**Methodological Appendix for “Choosing Whom to Betray: Populist Right-Wing Parties, Welfare State Reforms and the Trade-Off Between Office and Votes”**

NEWSPAPER SOURCES

The analysis of newspapers in the three countries was carried out by performing a keyword search in the electronic archives of at least one quality newspaper per country. The sources were as follows:

*Austria*: online archives of *Der Standard* <http://derstandarddigital.at/?page=ArchivSuche>; on LexisNexis, access to the *Wirtschaftsblatt* was available as part of a package of Austrian newspapers. Period: 2003-2008 (earlier period relies on secondary literature). Keyword search: “Rentensalter” (age or retirement) OR “Pensionsreform” (pension reform) AND “FPÖ” (Freiheitspartei Österreich) OR “Haider””.

*Switzerland*: the archives of the French-speaking *Nouveau Quotidien*, now out of press, are freely available on www.letempsarchives.ch/‎ for the period 1991-1998. Keyword search in French: “AVS” (name of the state public pension scheme) AND “UDC” OR “Blocher”. For the period after 1998: Archives of the NZZ <http://nzz.gbi.de/NZZ.ein> and *Tages Anzeiger* via Lexis Nexis. Period: 1998-2010. Keyword search in German: “AHV” (name of state pension scheme in German) AND “SVP” OR “Blocher”. Full period covered: 2003-2010.

*Netherlands***:** Onlinearchivesof the*NRC Handelsblad***:** <http://archief.nrc.nl/?modus=w>. Keyword search: “AOW” (name of state pension scheme in Dutch) OR “pensioensleeftijd” (age of retirement) AND “PVV” (Partij voor de Vrijheid) OR “Wilders”. Period covered: 2009-2012.

INTERVIEW DATA

The interview data used in this article were collected during two phases.

**A first phase** of 8 interviews was conducted by the author between 2007 and 2008 in the framework of a previous project on social protection and social partnership in Austria and Switzerland. In this wave, interviews were conducted with social partners, government officials and MPs from social-democratic parties involved in decision-making processes about pensions between the mid-1990s until 2008. The primary focus of the interviews was not the role of the populist radical right in welfare reforms but decision-making about welfare state reforms in general. The role of PRWPs was mentioned repeatedly by interview partners, and as such, material from this wave was used to inform this article (this was the main inspiration for writing this article in the first place). In this appendix, only the relevant questions from this first wave are mentioned.

**A second phase** of 5 interviews was conducted by the author between May 2012 and December 2013 specifically with current or former PRWP MPs in Switzerland and the Netherlands, as well as one former MP from a centre-right party in Switzerland. This was not possible in Austria, as the FPÖ MPs contacted did not respond to requests for interviews. Because the period analysed dates further back in time, the Austrian case draws to a larger extent on the press and secondary literature. In the two countries where interviews were conducted in this second wave, interview partners were current or former MPs from the Swiss People’s Party (in Switzerland) and the Partij voor de Vrijheid (in the Netherlands). Interview partners were chosen due to their involvement in the party parliamentary fraction during the period analysed. In Switzerland, interviewee CH14 was involved in the 2002 revision of pensions, and CH15 in the 2010 revision. In the Netherlands, both interview partners were no longer part of the PVV member fraction, but had been closely involved in the party leadership before and during the 2010-2012 period. As noted by De Lange and Art (2011), access to current PVV MPs is very difficult, as they tend not to respond to requests from researchers.

Interviews in Austria were conducted in German; in Switzerland, they were conducted in French or German; in the Netherlands, questions were asked in English or Dutch and respondents answered in Dutch (they are translated into English below). Below, I indicate whether interviews were recorded, and whether they were completely or only partially transcribed

*Interviews First phase*

1. MP Council of States (former National Council) (MP between 1991-2007), Social Democratic Party, 01 March 2007, Geneva (recorded, fully transcribed)
* Do you think it is more difficult to find compromises between left and right-wing parties in the domain of welfare, and if so, why? Are there differences between domains?
1. President of the Swiss Trade Union Federation and Social Democratic MP (now Council of States) (MP since 1986) , 20 March 2007, Bern (recorded, fully transcribed)
* Do you think it is more difficult to find compromises between left and right-wing parties in the domain of welfare, and if so, why? Are there differences between domains?
1. Central Secretary, Swiss Trade Union Federation (1993-2007), 03 April 2007, Bern (recorded, fully transcribed)
* Was it a risky strategy to leave some points open in the negotiations with employers, in the light of the power relationships which prevail in Parliament? Are there differences between policy domains?
* Has it become more difficult for agreements struck in the pre-parliamentary phase to be translated into laws?
1. Social Democratic MP (1997-2013), 19 June 2007, Bern.
* Do you think it is more difficult to find compromises between left and right-wing parties in the domain of welfare, and if so, why? Are there differences between domains?
1. Social Democratic MP (1991-2011) and Former Vice President of Social Democratic Party, 06 May 2008, Bern.
* Do you think it is more difficult to find compromises between left and right-wing parties in the domain of welfare, and if so, why ? Are there differences between domains ?
1. Section Chief, Labour Force Division, Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich, 23 September 2008, Vienna.
* