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## A Survey items of economic populist, sovereignist and globalization

*Economic Populism*

* The overall economic well-being of this country has declined compared to the past
* Today in our country, many economic decisions are made without considering the interests of the people
* In this country, one does not really care about people who work hard
* In our country, politicians don’t really care about the people’s living standard
* Citizens should have more say in the economic decisions of our country

*Economic Sovereignism*

* Our country must regain control of its economic destiny
* To guarantee its well-being, our country should be able to close its economic borders
* We must strengthen our national sovereignty to ensure more social justice

*Globalization*

* To ensure economic prosperity, our country should work more together with other countries
* Globalization is an opportunity for economic growth in our country
* Globalization increases inequalities in our country
* International trade leads to jobs creation in our country

All items were a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ‘Strongly disagree’ to 7 ‘Strongly agree’

## A Descriptive statistics for economic populist, sovereignist and globalization items by country

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Country** | **n** | **mean** | **sd** | **min** | **max** |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | France | 1739 | 5.55 | 1.48 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | Germany | 1742 | 4.71 | 1.76 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | Italy | 1762 | 5.84 | 1.36 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | Switzerland | 1652 | 4.61 | 1.68 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | United States | 2273 | 5.11 | 1.92 | 1 | 7 |
| NoInterestofPeople | France | 1819 | 5.78 | 1.46 | 1 | 7 |
| NoInterestofPeople | Germany | 1803 | 5.26 | 1.54 | 1 | 7 |
| NoInterestofPeople | Italy | 1762 | 5.69 | 1.46 | 1 | 7 |
| NoInterestofPeople | Switzerland | 1716 | 5.05 | 1.62 | 1 | 7 |
| NoInterestofPeople | United States | 2331 | 5.81 | 1.45 | 1 | 7 |
| NoCareWorkHard | France | 1831 | 5.61 | 1.54 | 1 | 7 |
| NoCareWorkHard | Germany | 1796 | 4.93 | 1.73 | 1 | 7 |
| NoCareWorkHard | Italy | 1754 | 5.64 | 1.44 | 1 | 7 |
| NoCareWorkHard | Switzerland | 1750 | 4.70 | 1.72 | 1 | 7 |
| NoCareWorkHard | United States | 2251 | 4.22 | 1.94 | 1 | 7 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | France | 1836 | 5.87 | 1.47 | 1 | 7 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | Germany | 1820 | 5.06 | 1.68 | 1 | 7 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | Italy | 1779 | 5.91 | 1.41 | 1 | 7 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | Switzerland | 1760 | 4.90 | 1.73 | 1 | 7 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | United States | 2361 | 5.69 | 1.50 | 1 | 7 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | France | 1818 | 5.48 | 1.48 | 1 | 7 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | Germany | 1786 | 4.82 | 1.59 | 1 | 7 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | Italy | 1753 | 5.31 | 1.60 | 1 | 7 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | Switzerland | 1758 | 4.95 | 1.50 | 1 | 7 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | United States | 2293 | 5.53 | 1.44 | 1 | 7 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | France | 1813 | 5.92 | 1.22 | 1 | 7 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | Germany | 1748 | 5.32 | 1.47 | 1 | 7 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | Italy | 1766 | 5.81 | 1.39 | 1 | 7 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | Switzerland | 1694 | 5.06 | 1.49 | 1 | 7 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | United States | 2253 | 5.69 | 1.42 | 1 | 7 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | France | 1678 | 4.42 | 1.63 | 1 | 7 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | Germany | 1744 | 4.95 | 1.47 | 1 | 7 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | Italy | 1706 | 4.97 | 1.62 | 1 | 7 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | Switzerland | 1713 | 4.79 | 1.63 | 1 | 7 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | United States | 2241 | 5.03 | 1.67 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | France | 1692 | 4.05 | 1.99 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | Germany | 1651 | 3.97 | 1.85 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | Italy | 1666 | 3.62 | 2.04 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | Switzerland | 1678 | 3.47 | 1.94 | 1 | 7 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | United States | 2108 | 4.11 | 2.08 | 1 | 7 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | France | 1637 | 5.07 | 1.63 | 1 | 7 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | Germany | 1715 | 4.85 | 1.65 | 1 | 7 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | Italy | 1645 | 4.61 | 1.94 | 1 | 7 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | Switzerland | 1587 | 4.71 | 1.60 | 1 | 7 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | United States | 1929 | 4.70 | 1.86 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | France | 1692 | 3.90 | 1.72 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | Germany | 1745 | 4.76 | 1.52 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | Italy | 1698 | 4.46 | 1.76 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | Switzerland | 1680 | 4.36 | 1.60 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | United States | 2050 | 4.40 | 1.96 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | France | 1710 | 5.41 | 1.58 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | Germany | 1687 | 4.58 | 1.66 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | Italy | 1672 | 4.63 | 1.79 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | Switzerland | 1670 | 4.57 | 1.70 | 1 | 7 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | United States | 1905 | 4.16 | 1.95 | 1 | 7 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | France | 1704 | 4.46 | 1.62 | 1 | 7 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | Germany | 1742 | 5.03 | 1.41 | 1 | 7 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | Italy | 1710 | 5.07 | 1.52 | 1 | 7 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | Switzerland | 1680 | 4.89 | 1.40 | 1 | 7 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | United States | 2129 | 4.84 | 1.66 | 1 | 7 |

## A Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) – Pooled data

EFA is a method that reduces data to a smaller set of summary variables and allows to explore and interpret the underlying theoretical structure of the data. EFA is appropriate when the goal of the research is to create a measurement instrument that reflects meaningful underlying latent dimensions or constructs represented in the observed variables. In such context, researchers want to identify groups of variables, each of which has high correlations with only one factor, and to interpret and label each factor (Fabrigar et al. 1999).

