



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

A populist Zeitgeist? The impact of populism on parties, media and the public in Western Europe

Rooduijn, M.

Publication date
2013

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rooduijn, M. (2013). *A populist Zeitgeist? The impact of populism on parties, media and the public in Western Europe*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Overview of analyzed election manifestos with classical content analysis

Country	Party	Election 1	Election 2	Election 3	Election 4
France	PS	X	X	X	X
	RPR	X	X	X	-
	UDF	X	-	X	-
	UMP	-	-	X	X
	PCF	X	X	X	-
	FN*	-	X	X	X
Germany	CDU/CSU	X	X	X	X
	SPD	X	X	X	X
	FDP	X	X	X	X
	Die Linke/PDS*	X	X	X	X
Italy	DC/PP	X	X	-	-
	PD/Ulivo	-	-	X	X
	DS	X	X	-	-
	AN/MSI*	X	X	-	-
	CdL/FI/PdL*	-	X	X	X
LN*	X	X	-	-	
Netherlands	CDA	X	X	X	X
	D66	-	X	X	X
	PvdA	X	X	X	X
	VVD	X	X	X	X
	CD*	-	X	-	-
	LPF*	-	-	X	-
	PVV*	-	-	-	X
SP*	-	X	X	X	
UK	Cons	X	X	X	X
	Labour	X	X	X	X
	LibDems	X	X	X	X
	BNP*	X	-	-	X
	UKIP*	-	X	-	X

* Allegedly populist party.

The election years are: 1993, 1997, 2002 and 2007 in France; 1990, 1994, 2002 and 2005 in Germany; 1992, 1994, 2001 and 2008 in Italy; 1989, 1994, 2002 and 2006 in the Netherlands; and 1992, 1997, 2001 and 2005 in the United Kingdom.

Appendix B

Questions in classical content analysis

Reference to the people

Do the authors refer to 'the people'?

Note 1: The authors can refer to 'the people' directly by using terms such as 'the people', 'the citizens', 'the British', 'Britain', 'the community', 'the society', etc. They can also refer to 'the people' more indirectly. This is the case if they use terms such as 'our nation', 'public opinion', 'the electorate', 'our culture', 'we', etc. They also refer to the people if they propose to introduce a measure that implies that emphasize the importance of the people. Examples are the proposition to introduce more participatory democracy or a strong emphasis on integration.

Note 2: We only speak of 'the people' if the authors of the text (implicitly) identify themselves with 'the people'. This means that in some particular cases, even the broad term of 'Westerners' or the narrow term of 'New Yorkers' could refer to 'the people'.

Note 3: The authors of a text do NOT refer to the people if they only talk about specific subgroups *within* the people, such as children, elderly, migrants, etc.

Note 4: What the authors mean by the 'the people' can also differ from case to case. It could refer to the sovereignty or power of the people, their identity (national feelings, values, ideas, religion, language, ethnicity, etc.), their prosperity, their rights, their wisdom, etc.

0. Argument not made
1. Argument made

Anti-Elitism

Do the authors criticize political, cultural, economic, legal, or media elites?

Note 1: Elites are not individual persons. Criticisms regarding for example a prime minister or a businessman are usually not anti-elitist. Only if these individuals are portrayed as representatives of a certain elite these criticisms should be seen as anti-elitist.

Note 2: Criticisms regarding a specific government, political party, company, medium or organization are usually not anti-elitist. A criticism is only anti-elitist if it concerns an elite *in general*, or if a specific government, political party, company, medium or organization is clearly portrayed as a representative of an elite in general.

- 0. Argument not made
- 1. Argument made

Appendix C

Words in dictionary for computer-based content analysis

	NL	UK	GE	IT	FR
Core	elit* consensus* ondemocratisch* ondemokratisch* corrupt* propagand* politici* *bedrog* *bedrieg* *verraa* *verrad* schaam*	elit* consensus* undemocratic* corrupt* propagand* politici* *deceit* *deceiv* *betray* shame*	elit* konsens* undemokratisch* korrupt* propagand* politiker* täusch* betrug* betrug* *verrat*	elit* consens* antidemocratic* corrot* propagand* politici* ingann* tradi* vergogn* scandal* verità disonest* partitocrazia	élit* consensus* antidémocratiqu* corromp* propagand* politiciens* *tromp* *trahi* honte* scandal* vérité* malhonnêt* mensonge mentir*
Context	establishm* heersend* capitul* kapitul* kaste* leugen* lieg*	establishm* ruling* establishm* *hersch*	establishm* *hersch*	partitocrazia	partitocrazia

