

Seminar Paper

Variants of Populism

A Cross-National Examination of the Support for Populism in 22 European countries

Author: Fabio Votta, B.A.
Email: fabio.votta@gmail.com
Student ID: 2876533

Author: Marlon Schumacher, B.A.
Email: M.C.Schumacher@live.de
Student ID: xxxxxxxx

Author: Quynh Nga Nguyen, B.A.
Email: qynga.n@gmail.com
Student ID: 2949965

Date of Submission: 30.03.2018

Abstract

This paper seeks to investigate support for populist parties in Europe. While populism is an intensely debated topic, most scholarship is plagued with conceptual confluences between different variants of populism.

To avoid such conceptual confusions, this paper adopts a minimalist definition to identify core features that all subtypes of populism have in common, namely anti-establishment attitudes as well as their opposition to globalization.

While previous authors used economic and cultural factors to determine support for populism, we propose a theoretical model that distinguishes between *traditionalist* and *progressive populism*. This model involves two steps:

1. **Economically deprived individuals** are more likely to reject establishment parties and consequently support populist parties instead.
2. **Cultural values** determine whether these individuals support progressive or traditionalist populism:
 - a. *Traditionalist populists* draw their support from people who believe that societal change has gone too far.
 - b. *Progressive populists* draw their support from people who believe that their reactionary society is in need of progressive change.

In order to operationalize our conceptual considerations, we use the *Chapel Hill Expert Survey* dataset and combine it with *European Social Survey* data to identify respondents that vote for and/or identify with populist parties.

We estimate a multinomial logistic regression to test our hypotheses. Our models lend support for our theoretical expectations. Economically deprived individuals are more likely to support either variant of populism. Yet individuals who hold traditional values are more likely to support traditionalist populism, whereas the effect goes in the opposite direction for the support of progressive populism.

Further research might be able to build upon our conceptualization and give more attention to the different variants of populism, so as to not conflate the distinct explanatory frameworks that come along with them.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Theory	6
2.1	What is populist about populism? (5,5)	6
2.1.1	A minimalist definition: Moving away from the confusion between populism and the Right (3)	6
2.1.2	An essential distinction: Moving towards a comprehensive conceptualization of progressive and traditionalist populism (2,5)	9
3	Methods and Data Preparation	13
3.1	Data & Operationalization	13
3.1.1	Establishment - Anti-Establishment Axis	13
3.1.2	Progressivism - Traditionalism Axis	14
3.1.3	Dependent Variable: Support for Establishment/Populist Parties	20
3.1.4	Independent Variables: Cultural and Economic Explanations	20
3.2	Statistical Methodology	21
4	Analysis	23
4.1	Descriptive Statistics	23
4.2	Multinomial Logistic Regression	27
4.2.1	Results	27
5	Conclusions	35
6	References	37
7	Appendix	38

List of Figures

1	Factor Analysis of CHES Data	16
2	Results of Gap Statistic Method	17
3	Party Alignment of European Parties	18
4	Support for Establishment/Populist Parties over Time	24
5	Support for Establishment/Populist Parties Across European Regions	25
6	Support for Establishment/Populist Parties by NUTS - Regions	26
7	Support for Establishment/Populist Parties over Time	26
8	Marginal Effects for Control Variables - Model 4	28
9	Marginal Effects for Economic Hypotheses - Model 4	29
10	Coefficient Plot: Models 1 - 5	30
11	Marginal Effects for Cultural Hypotheses - Model 4	31
12	Marginal Effects for Interaction: Economic Insecurity \times Anti-Immigration Sentiment	32
13	Marginal Effects for Interaction: Unemployed \times Self-Enhancement	33
A1	Marginal Effects of Left-Right Scale	38

List of Tables

1	Summary Statistics	23
2	Summary of Results	36
A1	Party Alignment	39
A1	Party Alignment	40
A1	Party Alignment	41
A1	Party Alignment	42
A1	Party Alignment	43
A1	Party Alignment	44
A1	Party Alignment	45

1 Introduction

This paper seeks to investigate support for populist parties in Europe. While populism is an important and intensely debated topic, most scholarship is plagued with conceptual conflation between different variants of populism. Despite efforts to avoid such conflation, many influential scholars continue to use qualifying features of the Right to describe populism, possibly leading to severe shortcomings in their empirical analyses. For example, in Inglehart's and Norris' publication "Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism"¹ ostensibly right-wing parties such as the *National Democratic Party* in Germany or the Hungarian *Jobbik* are classified as populist left, based solely on their left-right position on the economic scale.

To avoid such conceptual confusions, this paper adopts Cas Mudde's clear minimalist definition to identify core features that all subtypes of populism have in common. In line with this definition, we suggest that populist parties are primarily defined by their degree of anti-establishment attitudes as well as their opposition to globalization. Subsequently, we propose to classify European populist parties along a *progressive and traditionalist* left-right dimension.

While previous authors used economic and cultural factors to determine support for (mostly traditionalist) populism, we propose a hierarchical theoretical model that distinguishes between traditionalist and progressive populism. This model involves two steps:

1. **Economically deprived individuals** - seeking to change the status quo - are more likely to reject establishment parties and consequently support populist parties instead.
2. **Cultural values** determine whether these individuals support progressive or traditionalist populism:
 - a. *Traditionalist populists* draw their support from people who believe that cosmopolitan liberal elites undermine national unity and that societal change has gone too far.
 - b. *Progressive populists* draw their support from people who believe that "neoliberal" elites (represented by institutions like multinational banks and companies) undermine the people's will by safeguarding the deeply reactionary society that is in dire need of radical change.

In order to operationalize our conceptual considerations, we use the *Chapel Hill Expert Survey* (CHES) dataset that contains information on the positions of political parties within Europe. We then devise two indices along which European parties can be classified: Anti-Establishment vs. Establishment and Progressivism vs Traditionalism. K-Nearest Neighbour clustering identifies four clusters, traditionalist and progressive populist parties as well as their two establishment

¹Inglehart, Ronald and Norris, Pippa (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash. HKS Working Paper No. RWP16-026.

counterparts that are merged into a single establishment cluster. After the successful classification, we combine the CHES data with *European Social Survey* (ESS) data Round 5 – 8 and identify respondents that either vote for or identify with the classified populist parties, forming our dependent variable *Support for Populist Parties*.

We estimate a multinomial logistic regression to test our hypotheses of support for populism. Our models lend support for our theoretical expectations. Economically deprived individuals are more likely to support both traditionalist and progressive populist parties. Yet individuals who hold anti-immigration views as well as traditional values are more likely to support traditionalist populism, whereas the effect goes in the opposite direction for the support of progressive populism.

Further research might be able to build upon our conceptualization and give more attention to the different variants of populism, so as to not conflate the distinct explanatory frameworks that come along with them.

The following Chapter 2 discusses our theoretical framework and classification of European populist parties, as well as some of the general challenges when it comes to quantifying and analyzing populism in Europe. In Chapter 3, the used research methods are introduced and the classification of European parties is done with the help of k-means clustering. Afterwards, Chapter 4 reports on the multinomial logistic regression and its results. Finally, the conclusion (Chapter 5) gives a summary of the results and derives implications for further research.

This is a great way to test whether 1233.34 really works in the way it is intended to work. This is different though because 34.876 might be better actually. Or how about 44864.

1233.34

1233.34

1233.34

The following subsection will conceptualize regime support and introduce possible explanatory frameworks that were gathered from the relevant literature (Section 2.1). In this section, the concept of deliberation is clarified (Section 2.2) and a link between deliberation and regime support is established, from which research hypotheses are subsequently derived (Section 2.3).

Some Citations

This is an example introduction. Let's cite someone here (Tibshirani et al. 2001). And in text as well: Habermas (1994) says that we can cite people in text. Or we can write the name, and then use the citation thingy to print the year: Blabla states something about something (1975). Or how about multiple citations (Habermas 1994; Habermas 1994). Or we citation with a little of text around it (cf. Habermas 1994: 92-93).

More Citations

Blah blah (cf. Easton 1965: 33–5; also Easton 1975: 2).

Blah blah (Easton 1975: 33–5, 38–9).

Blah blah (Easton 1975; Habermas 1994).

Smith says blah (1975).

Easton (1975) says blah.

Habermas (1994: 33) says blah.

2 Theory

2.1 What is populist about populism? (5,5)

While populism is an important and intensely debated topic, most scholarship is plagued with conceptual conflation (cf. Mudde/Kaltwasser 2011: 1). Despite efforts to avoid such conflation, many influential scholars continue to use qualifying features of the Right to describe populism, possibly leading to severe shortcomings in their empirical analyses. To avoid similar conceptual confusions, this chapter will first adopt Cas Mudde’s clear minimalist definition to identify those core elements that all subtypes of populism have in common (2.1.1.). Subsequently, we propose a comprehensive framework to classify European populist parties along two relevant dimensions: progressivist and traditionalist populism. (2.1.2.)

2.1.1 A minimalist definition: Moving away from the confusion between populism and the Right (3)

In almost every handbook about populism, authors would eventually point out to the concept’s contested nature. As Heinisch et al. described, “[n]early as ubiquitous as articles and commentaries on populism is the assertion that it is a contested concept and difficult to define. [...] [T]here have been numerous conceptualisations, which are themselves derived from several fundamental approaches that differ [...] in their ideas on whether populism is primarily ideational, discursive, stylistic, or strategic in nature.” (HB: 22) This contending debate on how to best define populism is reflected by various empirical studies that emphasize different and sometimes even contradictory aspects of the phenomenon (cf. Gerring 2001: 120 in HB: 169). Broadly speaking, there exist three types of definition for populism. It can be qualified as an organizational type, as a political communication style or as an ideology (cf. Pauwels 2011: 99). Especially the latter has gained prominence in scholarly literature (? Referenz wiederfinden) However, the differentiation between

populism as a communication style and as an ideology seems artificial at times. Both types distinguish between the people as opposed to the elite and they both allow for a combination with other (even diametrically opposed) ideologies. In our understanding these two types of populism share so many characteristics that the differentiation between them seems to be a matter of wording rather than a matter of clear defined features of populism. Most scholars agree on the “chameleonic” character of populism (cf. Taggart 2000 in Ot/Low 2015: 61). Some authors, borrowing Michael Freeden’s (1996) notion of a thin ideology (in Ot/Low 2015:61), assert that populism can be combined with other more “established” ideologies like liberalism, nationalism, conservatism, federalism or socialism (i.e. Mudde 2015:1, M/K 2017: 19, Albertazzi & McDonnell 2008: 4). As Mudde and Kaltwasser emphasize, populism can be “left-wing or right-wing, organized in top-down or bottom-up fashion, rely on strong leaders or be even leaderless” (? In Mudde/Kaltwasser 2012: 153). A serious problem is therefore the confusion between populism and the Right (ie Betz, 1994 in Albertazzi & McDonnell 2008:3), as Cas Mudde laments: “Until now, populism was almost exclusively linked to the radical right, leading to an incorrect conflation of populism and xenophobia.” (Mudde 2015: 1 in HB. 229) This tendency has to do with the fact that populism gained strength in Europe with the formation of populist radical right parties in the 1980s (Mudde/Kaltwasser 2012: 155). Their emergence triggered the blossoming of a vast scholarly literature – although focussing almost exclusively on discussing right-wing populism (De Lange, 2008, in Ot/low 2015:60) while neglecting the growing impact of their counterpart on the left side of the political spectrum (Lucardie and Voerman, 2012; March and Mudde, 2005 in Ot/Low 2015: 60).