For the purpose of the analysis, we pool all five countries together and run a preliminary parallel analysis to determine the number of factors that should be retained from EFA to correctly represent the data. Parallel analysis advises retaining a number of factors equal to the number of eigenvalues obtained for random data that are smaller than the eigenvalues in the observed data (Fabrigar et al. 1999). Preliminary parallel analysis suggests that 3 factors should be retained.



Consequently, we run EFA retaining the proposed 3-factor solution. EFA is performed using oblique rotation (*oblimin*) and polychoric correlation matrix for ordinal data. Oblique rotation assumes that there is a correlation between the factors, which is the most likely situation as regards our data.

We use Ordinary Least Squared/Minres factoring which is known to provide results similar to Maximum Likelihood without assuming multivariate normal distribution, and which derives solutions through iterative eigendecomposition (Harman and Wayne 1966).

**Standardized loadings (pattern matrix) based upon correlation matrix**

 MR1 MR2 MR3

SS loadings 2.41 1.62 1.37

Proportion Var 0.20 0.13 0.11

Cumulative Var 0.20 0.34 0.45

**Factor Loadings (pooled data)**

|  | **MR1** | **MR2** | **MR3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 0.587 | 0.063 | 0.039 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 0.771 | 0.013 | -0.009 |
| NoCareWorkHard | 0.582 | -0.012 | 0.026 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | 0.770 | -0.067 | -0.042 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 0.513 | 0.072 | 0.190 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | 0.271 | 0.051 | 0.491 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 0.109 | 0.648 | -0.126 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | -0.019 | -0.251 | 0.565 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 0.015 | 0.056 | 0.711 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | -0.036 | 0.714 | -0.038 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | 0.239 | -0.293 | 0.250 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | -0.057 | 0.691 | 0.133 |

## A Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) – Individual countries

### EFA France

(Analytical sample N=1334)

The root mean square of the residuals (RMSA) is 0.03

The df corrected root mean square of the residuals is 0.04

Tucker Lewis Index of factoring reliability = 0.94

RMSEA index = 0.057 and the 10 % confidence intervals are 0.049 0.065

BIC = -62.6

 With factor correlations of

 MR1 MR2 MR3

MR1 1.00 -0.25 0.58

MR2 -0.25 1.00 -0.25

MR3 0.58 -0.25 1.00

| France |
| --- |
|  | **MR1** | **MR2** | **MR3** |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 0.450 | 0.047 | 0.283 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 0.811 | -0.012 | -0.064 |
| NoCareWorkHard | 0.536 | 0.048 | 0.146 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | 0.789 | -0.018 | -0.022 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 0.579 | -0.008 | 0.082 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | 0.239 | 0.094 | 0.461 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 0.114 | 0.627 | -0.124 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | 0.024 | -0.250 | 0.526 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 0.026 | 0.030 | 0.663 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | -0.051 | 0.681 | -0.017 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | 0.424 | -0.198 | 0.213 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | -0.070 | 0.690 | 0.102 |

### EFA Italy

(Analytical sample N=1444)

The root mean square of the residuals (RMSA) is 0.03

The df corrected root mean square of the residuals is 0.04

Tucker Lewis Index of factoring reliability = 0.934

RMSEA index = 0.06 and the 10 % confidence intervals are 0.052 0.068

BIC = -35.6

 With factor correlations of

 MR1 MR2 MR3

MR1 1.00 -0.14 0.57

MR2 -0.14 1.00 -0.26

MR3 0.57 -0.26 1.00

| Italy |
| --- |
|  | **MR1** | **MR2** | **MR3** |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 0.629 | 0.009 | -0.029 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 0.755 | -0.036 | 0.066 |
| NoCareWorkHard | 0.595 | 0.037 | 0.092 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | 0.757 | -0.053 | -0.102 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 0.396 | 0.056 | 0.377 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | 0.472 | 0.062 | 0.328 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 0.134 | 0.547 | -0.247 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | -0.001 | -0.207 | 0.601 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 0.075 | 0.042 | 0.735 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | -0.110 | 0.751 | 0.045 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | 0.229 | -0.307 | 0.184 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | 0.064 | 0.582 | 0.047 |

### EFA Germany

(Analytical sample N=1375)

The root mean square of the residuals (RMSA) is 0.02

The df corrected root mean square of the residuals is 0.03

Tucker Lewis Index of factoring reliability = 0.965

RMSEA index = 0.046 and the 10 % confidence intervals are 0.038 0.054

BIC = -110

 With factor correlations of

 MR1 MR2 MR3

MR1 1.00 -0.14 0.63

MR2 -0.14 1.00 -0.15

MR3 0.63 -0.15 1.00

| Germany |
| --- |
|  | **MR1** | **MR2** | **MR3** |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 0.333 | -0.088 | 0.346 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 0.837 | 0.015 | -0.026 |
| NoCareWorkHard | 0.557 | -0.042 | 0.121 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | 0.697 | -0.080 | 0.096 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 0.572 | 0.082 | 0.117 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | 0.191 | 0.151 | 0.591 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 0.221 | 0.668 | -0.206 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | 0.034 | -0.194 | 0.584 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 0.056 | 0.040 | 0.707 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | -0.180 | 0.700 | 0.035 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | 0.406 | -0.204 | 0.129 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | -0.058 | 0.748 | 0.119 |

### EFA Switzerland

(Analytical sample N=1319)

The root mean square of the residuals (RMSA) is 0.02

The df corrected root mean square of the residuals is 0.03

Tucker Lewis Index of factoring reliability = 0.954

RMSEA index = 0.048 and the 10 % confidence intervals are 0.039 0.056

BIC = -105

 With factor correlations of

 MR1 MR3 MR2

MR1 1.00 0.56 -0.17

MR3 0.56 1.00 -0.19

MR2 -0.17 -0.19 1.00

| Switzerland |
| --- |
|  | **MR1** | **MR3** | **MR2** |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 0.307 | 0.341 | -0.067 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 0.790 | -0.018 | 0.044 |
| NoCareWorkHard | 0.595 | 0.066 | -0.078 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | 0.787 | -0.020 | -0.049 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 0.505 | 0.185 | 0.111 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | 0.115 | 0.656 | 0.065 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 0.099 | -0.138 | 0.618 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | -0.058 | 0.628 | -0.221 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 0.035 | 0.684 | 0.096 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | -0.057 | 0.011 | 0.653 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | 0.318 | 0.208 | -0.283 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | -0.078 | 0.138 | 0.613 |

### EFA United States

(Analytical sample N=1441)

The root mean square of the residuals (RMSA) is 0.03

The df corrected root mean square of the residuals is 0.04

Tucker Lewis Index of factoring reliability = 0.923

RMSEA index = 0.057 and the 10 % confidence intervals are 0.049 0.065

BIC = -51.1

 With factor correlations of

 MR1 MR2 MR3

MR1 1.00 0.36 -0.32

MR2 0.36 1.00 0.00

MR3 -0.32 0.00 1.00

| United States |
| --- |
|  | **MR1** | **MR2** | **MR3** |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 0.210 | 0.503 | -0.094 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 0.010 | 0.718 | -0.022 |
| NoCareWorkHard | -0.002 | 0.452 | -0.022 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | -0.114 | 0.636 | 0.025 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 0.169 | 0.468 | 0.222 |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | -0.018 | 0.140 | 0.546 |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 0.748 | 0.122 | -0.017 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | -0.359 | -0.048 | 0.505 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 0.115 | -0.065 | 0.627 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | 0.717 | 0.025 | -0.117 |
| GlobalizationIncreaseInequalities | -0.291 | 0.081 | 0.336 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | 0.722 | -0.086 | 0.124 |

## A Multigroup Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA)

CFA is typically used to test the fit of a model obtained from exploratory factor analysis or a previously existing theoretical model with the data in the sample. CFA allows the researcher to test the hypothesis that a relationship between the observed variables and their underlying latent constructs exists in their data (Harrington 2009).

### Group 1 [France]:



Latent Variables:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 =~

 WllBngCntryDcl 0.949 0.030 31.987 0.000 0.949 0.655

 NoInterestfPpl 1.077 0.032 33.600 0.000 1.077 0.731

 NoCareWorkHard 0.951 0.031 30.304 0.000 0.951 0.632

 PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.107 0.032 34.571 0.000 1.107 0.748

 CitizenHavMrSy 0.895 0.028 31.855 0.000 0.895 0.617

 F2 =~

 PrsprtyWrkOthC 0.960 0.049 19.581 0.000 0.960 0.606

 GlblztnEcGrwth 1.300 0.061 21.350 0.000 1.300 0.769

 IntrntnlTrdJbC 1.023 0.051 19.975 0.000 1.023 0.634

 F3 =~

 CntryRgnCntrED 0.754 0.028 26.614 0.000 0.754 0.611

 WllBngClsEcBrd 1.188 0.044 27.302 0.000 1.188 0.610

 MrNtSvMrSclJst 0.947 0.036 26.203 0.000 0.947 0.591

Covariances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 ~~

 F2 -0.271 0.017 -15.702 0.000 -0.271 -0.271

 F3 0.769 0.027 28.099 0.000 0.769 0.769

 F2 ~~

 F3 -0.334 0.027 -12.358 0.000 -0.334 -0.334

Intercepts:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 5.552 0.039 141.131 0.000 5.552 3.835

 .NoInterestfPpl 5.747 0.040 143.578 0.000 5.747 3.902

 .NoCareWorkHard 5.623 0.041 137.596 0.000 5.623 3.739

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 5.838 0.040 145.172 0.000 5.838 3.945

 .CitizenHavMrSy 5.495 0.039 139.254 0.000 5.495 3.784

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 4.388 0.043 101.993 0.000 4.388 2.772

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 3.908 0.046 85.027 0.000 3.908 2.311

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 4.434 0.044 101.037 0.000 4.434 2.746

 .CntryRgnCntrED 5.908 0.034 176.200 0.000 5.908 4.788

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 4.089 0.053 77.278 0.000 4.089 2.100