Appendix D

Alternative estimation techniques for the analysis in Chapter 5

	Model 1 <i>Final model</i>		Model 2 <i>2 levels</i>		Model 3 <i>Robust SEs</i>		Model 4 <i>Bootstrapping</i>		Model 5 <i>Negative binomial</i>	
	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)
<i>Intercept</i>	-3.50**	(1.60)	-3.16**	(1.55)	-3.15**	(1.27)	-3.11*	(1.52)	-1.29**	(0.40)
<i>Country-year variables (N=20)</i>										
Time	-0.05	(0.07)	-0.04	(0.08)	-0.05	(0.07)	-0.04	(0.08)	-0.04	(0.02)
Success populists	1.98**	(0.62)	1.82**	(0.67)	1.85**	(0.64)	1.81**	(0.66)	0.70**	(0.16)
<i>Newspaper variables (N=15)</i>										
Left/right	0.48	(0.92)	0.40	(0.67)	0.42	(0.58)	0.38	(0.64)	-0.01	(0.14)
Tabloid	0.48	(1.20)	0.60	(0.89)	0.62	(0.98)	0.60	(0.88)	0.04	(0.19)
<i>Article variables (N=3315)</i>										
Article type (ref = editorial)										
Op-ed	1.22	(0.97)	1.36	(0.97)	1.41	(0.73)	1.36	(0.98)	0.49	(0.25)
Column	0.47	(0.91)	0.65	(0.91)	0.69	(0.64)	0.66	(0.97)	0.23	(0.23)
Letter	2.99**	(0.66)	2.98**	(0.66)	2.98**	(0.68)	2.98**	(0.67)	0.77**	(0.17)
Other	2.05	(3.43)	2.22	(3.43)	2.16*	(1.03)	2.20	(3.36)	0.98	(0.84)
Article length	-0.08	(0.05)	-0.10	(0.05)	-0.10	(0.05)	-0.10	(0.05)	-0.02	(0.01)
<i>Variance components</i>										
Country-year level	0.08	(0.77)	1.02	(0.88)	0.33	(0.81)	1.05	(1.06)	0.00	(0.00)
Newspaper level	1.30	(0.90)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	(0.00)
Article level	219.12**	(5.42)	219.02**	(5.42)	218.62**	(28.58)	218.93**	(5.48)	-	-
Deviance	27264.90	-	27263.77	-	27263.00	-	27262.75	-	-	-

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01.

I have employed different strategies to take into account that my dependent variable is not normally distributed (it is strongly inflated by zeros because most opinion articles do not contain populism at all). Each of these strategies, however, suffers from its own shortcomings. For this reason, I have not presented them in the main analysis. I have estimated the parameters with robust standard errors by means of bootstrapping and with a negative binomial regression model. Unfortunately, MLwiN was not able to estimate robust standard errors or to use the bootstrap procedure in its cross-classified design. The parameter estimation in the robust standard error and bootstrap procedure is therefore based on a simple two-level data structure with only the article and the country-year levels. The first model presented in this table is the full cross-classified three-level model that is presented in the actual analysis. Model 2 is the exact same model with only two levels. The findings do not substantially differ from the findings in the three-level model.

Robust standard errors

In model 3, I estimate the parameters with robust standard errors because inferences based on robust standard errors are less dependent on the assumption of normality (Hox, 2010: 261). The results show that this does not really affect the substantive conclusions. The only difference is that the effect of ‘other articles’ has become significant because its standard error decreased from 3.43 to 1.03 after correction. We should not pay too much heed to this finding. First of all, the ‘other articles’ category is very small ($N = 20$). Second, and this brings us to the biggest shortcoming of using robust standard errors, one needs a reasonable sample size on the second level for the standard errors to be accurate estimates (Hox, 2010: 261).

Bootstrapping

The fourth model shows the results after bootstrapping. ‘In bootstrapping we draw a sample b times (with replacement) from the observed sample at hand. In each sample we calculate the statistic(s) of interest, and the observed

distribution of the b statistics is used for the sampling distribution' (Hox, 2010: 264). I used the non-parametric bootstrap procedure using 20 iterated bootstrap runs of $b = 5000$ iterations each. As seen in model 4, the results do not differ from what I have found in the original sample. An important shortcoming of the bootstrap procedure is that, just as with using robust standard errors, it requires a large sample size at the highest level.

Negative binomial regression

Finally, I have estimated negative binomial regression models because the distribution of the dependent variable approximates the negative binomial distribution. Because the populism score is not a count variable, I have recoded the scores into discrete values. (In this case MLwiN was able again to estimate the cross-classified three-level model.) Again, the results remain basically the same. Both the success of populists and the letter have a positive significant effect on the degree of populism in the opinion articles. The most important shortcoming of this procedure is that the populism score – even with discrete values – is not a real count variable.