Despite the already existing thematization of this shortcoming, many scholars still make the mistake of using right-wing characteristics to define populism (Mudde 2007 in Ot/Low 2015: 61). Inglehart and Norris, for instance, in their analysis on the support for populism in Europe, justified their definition as follows: “Cas Mudde has been influential in the literature, suggesting that populist philosophy is a loose set of ideas that share three core features: anti-establishment, authoritarianism, and nativism.” (Inglehart/Norris 2016: 6). Considering that the publication they quoted from is called “Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe” (2007), Inglehart’s and Norris’ statement seems to be remarkably negligent. In this publication, Cas Mudde unambiguously named authoritarianism and nativism as ideological features of the populist right and not of populism per se (cf. Mudde 2007: 22, Mudde/Kaltwasser 2012: 155). We believe that it is exactly because of such a theoretical conflation that Inglehart’s and Norris’ empirical classification of European parties exhibits serious flaws, i.e. by wrongly categorising ostensibly right-wing parties such as the German National Democratic Party or the Hungarian Jobbik as populist left just because they happen to be on the left and right on the economic policy scale (cf. Inglehart/Norris 2016: 36). As Albertazzi points out, “this insistence on making ‘populist’ and ‘extreme right’ synonymous or lumping all populists under the ‘radical Right populist’ banner for ease of comparison [...] is detrimental to our understanding [of] [...] populism itself.” (Albertazzi et al. 2007: 4).

To avoid similar mistakes, we draw on a minimalist definition to capture core features that all subtypes of populism have in common. Following Mudde (who is indeed “influential in the literature”), we view populism as “a thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the *volonté générale* (general will) of the people”. (Mudde 2004: 543) / (Mudde/Kaltwasser 2017: 6). The biggest advantage of this minimalist definition is its neutrality, allowing us to analyse populism independently from the ideological environment in which it operates (Hali/Nanou 2012: 2). The particularity of Mudde’s definition is the normative distinction made between the “pure” people and the “corrupt” elite (cf. Mudde 2017: 9). According to populists, democracy has been perverted by the corrupt elite who act in their own interests instead of respecting the *volonté générale* (general will of the people) (M/K 2017: 16). Populists proclaim their commitment to fight these corrupt elites as well as other alien enemies in possession of power in order to give back the sovereignty to the people (Ot/Low 2015: 60). Studies of populism was initially studied in a narrow national or regional context, first concentrating on the United States and later expanding to also include Latin America and Europe. (cf. Mudde/Kaltwasser 2011: 1) Recognizing that left-wing populism was widely neglected in the past, recent scholarship has started to study this variant of populism (i.e. Stavrakakis, 2014 or Rendueles, 2018). However, so far this literature tends to conduct qualitative case studies that concentrate on regional singularities instead of generalizable tendencies of the phenomenon. (Mudde/Kaltwasser 2011: 1) Left-wing populism is commonly perceived as geographically limited to Latin America while right-wing populism is associated to the European political context. Given the recently growing importance of left-wing populist parties also in Europe (i.e. SYRIZA or Podemos), it is important to study the populist phenomenon taking into account – but without limiting it to – the regional context (comprising political, cultural and economic specificities) that it is embedded in (? in HB: 138, 229). With regard to the populist phenomenon in Europe – which is this is paper’s focus of study – two common points shared by all populist parties regardless of their ideological background are important to note. First, as explained above, populists reject establishment parties that they consider to represent the “corrupt elite” acting against the interests of the “pure people” (M/K 2017: 12). Secondly, populists are consistently opposed to globalization, most notably represented by the European integration process. (Halikiopoulou et al. 2012; Harmsen, 2010; Mudde, 2007 in OHP: 390, Hooghe et al. 2002 in van Elsas 2016:1184). However, while anti-establishment and anti-European attitudes constitute common denominators of populists from all sides of the political spectrum, the justification and intensity for these attitudes vary starkly depending on the ideological orientation of the populist parties in question (Conti and Memoli 2012: 93 in van Elsas 2016:1184; ? in Ot/Low 2015: 60, M/K 2017: 22). This begs another important question: what, then, distinguishes the operating logic of different variants of populist parties?

2.1.2 An essential distinction: Moving towards a comprehensive conceptualization of progressive and traditionalist populism (2,5)

The main difference originates from the populists' definition of "the pure people" and "the corrupt elite". (M/K 2012: 148) The term populism in itself is derived from the Latin word *populus* - literally meaning "the people". Populists are however very ambiguous about "the people" that they intend to represent (HB: 22). Since "the people" is an "empty signifier" (Laclau in M/K 2017: 9), its signification varies depending on historical and regional circumstances and its interpretation differs from party to party (Canovan 1981 in HB: 169). As Mudde and Kaltwasser (2017) assert, "[e]ach populist actor emerges because of a particular set of social grievances, which influences its choice of host ideology, which in turn affects how the actor defines 'the people' and 'the elite'". (M/K 2017: 22). Due to this ambiguity, the dichotomy between the "pure people" and the "corrupt elite" can be understood from a political, a cultural or an economic viewpoint (Mény and Surel 2000 in HB: 169). Most populists therefore not only target the political elite, but also other types of elites like the economic, the cultural or the media elite (M/K 2017: 12).

As suggested in the previous section, the two most discussed variants are commonly labelled "left-wing" and "right-wing" populism. In recent scholarly literature however, there exist many different notions to capture these two manifestations of the populist phenomenon. Alexander and Wenzel, for instance, propose to associate left-wing populism to "disaffected liberalism" and right-wing populism to "disaffected illiberalism". (A/W 2017: 8) Kaltwasser and Mudde, on the other hand, identify a juxtaposition between "inclusionary populism" and "exclusionary populism" (M/K 2011: 2, M/K 2012: 158). Whereas inclusive populism operates on a socioeconomic dimension (inclusion of the underprivileged), exclusive populism operates primarily on a sociocultural dimension (exclusion of the "others")." (M/K 2012: 167) In this sense, inclusive populism is considered to exhibit left-wing and exclusive populism right-wing characteristics. Halikiopoulou et al. (2012), for their part, consider nationalism to be the source of populism. Which variant of populism then emerges depends on whether a civic (left-wing) or an ethnic (right-wing) form of nationalism is at play (hal/nanou 2012: 3). These are but some of the many existing conceptualizations of populism – reflecting a certain difficulty to do justice to the diversity of this phenomenon.

We, for our part, seek to distance ourselves from the left-right labels and suggest to classify European populist parties along a values continuum on which *progressive populists* and *traditionalist populists* are opposing one another. There are two main reasons for as why we chose to categorize variants of populism along this value dimension and using these notions. The first reason has to do with the politically correct [appropriate] naming of public actors. We wish to avoid imposing a label that the actors in question would not employ to describe themselves. Populists do not necessarily agree to be pigeonholed as belonging to the "left" or to the "right" (and especially not to the "radical-left" or "radical-right"). Furthermore, it has been noted that the positions of some populist parties

on political and economic issues are too incoherent to be consistently categorized as left or right. [(cf. Havlík and Stanley (2015) in]. As for the suggestion to categorize populists as being “liberal” or “illiberal”, it is important to note that liberalism is a highly ambiguous concept in itself (Paton 2011: 9). On the one hand, the “classic” or “Lockean” version of liberalism insists on individual freedom associated to private property rights, hence rejecting any form of state intervention. On the other hand, the “social” or “Millian” version of liberalism rejects market inequality in favour of individual agency, hence encouraging state intervention, economic regulation and resources redistribution by a welfare state. (Stephens 2016: 58, Skorupski 1999: 215) In this respect, both the political right and the left can be qualified as “liberal”, depending on the interpretation of the concept. Furthermore, the term “liberal” has an inextricable political and normative connotation when used within the setting of liberal democracies. No populist party – regardless of their ideological affiliation – would accept being described as “illiberal”. Conversely, those populists who feel close to socialist ideals would shy away from being called “liberals”.

Our second reason to classify populism along a “progressivist-traditionalist” axis is of conceptual considerations. The notion of *progressivism*, defined by the Oxford dictionary as “support for or advocacy of social reform.”, refers initially to the Progressive Movement that developed in United States in the late 19th century. It emerged as a reaction to social problems that resulted from the rapid industrialisation, urbanisation, agrarian depression and financial recession at the time. Progressivism’s main assumption is that laissez-faire capitalism and excessive individualism has led to social ills, such as extreme poverty, the formation of slums, increased prostitution and the exploitation of workers. Progressives hence support state induced social reforms to help the weak and underprivileged (especially workers, women and children). The government, responsible for protecting the “public interest” against self-interest, (Prono 2009: 258, Nugent 2010: 4) is expected to control finance and industry to make these more accountable to citizens – and to fight social injustice in the process. (cf. Prono 2009: 257) The key value of progressivism is thus “openness to change” (Nugent 2010: 3), and the central belief of progressives is that “society could be changed into a better place.” (ibid: 5)

When speaking about progressivism since the late 20th century, it is notably associated with the “silent revolution” that describes a value change of the post-war generation towards post-materialism (cf. Inglehart 1977). Post-materialists endorse progressive social values and new lifestyles, champion self-expression and civil liberties (cf. Inglehart 1997: 131) including cosmopolitanism, multiculturalism, and a greater tolerance for sexual, ethnic and religious diversity (cf. ibid: 23). This value shift brought new issues on the political agenda such as environmental protection, human rights, legalisation of abortion, acceptance of homosexuality, and gender equity, resulting in rising support for left-libertarian parties (i.e. the Greens) and progressive movements. (cf. Ignazi 1992; Inglehart 1977 in M/K 2012: 167; Inglehart 1997: 4f., 23, 240f.) (in Inglehart/Norris 2016: 3).