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 5.063 0.044 116.301 0.000 5.063 3.161

 F1 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F2 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F3 0.000 0.000 0.000

Variances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 1.195 0.106 11.279 0.000 1.195 0.571

 .NoInterestfPpl 1.010 0.120 8.424 0.000 1.010 0.465

 .NoCareWorkHard 1.357 0.114 11.953 0.000 1.357 0.600

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 0.963 0.122 7.906 0.000 0.963 0.440

 .CitizenHavMrSy 1.307 0.096 13.560 0.000 1.307 0.620

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.585 0.132 12.050 0.000 1.585 0.632

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 1.170 0.183 6.406 0.000 1.170 0.409

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 1.561 0.141 11.109 0.000 1.561 0.599

 .CntryRgnCntrED 0.954 0.085 11.167 0.000 0.954 0.627

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 2.380 0.145 16.470 0.000 2.380 0.628

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.669 0.115 14.559 0.000 1.669 0.650

 F1 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F2 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F3 1.000 1.000 1.000

### Group 2 [Italy]:



Latent Variables:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 =~

 WllBngCntryDcl 0.773 0.024 32.125 0.000 0.773 0.568

 NoInterestfPpl 1.163 0.030 39.017 0.000 1.163 0.797

 NoCareWorkHard 0.926 0.027 33.846 0.000 0.926 0.644

 PltcnsIgnrLvnS 0.915 0.027 33.787 0.000 0.915 0.643

 CitizenHavMrSy 1.064 0.029 37.301 0.000 1.064 0.678

 F2 =~

 PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.176 0.061 19.274 0.000 1.176 0.733

 GlblztnEcGrwth 1.246 0.065 19.143 0.000 1.246 0.716

 IntrntnlTrdJbC 0.664 0.043 15.434 0.000 0.664 0.440

 F3 =~

 CntryRgnCntrED 1.028 0.031 33.212 0.000 1.028 0.735

 WllBngClsEcBrd 1.154 0.036 31.653 0.000 1.154 0.567

 MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.297 0.039 33.109 0.000 1.297 0.683

Covariances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 ~~

 F2 -0.187 0.017 -11.179 0.000 -0.187 -0.187

 F3 0.832 0.025 33.840 0.000 0.832 0.832

 F2 ~~

 F3 -0.337 0.024 -14.001 0.000 -0.337 -0.337

Intercepts:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 5.830 0.036 163.522 0.000 5.830 4.285

 .NoInterestfPpl 5.685 0.038 148.722 0.000 5.685 3.898

 .NoCareWorkHard 5.644 0.038 149.570 0.000 5.644 3.920

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 5.888 0.037 157.873 0.000 5.888 4.137

 .CitizenHavMrSy 5.329 0.041 129.642 0.000 5.329 3.398

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 4.964 0.042 118.115 0.000 4.964 3.095

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 4.478 0.046 98.110 0.000 4.478 2.571

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 5.062 0.040 127.854 0.000 5.062 3.351

 .CntryRgnCntrED 5.789 0.037 157.826 0.000 5.789 4.136

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 3.661 0.053 68.601 0.000 3.661 1.798

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 4.635 0.050 93.189 0.000 4.635 2.442

 F1 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F2 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F3 0.000 0.000 0.000

Variances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 1.254 0.088 14.172 0.000 1.254 0.678

 .NoInterestfPpl 0.776 0.110 7.049 0.000 0.776 0.365

 .NoCareWorkHard 1.214 0.103 11.769 0.000 1.214 0.586

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.189 0.110 10.814 0.000 1.189 0.587

 .CitizenHavMrSy 1.329 0.107 12.432 0.000 1.329 0.540

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.190 0.173 6.888 0.000 1.190 0.463

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 1.480 0.189 7.825 0.000 1.480 0.488

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 1.841 0.105 17.523 0.000 1.841 0.807

 .CntryRgnCntrED 0.902 0.110 8.163 0.000 0.902 0.460

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 2.815 0.129 21.817 0.000 2.815 0.679

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.920 0.145 13.264 0.000 1.920 0.533

 F1 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F2 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F3 1.000 1.000 1.000

### Group 3 [Germany]:



Latent Variables:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 =~

 WllBngCntryDcl 1.100 0.031 35.048 0.000 1.100 0.632

 NoInterestfPpl 1.167 0.030 39.377 0.000 1.167 0.752

 NoCareWorkHard 1.139 0.032 35.997 0.000 1.139 0.661

 PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.291 0.032 40.546 0.000 1.291 0.777

 CitizenHavMrSy 0.985 0.027 35.982 0.000 0.985 0.627

 F2 =~

 PrsprtyWrkOthC 0.807 0.047 17.268 0.000 0.807 0.554

 GlblztnEcGrwth 1.411 0.073 19.226 0.000 1.411 0.925

 IntrntnlTrdJbC 0.840 0.047 17.834 0.000 0.840 0.609

 F3 =~

 CntryRgnCntrED 1.046 0.033 32.131 0.000 1.046 0.710

 WllBngClsEcBrd 1.150 0.037 31.087 0.000 1.150 0.629

 MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.164 0.036 32.024 0.000 1.164 0.708