Appendix E

Populism-scores of election manifestos and reliability scores employed in Chapter 6

Country	Party	Election 1	Election 2	Election 3
France	PS	1.53	0	0
	RPR	0	0.62	-
	UDF	-	0.8	-
	UMP	-	0	0
	FN	15.79	2.59	4.08
	PCF	3.33	6.45	-
Germany	CDU/CSU	0	0	0
	SPD	0	0	0
	FDP	0.5	0	0
	Die Linke	0.69	1.14	2.82
Italy	DC/PP	1.67	-	-
	PD/Ulivo	-	0.34	0
	AN	7.29	-	-
	CdL/FI/PdL	3.80	1.39	1.82
	LN	2.47	-	-
	DS	3.76	-	-
Netherlands	CDA	0	0	0
	D66	0.65	0	2.64
	PvdA	1.03	0.85	0.61
	VVD	0	0	0
	CD	12.5	-	-
	LPF	-	10.53	-
	PVV	-	-	23.08
	SP	16.41	5.04	1.43
United Kingdom	Cons	0.31	3.1	1.43
	Labour	0.53	0.58	0.9
	LibDems	5.45	1	1.76
	BNP	-	-	10.64
	UKIP	8.54	-	8.02

The election years are: 1997, 2002 and 2007 in France; 1994, 2002 and 2005 in Germany; 1994, 2001 and 2008 in Italy; 1994, 2002 and 2006 in the Netherlands; and 1997, 2001 and 2005 in the United Kingdom.

Reliability

The general inter-coder reliability scores (measured with Krippendorff's alpha) are $\alpha = 0.72$ for people-centrism and $\alpha = 0.69$ for anti-elitism. The reliability statistics of the various country teams was measured with a sample (of approximately 5 per cent) of paragraphs from manifestos from every separate country. The results for people-centrism are $\alpha = 0.75$ (FR), $\alpha = 0.74$ (GE), $\alpha = 0.89$ (IT), $\alpha = 0.78$ (NL) and $\alpha = 0.73$ (UK). The results for anti-elitism are: $\alpha = 0.69$ (FR), $\alpha = 0.79$ (GE), $\alpha = 0.84$ (IT), 0.84 (NL) and $\alpha = 0.66$ (UK).

Appendix F

Populism-scores of newspapers and reliability scores employed in Chapter 6

Country	Newspaper	Election 1	Election 2	Election 3
France	Le Figaro (right-wing elite)	4.28	0.88	0.00
	Le Monde (left-wing elite)	2.94	0.35	0.00
	Liberation (left-wing)	2.08	1.91	2.26
Germany	Süddeutsche Zeitung (left-wing elite)	6.01	4.54	1.56
	Frankfurter Allgemeine (right-wing elite)	4.76	0.69	4.34
	Bild (right-wing tabloid)	3.85	0.94	1.39
Italy	Corriere della Sera (right-wing elite)	5.46	8.34	9.57
	La Repubblica (left-wing elite)	3.67	3.89	11.51
	La Stampa (right-wing elite)	8.52	8.94	-
Netherlands	NRC Handelsblad (right-wing elite)	2.73	9.46	3.35
	de Volkskrant (left-wing elite)	1.52	4.61	2.36
	De Telegraaf (right-wing tabloid)	6.61	12.76	6.37
United Kingdom	The Daily Telegraph (right-wing elite)	3.45	3.48	4.05
	The Guardian (left-wing elite)	2.29	3.55	4.72
	The Sun (right-wing tabloid)	2.34	1.57	2.52

The election years are: 1997, 2002 and 2007 in France; 1994, 2002 and 2005 in Germany; 1994, 2001 and 2008 in Italy; 1994, 2002 and 2006 in the Netherlands; and 1997, 2001 and 2005 in the United Kingdom.

Reliability

The results of the general reliability assessment are $\alpha = 0.81$ for people-centrism and $\alpha = 0.72$ for anti-elitism. The reliability scores per country are based on a selection of approximately 5 per cent of the selected articles. The results for people-centrism are $\alpha = 0.81$ (FR), $\alpha = 0.79$ (GE), $\alpha = 0.84$ (IT), $\alpha = 0.83$ (NL) and $\alpha = 0.92$ (UK). The results for anti-elitism are $\alpha = 0.74$ (FR), $\alpha = 0.80$ (GE), $\alpha = 0.72$ (IT), 0.78 (NL) and $\alpha = 0.87$ (UK).

Appendix G

Descriptive statistics Chapter 6

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Populism of party-year	1.39	3.38	0	23.08
Populism of newspaper-year	4.60	3.37	0	12.76
Satisfaction with democracy	2.65	0.79	1	4
Left/right attitude	-0.11	2.09	-4	4
EU-attitude	5.65	2.89	1	10
Radicalism left/right	4.40	5.49	0	16
Political interest	2.92	0.75	1	4
Education	21.00	6.16	0	67
Income	0.25	1.00	-3.48	2.96
Religiosity	2.27	1.14	1	5
Class (subjective)	2.87	1.07	1	5
Gender	0.42	0.49	0	1
Age	52.50	15.51	19	96

Appendix H

Descriptive statistics Chapter 6 without the degree of populism of newspaper variable

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Populism of party-year	1.39	3.38	0	23.08
Satisfaction with democracy	2.65	0.79	1	4
Left/right attitude	-0.11	2.09	-4	4
EU-attitude	5.65	2.89	1	10
Radicalism left/right	4.40	5.49	0	16
Political interest	2.92	0.75	1	4
Education	21.00	6.16	0	67
Income	0.25	1.00	-3.48	2.96
Religiosity	2.27	1.14	1	5
Class (subjective)	2.87	1.07	1	5
Gender	0.42	0.49	0	1
Age	52.50	15.51	19	96