Progressive populists, in our understanding, are people who challenge establishment institutions on the grounds of social justice and internationalist solidarity. They believe that “neoliberal” power elites (represented by institutions like multinational banks and firms) undermine the people’s will by safeguarding a deeply reactionary society that is in dire need of radical change. While being essentially tolerant towards cultural, religious and sexual diversity, progressive populists believe that the current economic system of free markets is fundamentally defective – insofar as to benefit the elites to the detriment of the underprivileged, ordinary people (March & Mudde 2005: 25, Bornschier 2010 in hali/nanou 2012: 2). Examples that progressive populists frequently use to criticize the dysfunctionality of the status quo are the financial crisis of 2008 or the European debt crisis. Neoliberal policies pursued by financial elites are perceived as widening the gap between rich and poor and as a danger to welfare state commitments (van Elsas 2016:1184) *Progressive populists* reject globalisation for fear of capital flight and depreciation of labour. (Frieden and Rogowski, 1996) (Verbeek/Zaslove in OHP: 389) They therefore oppose the EU – an institution considered as a means of action for these global neoliberal elites (i.e. “Goldman Sachs’ revolving doors in Brussels”). (Hooghe et al. 2004: 128 in hali/nanou 2012: 2, March and Rommerskirchen 2012 in van Elsas 2016:1184). The antithesis to *progressivism* is *traditionalism*. Tradition, in its broadest sense, is “anything which is typical of the past, customary, or part of a cultural identity.” (Allison 2009:537). Traditionalism is the “propensity to revive or defend traditions against non-traditional beliefs and values” (ibid), and traditionalists are people who highly value traditions. In its initial meaning, traditionalism refers to the idea that established institutions and order, most notably represented by the church and the monarchy, should be protected against radical revolutions. (cf. Allison 2009: 537) In a wider sense, traditionalism’s object of protection can include diverse items ranging from including “such diverse items as religious beliefs, sporting customs, linguistic practices, or dietary habits.” (ibid) The key value of traditionalism is the preservation of stability, and the central belief of traditionalists is that society must defend the customs they hold dear against chaotic change. (cf. Allison 2009: 537) Examples for progressive doctrines that oppose political traditionalism are Marxism or liberal capitalism, which – in their rationalism –are inherently intolerant towards traditional values and practices. These doctrines were however unable to provide people’s lives with cultural or spiritual meaning, which is important to give them the sense of security, stability and achievement. This contributes to the appeal of traditionalism, often manifesting through diverse forms of nationalist or religious renaissance (cf. ibid).

Traditionalism of the late 20th century refers to counterrevolutionary reactions to the “silent revolution”. Supporters consist primarily of white men, elders and those left behind by globalisation, who fear that the rise of progressive demands will endanger their material status, benefits and privileges. They also see the strengthening of post-materialist values as a threat to once prevailing cultural norms that they cherish. Traditionalists value tradition and stability over change, believing that the government should apply strict measures to protect their social and cultural identity against

morally corrupt influences. For them, security and order has priority over universal liberal norms. (cf. Inglehart 1977 in Inglehart/Norris 2016: 7, 13) *Traditionalist populists*, in our understanding, are people who challenge establishment institutions to protect their sociocultural identity. They draw their support from people who believe that cosmopolitan liberal elites undermine national unity and that societal change has gone too far. They usually endorse nationalist and authoritarian values (Mudde 2010, M/K 2012: 155), emphasizing the necessity to have strong leaders repelling “external threats” to the nation state. This tendency manifests itself most notably in “ethno-centric” discourses (Hainsworth 2008) and calls for harsh policies concerning asylum and immigration issues (Mudde 1996, 2007; Mair & Mudde 1998) (in hali/nanou 2012: 2). *Traditionalist populists* reject globalisation, which they see as a danger for national and local identities. (Verbeek/Zaslove 2017: 390 in OHP) This logic translate into their euroscepticism in defence of national sovereignty and cultural homogeneity against alien influences (?? (in van Elsas 2016:1184; Halikiopoulou et al. 2012: 2).

Summing up, while all populists attack political elites, progressive populists especially target the economic elite. By contrast, traditionalist populists are characterized by nativism and focus on arguments around cultural antagonism (HB: 170, cf. Mudde 2007: 18 ff.). Simply put, progressivists frequently enter in a marriage of convenience with some type of “socialism” while traditionalists do the same with some type of “nativism” (Mudde 2015: 1 in HB: 229, M/K 2017: 21).

Having established a hierarchical framework to categorize European populist parties along a populist-establishment and a progressive-traditionalist dimension, we now move to explanations for the rise and distinctive colouring of European populist parties.

3 Methods and Data Preparation

The following section introduces the data and its sources. We use the Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) on European party positions in order to construct our dependent variable of *Support for Establishment/Populist Parties* (i.e. Support for Progressive or Traditionalist Populist parties) along with individual level data from the European Social Survey (ESS) (Section 3.1). The section further operationalizes our hypotheses (cultural and economic explanations for populism) and give a description of the used control variables. Following this, the statistical methodology is explained (Section 3.2).

3.1 Data & Operationalization

The CHES dataset contains information on the positions of 365 political parties in 40 European countries on european and national policy issues in the timerange between 1999 and 2014. This makes the CHES data suitable for identifying the ideological party positions that can be classified as progressive and traditionalist populism within the European context. Since parties have changed over time, for the purposes of our analysis we only use the latest available data from 2014.

As a first step, we selected two variables that are in line with our minimalistic definition of populism. They will be used to construct the an Establishment - Anti-Establishment Axis.

3.1.1 Establishment - Anti-Establishment Axis

Populism, as it is conceptualized in this study, is characterized by two main features: a disdain for the established elites that supposedly exploit the *pure* and *little* people and an opposition to the effects of globalization that brings cultures and economies closer together at the expense of the (local) working class.

Anti-Elite Sentiment

Anti-Elite Sentiment is measured with the 11-point scale (0-1) variable *antielite_salience* that indicates the salience of anti-elite rhetoric within a given party. This corresponds with Mudde and Kaltwasser’s concept of populism where the “corrupt elite” is pitted against the pure people (M/K 2017: 12).

- *Salience of anti-establishment and anti-elite rhetoric*
 0. Not important at all
 1. Extremely important

Euroskepticism

Euroskepticism (*position*²) will be used as a proxy variable for anti-globalization. Populists are consistently opposed to the European integration process, albeit for different reasons.

- *Overall orientation of the party leadership towards European integration*
 1. Strongly opposed
 2. Strongly in favor

3.1.2 Progressivism - Traditionalism Axis

Next, we try to identify the value cleavage between progressivism and traditionalism.

This cleavage divides *progressives*, who favor progressive social values, promote liberal lifestyles and acceptance of homosexuality, civil liberties and multiculturalism from *traditionalists* who take the opposite stance on all these positions. The following variables have been selected in order to distinguish between progressive and traditionalist populism.

GAL-TAN

GAL-TAN is a new politics dimension invented by Hooghe et al. (2002). The capital letters are abbreviations for a scale that is supposed to capture the new fault lines in European politics and they stand for *Green-Alternative-Libertarian* (GAL) and *Traditional-Authoritarian-Nationalist* (TAN) respectively.

- *Position of the party [...] in terms of their views on democratic freedoms and rights. “Libertarian” or “postmaterialist” parties favor expanded personal freedoms, for example, access to abortion, active euthanasia, same-sex marriage, or greater democratic participation. “Traditional” or “authoritarian” parties often reject these ideas; they value order, tradition, and stability, and believe that the government should be a firm moral authority on social and cultural issues (galtan).*
 0. Libertarian/Postmaterialist
 1. Center
 2. Traditional/Authoritarian

Social Lifestyle

The acceptance of different lifestyle is a phenomena that consistently splits traditionalists from progressives. While progressives push for the acceptance of non-traditional social lifestyles traditionalists see this push as undermining very fabric of society.

- *Position on social lifestyle (e.g. homosexuality) (sociallifestyle).*
 0. Strongly supports liberal policies

²The Euroskepticism variable has been recoded so that higher values indicate higher opposition to European integration.

1. Strongly opposes liberal policies

Civil Liberties

While progressives favor civil liberties and rehabilitation of criminals into society, traditionalists favor tough measures can serve as a deterrence, even at the expense of civil liberty.

- *Position on civil liberties vs. law and order (civlib_laworder).*
 0. Strongly promotes civil liberties
 1. Strongly supports tough measures to fight crime

Multiculturalism

Traditionalists usually see a looming threat from immigrants from different countries, especially when they come from non-European countries, so they favor their complete assimilation into the host country. Progressives on the other hand understand diversity as strength and favor multicultural society without assimilation.

- *Position on integration of immigrants and asylum seekers (multiculturalism vs. assimilation) (multiculturalism).*
 0. Strongly favors multiculturalism
 1. Strongly favors assimilation

Left-Right Scale

Lastly, a general left-right scale is added to this dimension. While our definition of the Progressive-Traditionalist Axis is mostly based on value differences, it's not *just* that. Party affiliation with a set of ideas matters as well and therefore we also include a measure of ideology through this scale.


- *Position of the party [...] in terms of its overall ideological stance (lrgen).*
 0. Extreme left
 1. Center
 2. Extreme right

Having selected the variables, a maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation is conducted in order to estimate whether our proposed dimensions are being measured by the relevant variables.

Based on the Kaiser-Criterion, two distinct dimensions are extracted explaining a total variance of 0.78%. The extracted scales are then summed into two scales *Establishment vs. Anti-Establishment* and *Progressive vs. Traditionalism*, each standardized from 0 to 100 points to facilitate easy interpretation.

As a next step, we want to extract our traditionalist and progressive populist parties. This will be done with the help of *k-means clustering*. K-Means clustering is a very popular form of unsupervised

Figure 1: Factor Analysis of CHES Data



machine learning that helps with classification problems. The algorithm produces a k number of clusters (classification groups), where k is specified by the researcher. K-Means clustering estimates a centroid (i.e. a center) for each group that has the highest *intra-class similarity* within a given cluster (i.e. smallest distance from the centroid) and the lowest *inter-class similarity* with other specified cluster (i.e. maximized distance from other cluster centroids). The resulting clusters have minimal *within cluster variation* and a maximum of *between cluster variation* (cf. Friedman et al. 2001: 509 ff.).