Covariances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 ~~

 F2 -0.226 0.017 -13.358 0.000 -0.226 -0.226

 F3 0.806 0.024 33.834 0.000 0.806 0.806

 F2 ~~

 F3 -0.184 0.022 -8.362 0.000 -0.184 -0.184

Intercepts:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 4.731 0.046 101.775 0.000 4.731 2.720

 .NoInterestfPpl 5.239 0.041 126.405 0.000 5.239 3.378

 .NoCareWorkHard 4.922 0.046 106.899 0.000 4.922 2.857

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 5.087 0.044 114.483 0.000 5.087 3.060

 .CitizenHavMrSy 4.851 0.042 115.575 0.000 4.851 3.089

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 4.979 0.039 127.778 0.000 4.979 3.415

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 4.756 0.041 116.632 0.000 4.756 3.117

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 5.056 0.037 137.094 0.000 5.056 3.664

 .CntryRgnCntrED 5.293 0.039 134.348 0.000 5.293 3.591

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 4.000 0.049 81.847 0.000 4.000 2.187

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 4.850 0.044 110.305 0.000 4.850 2.948

 F1 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F2 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F3 0.000 0.000 0.000

Variances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 1.816 0.114 15.968 0.000 1.816 0.600

 .NoInterestfPpl 1.044 0.111 9.416 0.000 1.044 0.434

 .NoCareWorkHard 1.671 0.119 14.055 0.000 1.671 0.563

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.098 0.121 9.101 0.000 1.098 0.397

 .CitizenHavMrSy 1.497 0.095 15.755 0.000 1.497 0.607

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.473 0.111 13.279 0.000 1.473 0.693

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 0.337 0.225 1.498 0.134 0.337 0.145

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 1.199 0.109 11.029 0.000 1.199 0.630

 .CntryRgnCntrED 1.078 0.110 9.794 0.000 1.078 0.496

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 2.020 0.127 15.908 0.000 2.020 0.604

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.351 0.127 10.668 0.000 1.351 0.499

 F1 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F2 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F3 1.000 1.000 1.000

### Group 4 [Switzerland]:



Latent Variables:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 =~

 WllBngCntryDcl 1.020 0.033 30.610 0.000 1.020 0.609

 NoInterestfPpl 1.151 0.034 34.004 0.000 1.151 0.710

 NoCareWorkHard 1.083 0.033 32.384 0.000 1.083 0.648

 PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.271 0.035 36.062 0.000 1.271 0.744

 CitizenHavMrSy 0.892 0.029 30.768 0.000 0.892 0.603

 F2 =~

 PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.066 0.064 16.535 0.000 1.066 0.663

 GlblztnEcGrwth 1.077 0.065 16.597 0.000 1.077 0.677

 IntrntnlTrdJbC 0.752 0.048 15.561 0.000 0.752 0.542

 F3 =~

 CntryRgnCntrED 1.093 0.037 29.277 0.000 1.093 0.740

 WllBngClsEcBrd 1.166 0.043 27.241 0.000 1.166 0.605

 MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.026 0.038 27.305 0.000 1.026 0.652

Covariances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 ~~

 F2 -0.211 0.020 -10.587 0.000 -0.211 -0.211

 F3 0.706 0.024 29.479 0.000 0.706 0.706

 F2 ~~

 F3 -0.233 0.027 -8.777 0.000 -0.233 -0.233

Intercepts:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 4.599 0.046 100.131 0.000 4.599 2.747

 .NoInterestfPpl 5.051 0.044 113.584 0.000 5.051 3.116

 .NoCareWorkHard 4.728 0.046 103.124 0.000 4.728 2.829

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 4.929 0.047 105.169 0.000 4.929 2.885

 .CitizenHavMrSy 4.977 0.041 122.724 0.000 4.977 3.366

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 4.833 0.044 109.521 0.000 4.833 3.004

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 4.351 0.044 99.777 0.000 4.351 2.737

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 4.879 0.038 128.319 0.000 4.879 3.520

 .CntryRgnCntrED 5.049 0.041 124.647 0.000 5.049 3.419

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 3.590 0.053 67.956 0.000 3.590 1.864

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 4.706 0.043 108.962 0.000 4.706 2.989

 F1 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F2 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F3 0.000 0.000 0.000

Variances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 1.764 0.113 15.624 0.000 1.764 0.629

 .NoInterestfPpl 1.304 0.120 10.874 0.000 1.304 0.496

 .NoCareWorkHard 1.620 0.115 14.109 0.000 1.620 0.580

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.305 0.125 10.402 0.000 1.305 0.447

 .CitizenHavMrSy 1.391 0.093 14.992 0.000 1.391 0.636

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.451 0.167 8.667 0.000 1.451 0.561

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 1.368 0.165 8.269 0.000 1.368 0.541

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 1.356 0.106 12.782 0.000 1.356 0.706

 .CntryRgnCntrED 0.986 0.116 8.467 0.000 0.986 0.452

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 2.350 0.142 16.583 0.000 2.350 0.634

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 1.427 0.118 12.099 0.000 1.427 0.576

 F1 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F2 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F3 1.000 1.000 1.000

