter characteristics: **political knowledge** (0-10), **subjective political information** (0=not informed, 1=somehow/very informed), **time of voting decision** (0=early decider, 1=late decider), **party identification** (0=non-identifier, 1=somehow close/very close), **interest in politics** (1-4)

Step 1: How personalized was vote choice?

→ Δ Pseudo R² strategy

Step 2: Do interaction factors bring a significant contribution to explaining vote choice?

→ Δ$\varkappa^2$ strategy + statistically significant exp(b)'s

Step 3: What is the influence of individual moderators on leader effects?

→ Exp(b)'s, multiplicative factors, Johnson-Neyman method (using PROCESS by Andrew Hayes)

MODEL 2

Party characteristics and leader effects in post-communist polities

Strategy of analysis

Successive regression models: *meqrlogit* – Multilevel mixed effects logistic regression (QR decomposition) in Stata 13

Effect of party characteristics on personalization treated as *interaction term* (product term of leader evaluation and party characteristic)

General model:

DV = vote for party (1=yes, 0=no)

Level 2 IV: country + election

Level 1 IVs:

        Leader like/dislike scale (0-1)

        Party characteristic (either 0,1 or 0-1)

        Interaction term leader LD x party characteristic (0-1)

Party characteristics: **party size** (% seats before election), **party age** (years), **incumbency** (in office or opposition, % executive portfolios before election), **ideology** (ideological family and L-R position provided by CSES collaborators).

Party characteristics *introduced one by one in successive models*.

Control IVs: age (0-1), higher education (0, 1), less than secondary education (0, 1), union membership (0, 1), household income quintile (0-1), government retrospective evaluation (0-1), left-right self-positioning (0-1), party identification (0, 1)

MODEL 3

The personalization of electoral politics and leader characteristics in the Eastern post-communist bloc

Strategy of analysis

Successive regression models:

glmer – Generalised linear mixed-effects models (*lme4* package in R)

Effect of leader characteristics on personalization treated as *interaction term* (product term of leader evaluation and leader characteristic)

Leader characteristics *introduced one by one in successive models*.

General model:

DV = vote for party (1=yes, 0=no)

Political system – related IV:

   Type of political system: *semi-presidential* (1) vs. *parliamentary* (0)

Leader-related IV:

Leader characteristics considered introduced in successive models: *gender* (0=male, 1=female), *age* (0-1), *executive position* (0=no, 1=yes), *time in executive positions* (0-1), *time as party leader* (0-1), *incumbent* (0=no, 1=yes), *top position in the former communist party* (0=no, 1=yes), *former dissident* (0=no, 1=yes)

Individual IV:

Leader evaluation like/dislike scale (0-1)

Control IVs: gender (1=male), age (0-1), higher education (1=yes), less than secondary education (1=yes), union membership (1=yes), household income quintile (0=lowest, 1=highest), ideological distance (0-1), party identification (0, 1)

Core IV: Interaction effect between the leader characteristic and the leader rating.