The classical algorithm for k-means clustering is the Hartigan-Wong algorithm (1979), where the total within-cluster variation is defined as the sum of squared (Euclidean) distances between data points and the corresponding centroid:

$$W(C_k) = \sum_{x_i \in C_k} (x_i - \mu_k)^2$$

Where x_i is a data point belonging to the cluster C_k and μ_k is the mean of values that are classified as cluster C_k (centroid).

Each data point x_i is classified as a specific cluster so that the sum of squares euclidian distance of the observation to their assigned cluster centroid μ_k is minimized.

$$Within - SS = \sum_{k=1}^k W(C_k) = \sum_{k=1}^k \sum_{x_i \in C_k} (x_i - \mu_k)^2$$

Finally, the total within-cluster sum of square (Within-SS) measures the appropriateness of the

clustering based on how much it can be minimized.

Now the algorithm can come into use. As a first step, the algorithm randomly selects k points from the given data that will be used as centroids. Next, two steps will be repeated iteratively until convergence is achieved:

1. Cluster Assignment Step

Using Euclidean distance, the distances to the centroid are calculated and the data points are classified to be part of a cluster.


2. Centroid Update Step

In this step, a new centroid is calculated based on the estimated clusters. These centroids serve as new starting point and all data points are reassigned.

The algorithm converges when the clusters do not change in the next iteration (the last two iteration produce the same clusters with the same data points within them).

Finally, the two scales *Establishment vs. Anti-Establishment* and *Progressive vs. Traditionalism* are handed over to the K-means clustering algorithm. Based on the *Gap Statistic* method (cf. Tibshirani et al. 2001), four clusters are suggested as the optimal number of clusters.³ Figure 2 shows the results of the gap statistic that clearly indicate four clusters.

Figure 2: Results of Gap Statistic Method



The four clusters that are estimated with the help of the k-means algorithm can be named as traditionalist and progressive populist parties as well as their two establishment counterparts (establishment progressives and traditionalists). Together with the clustering method, the two dimensions

³Elbow and average silhouette method also suggest four clusters as optimal.

can be used to visualize the ideological position of each European party and its classification, which is illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Party Alignment of European Parties



In order to validate the clusters, let's pick some examples and see whether the classified parties fit our theoretical expectations.

The *top-left quadrant* shows progressive populists such as:

Syriza

After winning the parliamentary elections in January 2015, SYRIZA (*Coalition of the Radical Left*) attempted to carry out the difficult balancing act between extreme left-wing positions, opposition to EU imposed austerity and yet supposedly pro-European commitments. In social policy, Syriza is particularly committed to the socially disadvantaged in society with policies such as guaranteeing that unemployed, homeless and low-income people should be allowed to use the health facilities free of charge or that family reunification should be made easier for individuals with a migration background.

Podemos

In the general elections held on December 20, 2015, the left-wing political party Podemos that emerged from a protest movement obtained 20.68% of the votes and 69 deputies in the whole of the State. The Spanish “Indignados”, the “indignants” of the Podemos movement, practice critique of globalization and capitalism often symbolized in the overarching EU bureaucracy. Among other measures, they defend abortion, want to stop house evictions, suppress church privileges, promote renewable energies and are in favor of curbing nuclear energy. With regard to political parties, they propose to stop gauging, reduce subsidies and expand restrictions on connections between politicians and companies.

Red-Green Alliance (Denmark)

The Red-Green Alliance (Enhedslisten) was formed as a collaboration between the Left Socialists (VS), the Danish Communist Party (DKP) and the Socialist Labor Party (SAP) in 1989. During the last parliamentary elections in 2015, the Red-Green Alliance gained 7,8% of the popular vote. Enhedslisten does not stand in European elections, but supports Folkebevægelsen mod EU (*Popular Movement against the EU*), a heavily anti-EU political party that only competes for the European elections. The party attaches great importance to combating social inequality and poverty, as well as advocating strengthening and expanding the welfare state. Politically, the party is in favor of more space for all forms of diversity, including gender, sexuality, disability and ethnic background.

The *top-right quadrant* shows traditionalist populists such as:

AfD

The alternative for Germany (AfD) is a political party founded in 2013 in Germany. As of 2014, it gradually moved into 14 state parliaments and in the 2017 general election, the AfD received 12.6% of the vote and thus became the third strongest force and the strongest opposition party in the German Bundestag. Regarding the EU, they have been in favor of renationalization of policies that are currently situated in the EU. The AfD represents conservative-antifeminist positions in gender politics and rejects gender equality policies and relies thereby on Christian fundamentalist and nationalist ideas. According to the AfD, Islam does not belong to Germany. In particular, the party calls for a ban on minarets and the face veiling.

Front National

UKIP

The *bottom-left and bottom-right quadrants* show progressive and traditionalist establishment parties:

German SPD and CDU, Labour Party and Conservatives UK, SOME FRENCHIES

Given that the distinction between kinds of establishment parties is not of greater interest to us, we will merge progressive and traditionalist establishment parties into a single establishment party group.

A full list of used parties as well as their respective scores and affiliations can be found in the appendix Table A1.

3.1.3 Dependent Variable: Support for Establishment/Populist Parties

After the successful classification, we combine the clusters from the CHES data with the *European Social Survey* (ESS) Round 5 – 8. We decided to use only this timerange, because in this way we capture the years after the European financial crisis (2008-09). Two variables will be used to measure our dependent variable *Support for Establishment/Populist Parties*:

1. *What party did you vote for in the last national election?*
2. *Which party is closest to your views?*

A respondent that either voted for or indicated that they feel closest to a specific party, will be classified as either supporting a progressive or traditionalist populist or an establishment party, based on the clusters generated by the k-means algorithm. If it is the case that a person voted for a party but felt close to a different party, we decided to classify said person as a supporter of the party that it felt most close to (thus ranking their vote as less indicative of their support). This is based on the assumption that many voters have an incentive to vote strategically and they might end up voting for an establishment party even though they actually support a populist party.

After merging of the datasets is completed, we are initially left with 130155 respondents from 22 European countries. However, given that there are many missing values for respondents who gave no indication on whether they support a political party (32.99%), we are ultimately left with 87238 cases for the purposes of our descriptive analysis and 68403 for the multinomial logistic regression analysis (where all missing values were deleted listwise).⁴

3.1.4 Independent Variables: Cultural and Economic Explanations

Next, the hypotheses will be operationalized with corresponding ESS variables. *Economic deprivation* will be captured with two variables: *Economic Insecurity* (4-point scale) and the dummy variables *Unemployment*, and *Welfare*. The *cultural value hypothesis* will be measured with an index for *Anti-Immigration Sentiment* and four *Schwartz Human Value* dimensions, all ranging from 0 to 10: *Openness*, *Self-Transcendence*, *Self-Enhancement* and *Conservation*, where the former two are associated with liberal values and the latter two are associated with conservative values (cf. Schwartz 1994; Schwartz 2005). The models further include common socio-demographic control variables, for example, *Age*, *Education* and *Sex* but also includes a *Left-Right Scale*, *Religiosity*, *Government Satisfaction*, *Ethnic Minority Status*, *Trust in Global Governance* and the dummy variable *Rural*

⁴Note that is certainly a high amount of missing values. Imputation could be considered in this case, however, this would be beyond the scope of this seminar paper.

vs. Urban. Lastly, regional dummies (East, West, North and Southern Europe) and time dummies for each year will be included in the model as controls (2010, 2012, 2014 and 2016).

A more detailed description of the used variables can be requested from the authors.

3.2 Statistical Methodology

Multinomial logistic regression expands upon binary logistic regression, so that it is possible to predict three or more outcomes of a variable. Each category of the variable of interest is compared to the *reference category*, which is specified by the researcher, with the consequence that estimated parameters (logits and/or odds ratios) are interpreted in reference to that category (cf. Hosmer Jr et al. 2013: 269).

For this example, we assume that the multinomial model is run over a categorical response category Y , coded as 0, 1, or 2, where 0 is used as reference category. Similar to the logistic regression model, where the the logit is understood as $Y = 1$ versus $Y = 0$, a multinomial logistic regression compares the outcomes $Y = 2$ and $Y = 1$ to $Y = 0$. Therefore, two distinct logit functions are estimated:

$$g_1(x) = \ln \left[\frac{Pr(Y=1|x)}{Pr(Y=0|x)} \right]$$

$$g_2(x) = \ln \left[\frac{Pr(Y=2|x)}{Pr(Y=0|x)} \right]$$

This model is almost analogous to a logistic regression model, except that the multinomial logit equations contrast each of response category Y with reference category $Y = 0$. When Y has a binary outcome the multinomial logit model reduces to the usual logistic regression model.

The probabilities for each Y-Category is calculated as follows:

$$Pr(Y = 0|x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{g_1(x)} + e^{g_2(x)}}$$

$$Pr(Y = 1|x) = \frac{e^{g_1(x)}}{1 + e^{g_1(x)} + e^{g_2(x)}}$$

$$Pr(Y = 2|x) = \frac{e^{g_2(x)}}{1 + e^{g_1(x)} + e^{g_2(x)}}$$

Theoretically a multilevel model would have been needed to estimate the model properly, but given

that there are some countries with almost none or no populist supporters in our data, this would lead to problems. In order to still account for the hierarchical order of our data, we decided to use regional variables of Europe, based on the four classifications: Eastern, Western, Southern and Northern Europe.

4 Analysis

In this section, a short examination of descriptive statistics takes place (Section 4.1) followed by a report on the results of estimated multinomial logistic regression models which are subsequently examined for their implications regarding the research hypotheses (Section 4.2).