### Group 5 [United States]:



Latent Variables:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 =~

 WllBngCntryDcl 1.396 0.049 28.613 0.000 1.396 0.716

 NoInterestfPpl 1.016 0.037 27.612 0.000 1.016 0.682

 NoCareWorkHard 0.853 0.041 21.007 0.000 0.853 0.443

 PltcnsIgnrLvnS 0.696 0.033 21.064 0.000 0.696 0.456

 CitizenHavMrSy 0.719 0.031 23.415 0.000 0.719 0.505

 F2 =~

 PrsprtyWrkOthC 1.414 0.043 32.928 0.000 1.414 0.852

 GlblztnEcGrwth 1.473 0.046 32.165 0.000 1.473 0.756

 IntrntnlTrdJbC 0.948 0.035 26.935 0.000 0.948 0.572

 F3 =~

 CntryRgnCntrED 0.435 0.032 13.546 0.000 0.435 0.305

 WllBngClsEcBrd 2.400 0.145 16.588 0.000 2.400 1.164

 MrNtSvMrSclJst 0.557 0.043 12.952 0.000 0.557 0.304

Covariances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 F1 ~~

 F2 0.495 0.020 24.472 0.000 0.495 0.495

 F3 -0.163 0.019 -8.582 0.000 -0.163 -0.163

 F2 ~~

 F3 -0.463 0.030 -15.544 0.000 -0.463 -0.463

Intercepts:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 4.987 0.050 99.346 0.000 4.987 2.558

 .NoInterestfPpl 5.728 0.038 149.341 0.000 5.728 3.845

 .NoCareWorkHard 4.186 0.050 84.492 0.000 4.186 2.175

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 5.617 0.039 143.126 0.000 5.617 3.685

 .CitizenHavMrSy 5.459 0.037 148.884 0.000 5.459 3.833

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 5.015 0.043 117.284 0.000 5.015 3.019

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 4.389 0.050 87.504 0.000 4.389 2.253

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 4.859 0.043 113.926 0.000 4.859 2.933

 .CntryRgnCntrED 5.653 0.037 153.970 0.000 5.653 3.964

 .WllBngClsEcBrd 4.121 0.053 77.600 0.000 4.121 1.998

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 4.655 0.047 98.695 0.000 4.655 2.541

 F1 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F2 0.000 0.000 0.000

 F3 0.000 0.000 0.000

Variances:

 Estimate Std.Err z-value P(>|z|) Std.lv Std.all

 .WllBngCntryDcl 1.854 0.176 10.527 0.000 1.854 0.487

 .NoInterestfPpl 1.188 0.119 9.981 0.000 1.188 0.535

 .NoCareWorkHard 2.975 0.115 25.810 0.000 2.975 0.803

 .PltcnsIgnrLvnS 1.840 0.103 17.815 0.000 1.840 0.792

 .CitizenHavMrSy 1.512 0.090 16.814 0.000 1.512 0.745

 .PrsprtyWrkOthC 0.758 0.152 4.993 0.000 0.758 0.275

 .GlblztnEcGrwth 1.625 0.169 9.603 0.000 1.625 0.428

 .IntrntnlTrdJbC 1.847 0.115 16.016 0.000 1.847 0.673

 .CntryRgnCntrED 1.845 0.093 19.901 0.000 1.845 0.907

 .WllBngClsEcBrd -1.505 0.701 -2.146 0.032 -1.505 -0.354

 .MrNtSvMrSclJst 3.047 0.109 27.997 0.000 3.047 0.908

 F1 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F2 1.000 1.000 1.000

 F3 1.000 1.000 1.000

Let us note that the standardized loading for the item on ‘closing economic borders’ is above 1 and that it has negative variance, which is typical of a ‘Heywood case’. Such problem is primarily due to non-normality of that particular item in American sample, however not significantly affecting the overall quality of the model’s fit.

## A Mokken scales of economic populist, sovereignist and globalization attitudes

We first test a scale of Economic Populism (EcoPop) from the 5 items retained in the first factor of CFA. The coefficient of homogeneity for the scale in the pooled data is 0.44 (s.e.=0.006), which suggests a ‘moderate’ Mokken scale. Standard errors are very small due to the large sample size and the 95% confidence intervals around the value of Hi do not include the lower bound cut-off. The second Mokken scale refers to Positive Views of Globalization (Global). It has a coefficient of 0.49 (s.e.=0.005) which is just below the conventional threshold for a ‘strong’ scale. Finally, the third scale refers to Economic Sovereignism (EcoSov). The coefficient of homogeneity is 0.43 (s.e.=0.006) which again suggests a moderate scale.

All three scales have high internal coherence and they meet the classic IRT assumptions of unidimensionality, local independence of items and monotonicity. We test all three scales for unidimensionality, local independence and monotonicity. The internal consistency reliability of our scales is estimated by the reliability coefficient Rho (a.k.a. Molenaar Sijtsma statistic), values of which should exceed 0.70. We also provide the Cronbach's alpha. In order to assess inter-item and item-to-total correlations, we use bootstrapped polychoric correlations. This method is a suitable tool to (i) evaluate the strength of inter-item relationships between normally distributed continuous latent variables when these are ordinal; (ii) consider the appropriateness of scoring them together on a single scale, and (iii) investigate local dependency (Van Hauwaert et al. 2019).

All details of the three Mokken scales of economic populist, sovereignist and globalization attitudes are provided below. All inter-item correlation coefficients are significant (at p<0.05) and below 0.80, which indicates they are positively, yet not too highly, correlated, thus confirming conditional association –i.e. local independence– of items across the three scales. Values of the Rho coefficient are all above 0.7, showing good internal consistency reliability. We find no significant deviation from monotonicity with all Crit values below the conventional 0.4 threshold –with just one exception of the Crit index for the item concerning national sovereignty as a means to ensure social justice, which is 0.4, thus suggesting only moderate violation of monotonicity in the Economic Sovereignism scale.

