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Online Appendix

Figure A1. Party electorates’ preferences regarding welfare state size and welfare state recalibration

Notes: This figure illustrates the aggregated welfare state preferences of voters from different party families within the two-dimensional space we propose as the accurate depiction of current welfare politics. The values indicate the aggregated position as deviation from the respective country mean on the welfare state size dimension and aggregated priorities as deviation from the country mean on the welfare state recalibration dimension. The confidence intervals are extracted from a bivariate regression of an individual’s position on partisanship. Magnitude differences between party families are mainly a result of the varying number of partisans per family.

**Description of data and operationalisation:**
An original online survey from the project (‘ANONYMIZED’), with 12,500 respondents in eight countries (Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom), fielded between October and December 2018.

X-axis (aggregated position as deviation from the respective country mean on the welfare state size dimension): Mean of answers given to: ‘The government should …’ (1) ‘… increase old age pension benefits’, (2) ‘… increase the availability of good-quality childcare services’, (3) ‘… expand access to good-quality university education for students from lower-income families’, (4) ‘… increase unemployment benefits’, (5) ‘… expand services that help reintegrate the long-term unemployed into the labour market’.

Y-axis (aggregated priorities as deviation from the country mean on the welfare state recalibration dimension): ‘Now imagine that the government had the means to improve benefits in some social policy fields, but not in all of them. You can allocate 100 points. Give more points to those fields in which you consider benefit improvement more important, and fewer points to those areas in which you consider benefit improvement less important.’: (1) old age pensions, (2) childcare, (3) university education, (4) unemployment benefits, (5) labour market reintegration services. Mean of share of points given to $2 + 3 + 5$. 
Figure A2. Party electorates’ preferences regarding welfare state recalibration, disaggregated by individual policy fields rather than combined to the recalibration-dimension (as in Figure A1)
Table A3. An overview of the included parties and party family classifications

| Country          | (English) Party Name                     | Abbreviation | Party Family        | Year of Manifesto | Number of Social Policy Statements |
|------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| Austria          | Austrian Freedom Party                   | FPÖ          | Radical Right       | 2017              | 81                                 |
|                  | Austrian People’s Party                  | ÖVP          | Conservative        | 2017              | 541                                |
|                  | The New Austria and Liberal Forum        | NEOS         | Liberal             | 2013              | 106                                |
|                  | The Greens                               | Greens AT    | Green               | 2017              | 178                                |
|                  | Austrian Social Democratic Party         | SPÖ          | Social Democratic   | 2017              | 574                                |
|                  | Venstre, Denmark’s Liberal Party         | Venstre     | Liberal             | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Social Democrats                         | SocDem       | Social Democratic   | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Red–Green Alliance                       | RGA          | Radical Left        | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Liberal Alliance                         | LA           | Liberal             | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Danish People’s Party                    | DPP          | Radical Right       | -                 | -                                  |
| Germany          | Alternative for Germany                  | AFD          | Radical Right       | 2017              | 65                                 |
|                  | Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union | CDU/CSU | Conservative        | 2017              | 97                                 |
|                  | Free Democratic Party                    | FDP          | Liberal             | 2017              | 170                                |
|                  | Alliance 90/Greens                       | Greens       | Green               | 2017              | 353                                |
|                  | The Left                                 | Left         | Radical Left        | 2017              | 493                                |
|                  | Social Democratic Party of Germany       | SPD          | Social Democratic   | 2017              | 341                                |
| Ireland          | Fianna Fáil                              | FF           | Conservative        | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Fine Gael                                | FG           | Conservative        | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Labour Party                             | Labour       | Social Democratic   | -                 | -                                  |
|                  | Sinn Féin                                | SF           | Radical Left        | -                 | -                                  |
| Italy            | League                                  | LN           | Radical Right       | 2018              | 110                                |
|                  | Go Italy                                 | FI           | Conservative        | 2013              | 22                                 |
|                  | Brothers of Italy                        | FDI          | Conservative        | 2013              | 44                                 |
|                  | Free and Equal                           | LeU          | Radical Left        | 2018              | 50                                 |
|                  | Democratic Party                         | PD           | Social Democratic   | 2018              | 222                                |
|                  | Five Star Movement                       | M5S          | -                   | 2018              | 271                                |
| Netherlands      | Party of Freedom                         | PVV          | Radical Right       | 2012              | 37                                 |
|                  | Christian Democratic Appeal             | CDA          | Conservative        | 2017              | 184                                |
|                  | Democrats 66                             | D66          | Liberal             | 2017              | 327                                |
|                  | People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy | VVD         | Liberal             | 2017              | 289                                |
|                  | Green Left                               | GL           | Green               | 2017              | 128                                |
|                  | Socialist Party                          | SP           | Radical Left        | 2017              | 87                                 |
|                  | Labour Party                             | PVDA         | Social Democratic   | 2017              | 265                                |
| Norway           | Progress Party                           | FrP          | Radical Right       | 2017              | 529                                |
|                  | Conservative Party                       | H            | Conservative        | 2017              | 349                                |
|                  | Centre Party                             | Sp           | -                   | 2017              | 503                                |
|                  | Green Party                              | MDG          | Green               | 2017              | 196                                |
|                  | Socialist Left Party                     | SV           | Radical Left        | 2017              | 513                                |
|                  | Labour Party                             | Ap           | Social Democratic   | 2017              | 414                                |
Due to, on the one hand, data availability and, on the other hand, the absence of a strong radical right party, we cannot use every country for every part of the analysis. However, we always use as many countries as possible. Generally, we included all parties with a vote share of at least 5% in the last general election before the voter data collection (autumn 2018). For the coding of manifestos, we complemented the list with smaller parties represented in parliament even if their vote share was lower than 5%, to achieve the best possible representation of each party family in each country.

For the empirical manifesto-based section, we use Austria, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

For the analysis of individual preferences (Figure A1), we make use of the eight countries for which we have individual level data, namely Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

For party perception analysis, which is based on the same individual-level data, we use data from Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK, i.e. from the countries that had a relatively strong radical right party at the time of the survey or were also included in the manifesto analysis.

*While we usually use the latest available manifesto for a party, the manifestos for the Italian FDI and FI, the Dutch PVV, the Austrian NEOS, and the Green Party of England and Wales are very short, containing less than 300 quasi-sentences (compared to a median of about 1,500 quasi-sentences among the other manifestos we used). In order to avoid getting biased results due to the brevity of these manifestos, we used these five parties’ second newest manifestos, which are longer (2013 for the FDI with 461 quasi-sentences, 2013 for the FI (PdL) with 210 quasi-sentences, 2012 for the PVV with 927 quasi-sentences, 2013 for NEOS with 1,236 quasi-sentences, and 2015 for the Green Party of England and Wales with 2,235 quasi-sentences).
Table A4. Overview of country selection for the manifesto analysis

| Country (RRP)                          | Last Election | Latest Manifesto Available at the time of coding | Coded | Comment |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| Austria (Austrian Freedom Party)      | 2017          | 2017                                             | yes   |         |
| Germany (Alternative for Germany)     | 2017          | 2017                                             | yes   |         |
| Italy (League)                        | 2018          | 2018                                             | yes   |         |
| Netherlands (Party of Freedom)        | 2017          | 2017                                             | yes   |         |
| Norway (Progress Party)               | 2017          | 2017                                             | yes   |         |
| Sweden (Sweden Democrats)             | 2018          | 2018                                             | yes   |         |
| United Kingdom (UK Independence Party)| 2019          | 2017*                                            | yes   |         |
| Belgium (Flemish Interest)            | 2019          | 2014*                                            | no    | latest not available; second latest >3yrs |
| Denmark (Danish People's Party)       | 2019          | 2015                                            | no    | latest not available; second latest too few statements (<300)** |
| Finland (True Finns)                  | 2019          | 2015*                                            | no    | latest not available; second latest >3yrs |
| France (National Rally)               | 2017          | 2017                                            | no    | too few statements (<300)** |
| Greece (Greek Solution)               | 2019          | 2015                                            | no    | latest not available; second latest does not include Greek Solution >3yrs |
| Luxembourg (Alternative Democratic Reform Party) | 2018 | 2013                                            | no    | latest not available; second latest too few statements for 3 out of 4 major parties (<300)** |
| Spain (Vox)                           | 2019          | 2015*                                            | no    | latest not available; second latest does not include Vox |
| Switzerland (SVP)                     | 2019          | 2015*                                            | no    |         |

* Latest manifestos were included only in the July 2020 update of the MARPOR corpus.
** Manifestos with fewer than 300 statements are generally too short to be meaningfully coded with regard to the recalibration dimension.
A5. Positioning on recalibration dimension by party family, based on election manifestos
- Replication of Figure 2 with positive statements only

Figure A6. Emphasis on welfare expansion by individual parties, based on election manifestos
A7. Positioning of party families on specific social policies - Replication of Figure 2 disaggregated into single policies

Figure A8. Positioning of individual parties on recalibration dimension based on voters’ perception, by country

Notes: The vertical line (0) indicates that a party is perceived to prioritize social investment over consumption exactly as much as the average in the country. Positive values represent higher than average perceived support for social investment over consumption, and negative values represent higher than average perceived support for consumption over social investment.
Figure A9. Perceptions of party positioning on the recalibration dimension (social investment vs. consumption), excluding own party voters’ evaluations, aggregated by party family

Figure A10. Perceptions of party positioning on the recalibration dimension (social investment vs. consumption), excluding own party voters’ evaluations, by country
Figure A11. Perceptions of party positioning on the recalibration dimension (social investment vs. consumption), only considering radical right voters’ evaluations, aggregated by party family.

Figure A12. Perceptions of party positioning on the recalibration dimension (social investment vs. consumption), only considering radical right voters’ evaluations, by country.
Figure A13. Perceptions of how much parties prioritise different social policy fields, aggregated by party family

Notes: This figure replicates Figure 4 but disaggregates the recalibration dimension by individual policy fields.
Figure A14. Party electorates’ preferences regarding welfare state size by country

Welfare State Size

Notes: This figure illustrates the welfare state preferences of voters from different parties on the welfare state size dimension. The values indicate the mean position as deviation from the respective country mean. The confidence intervals are extracted from a bivariate regression of an individual’s positional deviation from the country mean on partisanship. Magnitude differences between parties are mainly a result of the varying number of partisans per family. Position was measured by an additive index based on three items from the ESS round 8: (i) Standard of living for the old, governments’ responsibility (ii) Standard of living for the unemployed, governments’ responsibility (iii) childcare services for working parents, governments’ responsibility.