4.1 Descriptive Statistics


This section will introduce some basic descriptive statistics of the used variables. More specifically, we examine the support for populism over time, its geographical distribution and how it differs among different socio-demographic groups. Table 1 shows summary statistics for all used variables.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Median	Range	Missing in %
Support for Estab./Populism	87238	-	-	-	-	32.99
Age	129833	49.11	18.60	49.00	14 - 114	0.27
Education	129551	3.79	1.85	4.00	1 - 7	0.48
Female (0/1)	130054	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.10
Left-Right Scale	114144	5.11	2.20	5.00	0 - 10	12.32
Ethnic Minority (0/1)	128564	-	-	-	0 - 1	1.24
Religiosity	129073	4.54	3.07	5.00	0 - 10	0.85
Rural (0/1)	129824	-	-	-	1 - 5	0.27
Trust in Global Governance	115922	4.74	2.33	5.00	0 - 10	10.95
Government Satisfaction	123137	4.17	2.09	4.33	0 - 10	5.41
Anti-Immigration Sentiment	119842	4.87	2.14	4.67	0 - 10	7.94
Openness	125645	3.89	1.77	3.67	0 - 10	3.49
Conservation	124934	6.74	1.64	7.00	0 - 10	4.03
Self-Enhancement	126084	4.82	2.02	5.00	0 - 10	3.15
Self-Transcendence	126310	7.72	1.42	8.00	0 - 10	2.97
Economic Insecurity	128930	2.10	0.88	2.00	1 - 4	0.96
Unemployed (0/1)	129533	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.50
Welfare (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.02
Eastern Europe (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Western Europe (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Northern Europe (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Southern Europe (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Year 2010 (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Year 2012 (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Year 2014 (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00
Year 2016 (0/1)	130155	-	-	-	0 - 1	0.00

Figure 4 shows the support for populist and establishment parties over the timerange that is present in our dataset (2010 - 2016). As can be observed in the figure, support for populist parties has increased in recent years and support for the establishment has fallen. Support for established parties has dropped from 86.17% in 2010 to 81.45% in 2016, reaching the lowest point in 2014 with 80.44%. The opposite trend can be observed for the support of populist parties: support for

Figure 4: Support for Establishment/Populist Parties over Time




Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 87238.

progressive populists has risen from 5.83% in 2010 to 8.3% in 2016. In regards to traditionalist populism, there was an increase from 8% in 2010 to 10.25% support in 2016. Support for progressive and traditionalist populist parties peaked with 9.2% and 10.36% respectively in 2014 and has remained relatively constant for 2016.

Figure 5 visualizes the support of populist parties for European regions as defined by the UN⁵. It can be observed that Eastern Europe stands out in regard to the support for established parties, where it is significantly lower than in other regions: only 64.21% support established parties in Eastern Europe, whereas in any other region support is well above 80%. Most notably, the support for non-establishment parties in Eastern Europe is primarily due to traditional populists (31.38%).

⁵Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49). See: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>

Figure 5: Support for Establishment/Populist Parties Across European Regions



Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 87238.

Regarding the support of progressive populists, the East does not stand out clearly anymore.


Southern Europe, like Northern and Western Europe, shows more than 80% support for established parties, but the south clearly stands out in regard to their support for progressive populists (15.24%). In regard to traditionalist populists, a very different picture emerges for Southern Europe, where support is just over 1% and thus hardly worth mentioning. Such low support for populists cannot be observed in any other region, where the minimum is at least 6%.

Additionally, Figure 6 shows three maps and the distribution of support for establishment, traditionalist and progressive populist parties in Europe. One can clearly observe the difference of establishment party support between Eastern and Western Europe which goes right through Germany. The prevalence of traditionalist populist in Eastern Europe becomes rather clear to see, specifically in Hungary where the Fidesz dominates the political landscape. In regards to progressive populists, one can observe that East Germany and the Czech Republic, as well as Southern Europe seem to be the hotspots of support.

Figure 7 seeks to visualize the socio-demographic characteristics of establishment and populist party supporters. The chart uses violinplots paired with boxplots, inside which the arithmetic mean is shown. The dotted line shows the overall mean. In addition, on the right hand side of each plot the results of a t-test are reported.

A clear picture emerges regarding self-placement on the left-right scale in the upper left part of

Figure 6: Support for Establishment/Populist Parties by NUTS - Regions




Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 87238.

Figure 7. Those who support progressive populists generally locate themselves on the political left (Mean = 3.09; SD = 2.05). On the other hand, the supporters of traditional populists tend to place themselves on the right-wing spectrum (Mean = 6.46; SD = 2.16). One can also observe that the average supporter for establishment parties places themselves right in the middle of the left-right spectrum (Mean = 5.18; SD = 2.17). T-tests between each pair further shows that the p-values are below 0.001, indicating that all differences are statistically significant. At first, this seems like a trivial finding, however these results once again confirm our operationalization and validate the idea that we accurately captured traditionalist and progressive populists in their respective categories.

With regard to age in the upper right part of Figure 7, it becomes clear that supporters of established

Figure 7: Support for Establishment/Populist Parties over Time



Number in boxplots show the arithmetic mean. Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 68403.

parties are older than those who support populist parties. The average supporter populist parties is 47.35, in regards to progressive populists and 49.34, whereas the average establishment supporter is 51.32 years old. As the t-tests show, the differences between the group of supporters for established parties over the other two groups are statistically significant. However, there seems to be no statistically significant difference between the supporters of traditionalist and progressive populists in regards to age.

The bottom-left graph of Figure 7 shows the distribution of education. One can clearly observe that supporters for traditionalist populists stand out with lower education levels (Mean = 3.57; SD = 1.61) than the supporters of established parties (Mean = 4.16; SD = 1.9) or progressive populists (Mean = 4.14; SD = 1.9) and these differences are statistically significant. The educational attainment differences between supporters of progressive populists and supporters of established parties is also statistically significant but only marginally lower for the latter.

Lastly, the bottom-right graphic of Figure 7 shows the degree of religiosity by party support. Focusing on the the graph, supporters of progressive populists stand out clearly with a low average level of religiosity (Mean = 3.43; SD = 3.08). Supporters of traditional (Mean = 4.71; SD = 3.1) and established parties (Mean = 4.64; SD = 2.96) both share a similar degree of religiosity, with the former exhibiting higher levels of religiosity. As the results of the t-tests show, all differences between groups are highly statistically significant.

4.2 Multinomial Logistic Regression

This section will present the results of multinomial logistic regressions used to estimate the support for progressive and traditionalist populism followed by a short summary and discussion of the findings in regards to our hypotheses.

4.2.1 Results

Five models will be estimated in total: *Model 1* only includes the results of the control variables. *Model 2* tests the economic hypothesis and *Model 3* tests the cultural hypothesis. Lastly, *Model 4* estimates variables of both hypotheses together and *Model 5* shows additional interaction effects between them.⁶ Instead of a table, it was decided to use a coefficient plot in order to visualize the results, shown in Figure 10. The big advantage of reporting the results in this way is that in addition to estimates and p-values, the relation and differences between coefficients can be intuitively read, as negative relationships are found to the left and positive relationships are found to the right of an Odds Ratio of 1.

⁶All models were checked by tolerance tests to be free of problems of multicollinearity.

The results found in the descriptive part are further corroborated in *Model 1*. In terms of *Age*, the chance of supporting both progressive and traditionalist populism is 1.01 times lower for each year that a person ages compared to the chance of supporting an establishment party. In regard to *Education*, the chance to support traditional populists compared to support established parties is 1.23 times lower per educational attainment score (OR = 0.81; 95% CI [0.79 - 0.82]; $p < 0.001$). With respect to the *Left-Right Scale*, the previously identified trend also emerges clearly: the chance to support progressive populists compared to support for established parties is 1.45 times lower (OR = 0.69; 95% CI [0.68 - 0.70]; $p < 0.001$), whereas the chance to support progressive populists is 1.45 higher (OR = 1.45; 95% CI [1.43 - 1.47]; $p < 0.001$). Not surprising are the effects of *Government Satisfaction* and *Trust in Global Governance*. Government satisfaction seems to decrease the chance of supporting both progressive (OR = 0.85; 95% CI [0.83 - 0.86]; $p < 0.001$) and traditionalist populist parties (OR = 0.90; 95% CI [0.88 - 0.91]; $p < 0.001$). The same trend emerges for trust in global governance: for each point on the scale, the chance to support a traditionalist populist party decreases by 1.06 (OR = 0.94; 95% CI [0.92 - 0.95]; $p < 0.001$) and the chance to support a progressive populist party decreases by 1.05 (OR = 0.95; 95% CI [0.93 - 0.96]; $p < 0.001$) compared to support for establishment parties. Figure 8 shows the (average) marginal effects of the estimated control variables and further visualizes the identified trends (based on the full Model 4).

Figure 8: Marginal Effects for Control Variables - Model 4




Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 68403.

Next, the economic hypothesis will be examined in *Model 2*. Here it can be seen that the chance for support of progressive populists compared to support of established parties increases by 1.08 per point on the *Economic Insecurity* scale (OR = 1.08; 95% CI [1.04 - 1.13]; $p < 0.001$). Similarly, the chance of supporting traditionalist populism also increases by 1.18 with higher perceived economic

insecurity (OR = 1.18; 95% CI [1.13 - 1.23]; $p < 0.001$).

Similar effects can be observed with *Unemployment*, where being unemployed increases the chance by 1.21 to support progressive populists (OR = 1.21; 95% CI [1.13 - 1.28]; $p < 0.001$) and by 1.20 to support traditionalist populists compared to supporting establishment parties (OR = 1.20; 95% CI [1.13 - 1.28]; $p < 0.001$). In regard to *Welfare*, a different picture emerges. While there is a 1.17 times greater chance to support progressive populists when on welfare compared to support established parties, it should be noted that the effect is only slightly significant (OR = 1.17; 95% CI [1.03 - 1.32]; $p < 0.05$). The same does not seem to be the case for traditionalist populists, where being on welfare has no significant effect albeit it goes in the expected direction (OR = 1.02; 95% CI [0.89 - 1.17]; $p = 0.79$). Figure 9 shows the (average) marginal effects of the estimated economic deprivation predictors and further visualizes the identified trends (based on the full Model 4).


Figure 9: Marginal Effects for Economic Hypotheses - Model 4



Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 68403.

In terms of the economic dimension, it can be seen that as economic deprivation increases, the chance of support for populists is higher compared to support for established parties. However, the effect of dependence on social benefits/welfare varies. Furthermore, almost all effects are significant in the model, and McFadden's R^2 increases from 0.22 to 0.23 in Model 1 compared to the control model and a likelihood ratio test shows a statistically significant better fit than the control Model 1, ($\chi^2 = 190.41$; $p < 0.001$).

Figure 10: Coefficient Plot: Models 1 - 5




Next, we examine the results in regards to the *cultural thesis* and focus on *Model 3*. Here one can observe that *Anti-Immigration Sentiment* increases the chance of support for traditionalist populist parties by 1.34 compared to support for established parties (OR = 1.34; 95% CI [1.32 - 1.36]; $p < 0.001$). As expected, *Anti-Immigration Sentiment* pulls in the opposite direction for progressive populism: for each point on the anti-immigration scale, the chance to support progressive populists decreases by 1.04 (OR = 0.96; 95% CI [0.95 - 0.98]; $p < 0.001$).

There are also similar patterns regarding *Conservation* attitudes: the chance of supporting traditionalist populists is 1.05 times higher compared to support for established parties (OR = 1.05; 95% CI [1.02 - 1.07]; $p < 0.001$), whereas the chance of supporting progressive populists is 1.03 times lower compared to support for established parties (OR = 0.97; 95% CI [0.95 - 0.99]; $p < 0.01$).

A similar pattern can also be noted in terms of *Openness*: the chance of supporting traditionalist populists is 1.05 times lower compared to support for established parties (OR = 0.95; 95% CI [0.93 - 0.97]; $p < 0.001$), whereas the chance of supporting progressive populists is 1.01 times higher compared to support for established parties, albeit the effect remains insignificant (OR = 1.01; 95% CI [0.99 - 1.03]; $p = 0.38$).

Figure 11: Marginal Effects for Cultural Hypotheses - Model 4



Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 68403.

The effects of the *Self-Enhancement* and the *Self-Transcendence* scale are also in line with expectations and pull in opposite directions for progressive and traditionalist populism. For each scale point on the self-enhancement scale, the chance of support for traditionalist populists is 1.08 higher compared to establishment party support (OR = 1.08; 95% CI [1.06 - 1.10]; $p < 0.001$). Regarding the support for progressive populists, the chance of support for progressive populists is 1.02 lower compared to


establishment party support (OR = 0.98; 95% CI [0.96 - 0.99]; $p < 0.01$).

For each scale point on the self-transcendence scale, the chance of support for traditionalist populists is 1.11 lower compared to establishment party support (OR = 0.90; 95% CI [0.87 - 0.92]; $p < 0.001$). Regarding the support for progressive populists, the chance of support for progressive populists is 1.08 higher compared to establishment party support (OR = 1.08; 95% CI [1.05 - 1.11]; $p < 0.001$). Figure 11 shows the (average) marginal effects of the estimated cultural predictors and further visualizes the identified trends (based on the full Model 4).

The McFadden's R^2 increases from 0.22 to 0.24 and the fit of the model is significantly better compared to the control Model 1, ($\chi^2 = 1790.01$; $p < 0.001$). As expected by our theoretical considerations, the effects on the cultural dimension went in opposite directions: culturally inclusive values seem to increase the support for progressive populists and decrease the support for traditionalist populists whereas exclusiveness seems to increase the support and inclusiveness decreases the support for the latter. It can thus be noted that the cultural dimension on its own is a meaningful differentiation between which form of populism is supported. However, it should also be emphasized that the effect sizes found here are rather weak.

Model 4 includes the economic as well as the cultural dimensions. This further confirms the previously found effects. In terms of the economic dimension reduced effects can be observed. However, despite a slight weakening of the effect sizes, significances remain untouched and the estimates continue to show the expected direction. Moreover, the McFadden's R^2 increases from 0.24 to 0.25 and the fit of the model is significantly better compared to Model 3, ($\chi^2 = 151.89$; $p < 0.001$).

Figure 12: Marginal Effects for Interaction: Economic Insecurity \times Anti-Immigration Sentiment




Lastly, *Model 5* shows two interaction effects that combine the economic and cultural dimensions.

Pairwise interaction effects are estimated between each possible combination of the economic and cultural predictors. Only two of these interaction effects yielded a p-value below 0.05: an interaction between *Economic Insecurity* and *Anti-Immigration Sentiment* and an interaction between *Unemployment* and *Self-Enhancement* values. The small number of significant effects does not bode well for hypothesis H4. Nonetheless, the effects will be interpreted.

For the interaction between *Economic Insecurity* and *Anti-Immigration Sentiment*, we interpret the marginal effects depicted in Figure 12. Focusing on the marginal probabilities for the support of establishment parties, one notices that support decreases quite sharply with increasing *Anti-Immigration Sentiment*. However, while the effect starts out lower for those that are most economically insecure, anti-immigration sentiment has a higher influence for those that feel very economically secure. This is an interesting finding and the opposite of what we would expect. Similarly, focusing on the support for traditionalist parties, the same effect emerges: while the probability for those with no anti-immigration sentiment is somewhat higher for those that are economically insecure, the effect of anti-immigration sentiment is higher for those that feel economically secure. On the other hand, the support for progressive populists decreases more strongly for those that are highly economically secure compared to those that are economically insecure, as anti-immigration sentiment increases.

Figure 13: Marginal Effects for Interaction: Unemployed \times Self-Enhancement



Based on Model 5. Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 68403.

Lastly, we take a more detailed look at Figure 13 where the interaction between *Unemployment* and *Self-Enhancement* is visualized. One can observe the already established effects: as self-enhancement values increase, the probability of support for establishment and progressive populist parties decreases and increases for traditionalist populists. However, in regard to progressive and traditionalist populists, this effect is even stronger for those that are unemployed. This is the

expected effect that we formulated in Hypothesis H4.

Although the McFadden's R^2 remains the same (0.25) the fit of Model 5 is significantly better compared to Model 4, ($\chi^2 = 47.41; p < 0.001$). However, it should be noted that only two interaction effects of all the possible combinations between the economic and cultural dimensions yielded significant effects, of which only one showed the expected direction. This makes hypothesis H4 untenable and it must therefore be rejected.

5 Conclusions

This section will briefly summarize the results and then conclude the study with a few words on limitations and future research.

With regard to our multinomial logistic models, it can be said that our hypotheses were able to be mainly *confirmed*. Let's start with the economic hypothesis:

H1: The less economically fortunate (economic dissatisfaction, unemployment, economic insecurity, living on welfare), the higher the probability of supporting populist parties.

The models estimated here mainly support this hypothesis. Unemployment, economic insecurity and receiving welfare increase the chance to support populists compared to support of established parties. Although, the impact of living on welfare seems not to be as great as the other two factors mentioned and does not yield a significant effect in supporting traditionalist populists. In addition, in Model 3, where the cultural dimension has been added, there is a slight reduction of the effects. Despite this, all significances remain stable and the estimates continue to show the expected effects.

Concerning the cultural dimension, the results of the multinomial logistic regression also support our hypotheses:

H2: The more culturally inclusive (values), the higher the probability of supporting progressive populist parties.

H3: The more culturally exclusive, the higher the probability of supporting a traditionalist populist party.

Inclusive values (high values for self-transcendence and openness and lower anti-immigration sentiment) increases the probability of support for progressive populists, but openness lacks a statistically significant effect. In addition, exclusive values (low values for self-transcendence and openness and a high value for anti-immigration), increase the probability of supporting traditionalist populism. Anti-immigration in particular seems very important here and stands out clearly from the other effects. Additionally, openness values decrease the chance of supporting traditionalist populist parties. Even in Model 4, which combines all predictors, all estimated effects remain stable. The effects also show our previously suspected differentiation. The economic dimension increases the likelihood of supporting populist parties in general. The cultural dimension, on the other hand, shows that it has diametrically opposed effects on the support of traditionalist and progressive populists.

The last hypothesis concerning interaction effects stated as follows:

H4: When economic and cultural factors interact, the support for populist parties is higher.

Table 2: Summary of Results

Hypothesis	Confirmed	Indications/ Tendencies	Restrictions
H1: <i>The less economically fortunate (economic dissatisfaction, unemployment, economic insecurity, living on welfare), the higher the probability of supporting anti-establishment parties.</i>	Yes	+	Weak Effects Welfare not significant for Traditionalist Populists
H2: <i>The more culturally inclusive (values), the higher the probability of supporting progressive populist parties.</i>	Yes	+	Weak Effects Openness not significant for Progressive Populists.
H3: <i>The more culturally exclusive, the higher the probability of supporting a traditionalist populist party.</i>	Yes	+	Weak Effects.
H4: <i>When economic and cultural factors interact, the support for populist parties is higher.</i>	No	-	No significant effects except for two inconclusive evidence

A "+" sign indicates at least some empirical evidence in favor of the hypothesis and a "-" sign stands for contradictory empirical evidence.

The empirical evidence obtained through multinomial logistic regression does not support this hypothesis. Two statistically significant effects were found, however most interactions were not. An interaction between *Anti-Immigration Sentiment* and *Economic Insecurity* implied that the effect of the former on populist party support is *weaker* for those that are very economically insecure, suggesting the direct opposite of what we expected. Future research should further investigate what factors might cause this discrepancy. On the other hand, the other interaction effect between *Unemployment* and *Self-Enhancement* showed the expected direction and the influence of self-enhancement values was *stronger* for those that are unemployed. However, given the overwhelming contradictory evidence, this hypothesis has to be rejected.

It should also be stressed that while all the effects found are significant, they are rather weak, especially when it comes to the cultural dimension. In addition, almost all control effects remain significant in all models. In the academic literature, supporters of populist parties are often associated with features such as older age and lower education. Some minor surprises were found here: in terms of educational attainment, more education decreases the support for traditional populists, whereas the same isn't true for supporters of progressive populists where higher education levels are associated with higher support. Further, when it comes to age, the models suggest that younger age is associated with higher support for progressive as well as traditional populists.


The goal of this paper was to bring some clarity on the confusion between different variants of populism that all too often have neglected this multidimensionality. Further research might be able to build upon our conceptualization and give more attention to the different variants of populism, so as to not conflate the distinct explanatory frameworks that come along with them.

6 References

- Easton, David 1975:** A re-assessment of the concept of political support, *British journal of political science* 5, pp. 435–57.
- Easton, David 1965:** *A systems analysis of political life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Friedman, Jerome, Hastie, Trevor & Tibshirani, Robert 2001:** *The elements of statistical learning*. Springer series in statistics New York.
- Habermas, Jürgen 1994:** Three normative models of democracy, *Constellations* 1, pp. 1–10.
- Hartigan, John A & Wong, Manchek A 1979:** Algorithm as 136: A k-means clustering algorithm, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)* 28, pp. 100–8.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, Marks, Gary & Wilson, Carole J 2002:** Does left/right structure party positions on european integration?, *Comparative political studies* 35, pp. 965–89.
- Hosmer Jr, David W, Lemeshow, Stanley & Sturdivant, Rodney X 2013:** *Applied logistic regression*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Schwartz, Shalom H 1994:** Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values?, *Journal of Social Issues* 50, pp. 19–45.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. 2005:** Human values. european social survey edunet,
- Tibshirani, Robert, Walther, Guenther & Hastie, Trevor 2001:** Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via the gap statistic, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 63, pp. 411–23.

7 Appendix

Figure A1: Marginal Effects of Left-Right Scale



Based on Model 4. Source: ESS Data Round 5 - 8; N = 68403.

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
1	Austria	aus_NEOS	Liberal Forum	35.49	19.01	Establishment
2	Austria	aus_GRUNE	The Austrian Green Party	26.27	6.11	Establishment
3	Austria	aus_SPO	Social Democratic Party of Austria	17.10	32.93	Establishment
4	Austria	aus_OVP	Austrian Peoples Party	7.39	63.75	Establishment
5	Austria	aus_FPO	Freedom Party of Austria	82.56	89.16	Traditionalist Populism
6	Austria	aus_TeamStronach	Team Stronach for Austria	73.52	74.80	Traditionalist Populism
7	Austria	aus_BZO	Alliance for the Future of Austria	69.79	70.97	Traditionalist Populism
8	Belgium	be_NVA	Peoples Union New Flemish Alliance	46.54	62.08	Establishment
9	Belgium	be_FDF	Francophone Democratic Front	26.05	31.90	Establishment
10	Belgium	be_Groen	Agalev Green!	19.16	2.23	Establishment
11	Belgium	be_ECOLO	Ecolo	18.73	1.66	Establishment
12	Belgium	be_PS	Socialist Party	18.71	14.39	Establishment
13	Belgium	be_SPA	Socialistische Partij	18.71	13.36	Establishment
14	Belgium	be_CDH	Christian Social Party	12.09	35.02	Establishment
15	Belgium	be_CD&V	Christian Peoples Party	10.39	42.25	Establishment
16	Belgium	be_MR	Liberal Reformist Party	9.94	34.85	Establishment
17	Belgium	be_VLD	Open Flemish Liberals and Democrats	8.24	34.94	Establishment
18	Belgium	be_PVDA	Workers Party of Belgium	71.95	12.80	Progressive Populism
19	Belgium	be_VB	Flemish Bloc Flemish Interest	81.97	84.58	Traditionalist Populism
20	Belgium	be_PP	Peoples Party	69.40	77.95	Traditionalist Populism
21	Bulgaria	bul_ABV	Alternative for Bulgarian Revival	40.97	49.17	Establishment
22	Bulgaria	bul_BSP	Coalition for Bulgaria	32.55	51.85	Establishment
23	Bulgaria	bul_DPS	Movement for Rights and Freedoms	26.54	44.59	Establishment
24	Bulgaria	bul_GERB	Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria	24.78	49.49	Establishment
25	Bulgaria	bul_DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	24.39	36.47	Establishment
26	Bulgaria	bul_SDS	United Democratic Forces	23.89	33.89	Establishment
27	Bulgaria	bul_DBG	Bulgaria for Citizens Movement	23.64	29.20	Establishment
28	Bulgaria	bul_ATAKA	National Union Attack Attack	93.85	95.62	Traditionalist Populism
29	Bulgaria	bul_VMRO-BND	Gergiovden-VMRO	75.29	87.17	Traditionalist Populism
30	Bulgaria	bul_NFSB	National Front for the Salvation of Bulgaria	75.22	83.07	Traditionalist Populism
31	Bulgaria	bul_BBT	Bulgaria without Censorship	64.59	76.52	Traditionalist Populism
32	Croatia	cro_HSP-AS	Ante Starcevic	66.55	89.22	Traditionalist Populism
33	Cyprus	cyp_EDEK	Movement for Social Democracy EDEK	41.78	44.53	Establishment
34	Cyprus	cyp_EVROKO	European Party	28.91	66.13	Establishment
35	Cyprus	cyp_DIKO	Democratic Party	27.79	59.19	Establishment

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
36	Cyprus	cyp_DISY	Democratic Rally	17.17	52.97	Establishment
37	Cyprus	cyp_AKEL	Progressive Party of Working People	52.40	21.37	Progressive Populism
38	Cyprus	cyp_KOP	Ecological and Environmental Movement	49.27	38.98	Progressive Populism
39	Czech Republic	cz_ODS	Civic Democratic Party	42.95	55.58	Establishment
40	Czech Republic	cz_SZ	Green Party	31.28	6.31	Establishment
41	Czech Republic	cz_KDU-CSL	Christian Democratic Union	13.72	74.54	Establishment
42	Czech Republic	cz_CSSD	Czech Social Democratic Party	12.24	35.68	Establishment
43	Czech Republic	cz_TOP09	Top09	9.41	44.34	Establishment
44	Czech Republic	cz_SVOBODNI	Party of Free Citizens	82.00	46.09	Progressive Populism
45	Czech Republic	cz_ANO2011	ANO 2011, Action of Dissatisfied Citizens	53.27	39.33	Progressive Populism
46	Czech Republic	cz_USVIT	Dawn of Direct Democracy	87.29	83.85	Traditionalist Populism
47	Czech Republic	cz_KSCM	Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia	63.08	61.38	Traditionalist Populism
48	Denmark	dk_LA	Liberal Alliance	40.23	28.35	Establishment
49	Denmark	dk_SF	Socialist Peoples Party	31.91	18.42	Establishment
50	Denmark	dk_KF	Conservative Peoples Party	22.43	64.08	Establishment
51	Denmark	dk_V	Venstre, Liberal Party of Denmark	21.33	54.18	Establishment
52	Denmark	dk_SD	Social Democrats	19.79	41.05	Establishment
53	Denmark	dk_RV	Radical Left-Social Liberal Party	2.16	12.12	Establishment
54	Denmark	dk_FolkB	Peoples Movement Against the EU	89.43	9.90	Progressive Populism
55	Denmark	dk_EL	Unity List-Red/Green Alliance	71.98	5.96	Progressive Populism
56	Denmark	dk_DF	Danish Peoples Party	76.57	79.82	Traditionalist Populism
57	Estonia	est_EVE	Estonian Free Party	48.08	46.22	Establishment
58	Estonia	est_EER	Estonian Greens	45.02	33.61	Establishment
59	Estonia	est_EK	Estonian Center Party	38.76	45.51	Establishment
60	Estonia	est_SDE	Social Democratic Party	14.96	21.26	Establishment
61	Estonia	est_IRL	Pro Patria and Res Publica Union	9.23	58.42	Establishment
62	Estonia	est_ER	Estonian Reform Party	2.68	33.05	Establishment
63	Finland	fin_KESK	Finnish Center Party	37.64	61.72	Establishment
64	Finland	fin_KD	Finish Christian League Christian Democrats	34.68	79.73	Establishment
65	Finland	fin_VIHR	Green League	28.42	2.89	Establishment
66	Finland	fin_SDP	Social Democratic Party of Finland	22.25	30.29	Establishment
67	Finland	fin_RKP/SFP	Swedish Peoples Party	7.39	20.46	Establishment
68	Finland	fin_KOK	National Coalition Party	4.35	50.82	Establishment
69	Finland	fin_VAS	Left Alliance	52.76	11.17	Progressive Populism
70	Finland	fin_PS	True Finns	91.15	89.52	Traditionalist Populism
71	France	fr_EELV	Green Party	31.73	3.73	Establishment

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
72	France	fr_MODEM	Union for French Democracy	27.98	50.58	Establishment
73	France	fr_PRG	Left Radical Party	26.34	28.06	Establishment
74	France	fr_UMP	Rally for the Republic	25.72	71.27	Establishment
75	France	fr_PS	Socialist Party	23.76	27.70	Establishment
76	France	fr_PRV	Radical Party	23.54	51.51	Establishment
77	France	fr_NC	New Center	18.55	56.16	Establishment
78	France	fr_AC	Centrist Alliance	14.69	54.40	Establishment
79	France	fr_PG	Left Party	86.37	17.96	Progressive Populism
80	France	fr_PCF	French Communist Party	68.92	28.10	Progressive Populism
81	France	fr_Ensemble	Together	68.40	32.57	Progressive Populism
82	France	fr_FN	National Front	96.68	88.58	Traditionalist Populism
83	France	fr_MPF	Rally for France/Movement for France	84.67	89.27	Traditionalist Populism
84	Germany	ge_CSU	Christian Social Union in Bavaria	25.30	75.16	Establishment
85	Germany	ge_Grunen	Alliance 90 The Greens	13.53	9.87	Establishment
86	Germany	ge_FDP	Free Democratic Party	12.20	27.88	Establishment
87	Germany	ge_SPD	Social Democratic Party of Germany	8.46	32.99	Establishment
88	Germany	ge_CDU	Christian Democratic Union of Germany	5.78	55.92	Establishment
89	Germany	ge_DieTier	Human Environment Animal Protection	75.44	9.59	Progressive Populism
90	Germany	ge_LINKE	Party of Democratic Socialism	59.25	32.11	Progressive Populism
91	Germany	ge_Piraten	Pirate Party of Germany	52.50	7.66	Progressive Populism
92	Germany	ge_NPD	German Peoples Union	90.51	97.20	Traditionalist Populism
93	Germany	ge_AfD	Alternative for Germany	83.78	85.59	Traditionalist Populism
94	Greece	gr_Potami	The River	33.39	14.57	Establishment
95	Greece	gr_DIMAR	Democratic Left	29.91	12.96	Establishment
96	Greece	gr_PASOK	Panhellenic Socialist Movement	14.94	33.65	Establishment
97	Greece	gr_ND	New Democracy	12.56	73.43	Establishment
98	Greece	gr_SYRIZA	Coalition of the Left and Progress	72.41	9.22	Progressive Populism
99	Greece	gr_XA	Popular AssociationGolden Dawn	100.00	100.00	Traditionalist Populism
100	Greece	gr_KKE	Communist Party of Greece	98.81	47.17	Traditionalist Populism
101	Greece	gr_ANEL	Independent Greeks	86.38	90.54	Traditionalist Populism
102	Greece	gr_LAOS	Popular Orthodox Rally	76.45	88.72	Traditionalist Populism
103	Hungary	hun_E14	Together 2014	27.28	13.49	Establishment
104	Hungary	hun_MSZP	Hungarian Socialist Party	22.94	35.82	Establishment
105	Hungary	hun_DK	Democratic Coalition	22.84	18.09	Establishment
106	Hungary	hun_LMP	Politics Can Be Different	50.71	16.29	Progressive Populism
107	Hungary	hun_JOBBIK	Movement for a Better Hungary	94.14	96.09	Traditionalist Populism

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
108	Hungary	hun_Fidesz	FideszHungarian Civic Union	57.61	82.36	Traditionalist Populism
109	Ireland	irl_FF	Soldiers of Destiny	15.69	59.40	Establishment
110	Ireland	irl_Lab	Labour	13.75	34.90	Establishment
111	Ireland	irl_FG	Family of the Irish	7.24	54.66	Establishment
112	Ireland	irl_PBPA	People Before Profit Alliance	86.29	16.85	Progressive Populism
113	Ireland	irl_SP	Socialist Party	84.11	19.73	Progressive Populism
114	Ireland	irl_SF	We Ourselves	76.17	33.66	Progressive Populism
115	Ireland	irl_GP	Green Party	45.41	26.06	Progressive Populism
116	Italy	it_FI	Forward Italy	48.09	66.81	Establishment
117	Italy	it_SVP	South Tyrolean Peoples Party	34.43	54.63	Establishment
118	Italy	it_VdA	Aosta Valley	31.90	48.42	Establishment
119	Italy	it_CD	Democratic Centre	24.35	51.56	Establishment
120	Italy	it_PD	Democratic Party	23.52	27.39	Establishment
121	Italy	it_NCD	New Centre-Right	18.99	68.71	Establishment
122	Italy	it_UDC	Christian Democratic Center	11.59	66.68	Establishment
123	Italy	it_SC	Civic Choice	2.84	48.44	Establishment
124	Italy	it_M5S	Five Star Movement	97.30	30.75	Progressive Populism
125	Italy	it_RC	Communist Refoundation Party	88.86	4.25	Progressive Populism
126	Italy	it_SEL	Left and Freedom Left Ecology Freedom	65.55	8.23	Progressive Populism
127	Italy	it_LN	Northern League	93.29	80.76	Traditionalist Populism
128	Italy	it_Fdl	Brothers of Italy	70.89	83.78	Traditionalist Populism
129	Latvia	lat_SDPS	Harmony Centre Social Democratic Party Harmony	59.65	52.22	Establishment
130	Latvia	lat_LRA	Latvian Association of Regions	53.61	62.04	Establishment
131	Latvia	lat_ZZS	Union of Greens and Farmers	42.78	60.56	Establishment
132	Latvia	lat_NA	National Alliance All For Latvia!	34.15	71.23	Establishment
133	Latvia	lat_V	Unity	8.02	35.17	Establishment
134	Latvia	lat_LKS	For Human Rights in United Latvia	81.82	65.94	Traditionalist Populism
135	Latvia	lat_NSL	For Latvia from the Heart	68.18	61.62	Traditionalist Populism
136	Lithuania	lith_LVZS	Lithuanian Peasant Party	49.55	59.38	Establishment
137	Lithuania	lith_DP	Labour Party	37.18	49.96	Establishment
138	Lithuania	lith_TS-LKD	Homeland UnionLithuanian Christian Democrats	10.96	66.26	Establishment
139	Lithuania	lith_LSDP	Social Democratic Party of Lithuania	9.50	35.22	Establishment
140	Lithuania	lith_LRLS	Liberals Movement of the Republic of Lithuania	8.27	20.53	Establishment
141	Lithuania	lith_DK	The Way of Courage	79.87	82.04	Traditionalist Populism
142	Lithuania	lith_TT	Order and Justice	68.82	80.06	Traditionalist Populism
143	Lithuania	lith_LLRA	Electoral Action of Lithuanias Poles	53.61	69.63	Traditionalist Populism

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
144	Netherlands	nl_50PLUS	50PLUS	46.09	41.44	Establishment
145	Netherlands	nl_SGP	Political Reformed Party	40.30	86.13	Establishment
146	Netherlands	nl_CU	ChristianUnion	37.98	63.01	Establishment
147	Netherlands	nl_VVD	Peoples Party for Freedom and Democracy	20.91	51.44	Establishment
148	Netherlands	nl_CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	16.29	60.29	Establishment
149	Netherlands	nl_PvdA	Labour Party	16.29	27.69	Establishment
150	Netherlands	nl_GL	GreenLeft	9.32	3.71	Establishment
151	Netherlands	nl_D66	Democrats 66	5.47	5.07	Establishment
152	Netherlands	nl_SP	Socialist Party	73.19	33.40	Progressive Populism
153	Netherlands	nl_PvdD	Party for the Animals	51.03	16.94	Progressive Populism
154	Netherlands	nl_PVV	Party for Freedom	97.10	74.40	Traditionalist Populism
155	Poland	pol_RP	Your Movement (Palikots Movement)	27.81	1.02	Establishment
156	Poland	pol_PSL	Polish Peoples Party	22.20	61.39	Establishment
157	Poland	pol_SLD	Alliance of Democratic Left	14.91	21.74	Establishment
158	Poland	pol_PO	Civic Platform	7.83	38.22	Establishment
159	Poland	pol_KNP	Congress of the New Right	97.60	88.89	Traditionalist Populism
160	Poland	pol_SP	United Poland	71.86	85.15	Traditionalist Populism
161	Poland	pol_PiS	Law and Justice Party	63.36	81.24	Traditionalist Populism
162	Poland	pol_PR	Poland Together	55.76	66.40	Traditionalist Populism
163	Portugal	por_PS	Socialist Party	12.30	27.73	Establishment
164	Portugal	por_PP	Democratic and Social Center Peoples Party	7.27	66.66	Establishment
165	Portugal	por_PSD	Democratic Peoples Party	0.00	49.06	Establishment
166	Portugal	por_CDU	Democratic Unitarian Coalition	80.08	25.59	Progressive Populism
167	Portugal	por_BE	Left Bloc	69.46	1.27	Progressive Populism
168	Portugal	por_MPT	Earth Party	69.81	56.61	Traditionalist Populism
169	Romania	rom_PC	Romanian Humanist Party Conservative Party	28.60	66.12	Establishment
170	Romania	rom_PMP	Peoples Movement Party	24.04	49.10	Establishment
171	Romania	rom_UNPR	National Union for the Progress of Romania	21.47	67.94	Establishment
172	Romania	rom_UDMR	Hungarian Democratic Union of Romania	21.04	39.52	Establishment
173	Romania	rom_PSD	Social Democratic Party	19.88	62.72	Establishment
174	Romania	rom_PDL	Democratic Party	17.28	50.94	Establishment
175	Romania	rom_PNL	National Liberal Party	15.59	49.34	Establishment
176	Romania	rom_PLR	Liberal Reformist Party	15.30	45.83	Establishment
177	Romania	rom_PP-DD	Peoples PartyDan Diaconescu	63.75	80.79	Traditionalist Populism
178	Slovakia	slo_NOVA	New Majority	49.06	70.48	Establishment
179	Slovakia	slo_Siet	Net / Network	42.58	68.67	Establishment

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
180	Slovakia	slo_KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	33.58	83.06	Establishment
181	Slovakia	slo_SMK-MKP	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	25.01	58.83	Establishment
182	Slovakia	slo_Smer-SD	Direction-Third Way	23.48	63.75	Establishment
183	Slovakia	slo_SDKU-DS	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	20.12	48.50	Establishment
184	Slovakia	slo_MH	Bridge	19.90	47.86	Establishment
185	Slovakia	slo_SaS	Freedom and Solidarity	61.77	27.91	Progressive Populism
186	Slovakia	slo_OLaNO	Ordinary People and Independent Personalities	75.89	75.10	Traditionalist Populism
187	Slovakia	slo_SNS	Slovak National Party	73.91	94.27	Traditionalist Populism
188	Spain	esp_BNG	Galician Nationalist Bloc	42.40	15.88	Establishment
189	Spain	esp_UPyD	Union, Progress, and Democracy	35.48	34.61	Establishment
190	Spain	esp_C's	CitizensParty of the Citizenry	33.09	37.62	Establishment
191	Spain	esp_ERC	Republican Left of Catalonia	31.20	24.81	Establishment
192	Spain	esp_PSOE	Spanish Socialist Workers Party	14.91	18.38	Establishment
193	Spain	esp_EA	Basque Solidarity	13.65	43.42	Establishment
194	Spain	esp_CiU	Convergence and Unity	12.40	62.01	Establishment
195	Spain	esp_CC	Coalicion Canaria	11.54	52.78	Establishment
196	Spain	esp_EAJ/PNV	Basque Nationalist Party	11.18	58.91	Establishment
197	Spain	esp_PP	Peoples Party	5.47	76.62	Establishment
198	Spain	esp_Podemos	We Can	71.66	4.82	Progressive Populism
199	Spain	esp_IU	United Left	46.72	8.73	Progressive Populism
200	Spain	esp_Amaiur	Amaiur	44.54	19.06	Progressive Populism
201	Spain	esp_ICV	Initiative for Catalonia	42.34	6.62	Progressive Populism
202	Sweden	sv_MP	Environment PartyThe Greens	37.49	4.42	Establishment
203	Sweden	sv_SAP	Workers Party-Social Democrats	21.39	23.29	Establishment
204	Sweden	sv_C	Center Party	20.80	23.31	Establishment
205	Sweden	sv_KD	Christian-Democrats	17.22	55.09	Establishment
206	Sweden	sv_M	Moderate Party	10.99	38.02	Establishment
207	Sweden	sv_FP	Liberal Peoples Party	7.48	25.59	Establishment
208	Sweden	sv_PIRAT	Pirate Party	67.47	5.40	Progressive Populism
209	Sweden	sv_FI	Feminist Initiative	67.17	0.00	Progressive Populism
210	Sweden	sv_V	Left Party	66.42	3.84	Progressive Populism
211	Sweden	sv_SD	Sweden Democrats	92.69	90.43	Traditionalist Populism
212	United Kingdom	uk_SNP	Scottish National Party	41.70	28.56	Establishment
213	United Kingdom	uk_CONS	Conservative Party	40.67	60.20	Establishment
214	United Kingdom	uk_PLAID	Party of Wales	39.65	20.54	Establishment
215	United Kingdom	uk_LAB	Labour Party	29.87	28.70	Establishment

Table A1: Party Alignment

	Country	Party Code	Party Name	Populism Score	Prog. - Trad. Score	Type
216	United Kingdom	uk_LibDem	Liberal Democratic Party	15.68	17.35	Establishment
217	United Kingdom	uk_GREEN	Green Party	53.00	2.90	Progressive Populism
218	United Kingdom	uk_UKIP	United Kingdom Independence Party	95.90	90.17	Traditionalist Populism

Eigenständigkeitserklärung

Hiermit versichern wir, dass wir die vorliegende Hausarbeit selbständig und nur mit den angegebenen Hilfsmitteln verfasst haben. Alle Passagen, die wir wörtlich als auch sinngemäß aus der Literatur oder aus anderen Quellen wie z. B. Internetseiten entnommen haben, sind deutlich als Zitat mit Angabe der Quelle kenntlich gemacht.

Stuttgart, 15.04.2018