**Summary Table of Mokken scales of economic populist, sovereignist and globalization attitudes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Eco. Populism** | **Eco. Sovereignism** | **Positive Globalization** |
| H | 0.44 | 0.43 | 0.49 |
| Range of Hi | 0.40-0.50 | 0.42-0.44 | 0.48-0.50 |
| Reliability (Rho) | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Cronbach’s Alpha | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Inter-items correlations | 0.4 to 0.7All p < 0.05 | 0.4 to 0.5All p < 0.05 | 0.5All p < 0.05 |
| Monotonicity | All crit < 0.4 | All crit ⩽ 0.4 | All crit < 0.4 |

## A Graded Response Model for polytomous items

Tables below show item parameters for each of the three Mokken scales constructed from IRT analysis. Item information trace lines are shown in the corresponding figures. We also show the distribution of the IRT scores calculated from the GRM.

### Economic Populism

|  | **a** | **b1** | **b2** | **b3** | **b4** | **b5** | **b6** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WellBeingCountryDecline | 1.54 | -2.62 | -2.02 | -1.44 | -0.745 | 0.027 | 0.737 |
| NoInterestofPeople | 2.85 | -2.35 | -1.92 | -1.40 | -0.833 | -0.218 | 0.364 |
| NoCareWorkHard | 1.55 | -2.47 | -1.92 | -1.33 | -0.636 | 0.123 | 0.856 |
| PoliticiansIgnoreLivingStds | 2.59 | -2.38 | -1.91 | -1.35 | -0.801 | -0.252 | 0.313 |
| CitizenHaveMoreSay | 1.65 | -3.03 | -2.39 | -1.67 | -0.750 | 0.095 | 0.820 |





### Globalization positive

|  | **a** | **b1** | **b2** | **b3** | **b4** | **b5** | **b6** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ProsperityWorkOtherCountries | 1.93 | -2.23 | -1.87 | -1.266 | -0.361 | 0.514 | 1.17 |
| GlobalizationEcoGrowth | 2.05 | -1.68 | -1.35 | -0.833 | -0.057 | 0.788 | 1.50 |
| InternationalTradeJobCreation | 1.85 | -2.37 | -1.93 | -1.346 | -0.429 | 0.523 | 1.34 |





### Economic Sovereignism

|  | **a** | **b1** | **b2** | **b3** | **b4** | **b5** | **b6** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CountryRegainControlEcoDestiny | 1.70 | -3.10 | -2.583 | -1.974 | -1.065 | -0.182 | 0.553 |
| WellBeingCloseEcoBorders | 1.42 | -1.48 | -0.942 | -0.396 | 0.365 | 1.090 | 1.677 |
| MoreNatSovMoreSocialJustice | 2.04 | -2.01 | -1.611 | -1.092 | -0.293 | 0.439 | 1.023 |





## A Binary logistic regressions of radical right populist voting in Europe and the United States

Here we show the details for the binary logistic regressions of RRP voting in Europe and the United States. We first present the model for the pooled European countries, then the results for similar analyses conducted for each country individually.

### Pooled European countries (France, Italy, Germany and Switzerland)

|  |
| --- |
| **Model 1. Radical right populist voting European countries** |
|  |
|  | *Dependent variable:* |
|  |  |
|  | VoteRRP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | -0.215\*\* (0.094) |
| AgeContinuous | -0.012\*\*\* (0.003) |
| EducationRMiddle | -0.027 (0.121) |
| EducationRHigh | -0.285\*\* (0.134) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | -0.335\*\*\* (0.027) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | -0.164\*\*\* (0.025) |
| MoreLawOrder | 0.233\*\*\* (0.029) |
| EcoPop | 0.274\*\*\* (0.068) |
| Global | -0.600\*\*\* (0.061) |
| EcoSov | 0.692\*\*\* (0.078) |
| countrygermany | -0.284\* (0.150) |
| countryitaly | 1.530\*\*\* (0.137) |
| countryswiss | 1.320\*\*\* (0.146) |
| Constant | -0.378 (0.311) |
|  |
| Observations | 3,880 |
| Log Likelihood | -1,484.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 2,995.000 |
|  |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### United States

|  |
| --- |
| **Model 2. Trump versus Biden in the United States** |
|  |
|  | *Dependent variable:* |
|  |  |
|  | VoteRRP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | -0.504\*\* (0.198) |
| AgeContinuous | -0.005 (0.006) |
| EducationRMiddle | -0.071 (0.236) |
| EducationRHigh | 0.259 (0.254) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | -0.222\*\*\* (0.068) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | -0.423\*\*\* (0.054) |
| MoreLawOrder | 0.547\*\*\* (0.055) |
| EcoPop | -0.711\*\*\* (0.149) |
| Global | -1.050\*\*\* (0.142) |
| EcoSov | 1.040\*\*\* (0.175) |
| Constant | 0.249 (0.577) |
|  |
| Observations | 1,350 |
| Log Likelihood | -346.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 714.000 |
|  |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

Similar models for individual European countries are shown below.

### France

|  |
| --- |
| **Radical right populist voting in France** |
|  |
|  | *Dependent variable:* |
|  |  |
|  | VoteRRP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | 0.113 (0.199) |
| AgeContinuous | -0.028\*\*\* (0.007) |
| EducationRMiddle | -0.456\* (0.243) |
| EducationRHigh | -0.700\*\*\* (0.247) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | -0.348\*\*\* (0.057) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | -0.074 (0.056) |
| MoreLawOrder | 0.345\*\*\* (0.067) |
| EcoPop | 0.574\*\*\* (0.155) |
| Global | -0.600\*\*\* (0.123) |
| EcoSov | 0.287\* (0.168) |
| Constant | -0.336 (0.681) |
|  |
| Observations | 884 |
| Log Likelihood | -333.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 687.000 |
|  |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Italy

|  |
| --- |
| **Radical right populist voting in Italy** |
|  |
|  | *Dependent variable:* |
|  |  |
|  | VoteRRP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | 0.028 (0.163) |
| AgeContinuous | 0.001 (0.006) |
| EducationRMiddle | 0.434\*\* (0.212) |
| EducationRHigh | 0.162 (0.232) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | -0.266\*\*\* (0.047) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | -0.251\*\*\* (0.047) |
| MoreLawOrder | 0.264\*\*\* (0.048) |
| EcoPop | 0.203\* (0.122) |
| Global | -0.629\*\*\* (0.113) |
| EcoSov | 0.889\*\*\* (0.146) |
| Constant | 0.063 (0.469) |
|  |
| Observations | 1,039 |
| Log Likelihood | -472.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 966.000 |
|  |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Germany

|  |
| --- |
| **Radical right populist voting in Germany** |
|  |
|  | *Dependent variable:* |
|  |  |
|  | VoteRRP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | -0.695\*\*\* (0.253) |
| AgeContinuous | -0.018\*\* (0.009) |
| EducationRMiddle | -0.030 (0.374) |
| EducationRHigh | -0.076 (0.401) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | -0.496\*\*\* (0.085) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | -0.222\*\*\* (0.063) |
| MoreLawOrder | 0.079 (0.071) |
| EcoPop | 0.642\*\*\* (0.176) |
| Global | -0.749\*\*\* (0.164) |
| EcoSov | 0.713\*\*\* (0.205) |
| Constant | 1.110 (0.805) |
|  |
| Observations | 1,085 |
| Log Likelihood | -244.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 511.000 |
|  |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Switzerland

|  |
| --- |
| **Radical right populist voting in Switzerland** |
|  |
|  | *Dependent variable:* |
|  |  |
|  | VoteRRP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | -0.548\*\*\* (0.187) |
| AgeContinuous | -0.007 (0.006) |
| EducationRMiddle | -0.076 (0.236) |
| EducationRHigh | -0.516\* (0.296) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | -0.310\*\*\* (0.052) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | -0.122\*\* (0.050) |
| MoreLawOrder | 0.253\*\*\* (0.058) |
| EcoPop | -0.191 (0.132) |
| Global | -0.500\*\*\* (0.120) |
| EcoSov | 0.775\*\*\* (0.145) |
| Constant | 0.438 (0.557) |
|  |
| Observations | 872 |
| Log Likelihood | -389.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 800.000 |
|  |
| *Note:* | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

## A Binary logistic regression of radical left populist voting in France, Germany and Italy

Here we show the details for the binary logistic regressions of radical left populist voting in France, Germany and Italy, which all have a relevant radical left populist party i.e. La France Insoumise (LFI) in France, Die Linke in Germany and the Five Star Movement (M5S) in Italy. In model 3 below, we contrast radical left-wing populist voters with all other voters in the pooled dataset for all three countries, with country fixed effects. Radical left populist voters are selected based on the same voting intention question as previously, as follows: LFI in France (n=76 voters against 854 for other parties), Die Linke in Germany (n=100 / 1005), and the M5S in Italy (n=182 / 878).

We use again the IRT scores of economic populism (EcoPop), economic sovereignism (EcoSov) and pro-globalization (Global) attitudes as our main independent variables, controlling for standard socio-demographic variables –i.e. gender, age, education– as well as immigration, law and order, and pro-redistribution attitudes.

We first present the model for the pooled three countries, then the results for similar analyses conducted for each country individually.

|  |
| --- |
| **Model 3. Radical left populist votingin France, Germany and Italy (pooled)** |
|  |
|  |  |
|  | VoteLWP |
|  |
| GenderFemale | -0.240\* (0.123) |
| AgeContinuous | -0.002 (0.004) |
| EducationRMiddle | 0.102 (0.168) |
| EducationRHigh | -0.137 (0.180) |
| ImmigrantsEnrichCulture | 0.188\*\*\* (0.036) |
| TakeRichGivePoor | 0.272\*\*\* (0.040) |
| MoreLawOrder | -0.181\*\*\* (0.034) |
| EcoPop | 0.235\*\*\* (0.088) |
| Global | -0.253\*\*\* (0.078) |
| EcoSov | 0.042 (0.094) |
| countrygermany | 0.167 (0.180) |
| countryitaly | 0.946\*\*\* (0.167) |
| Constant | -3.680\*\*\* (0.433) |
|  |
| Observations | 3,008 |
| Log Likelihood | -958.000 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 1,943.000 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |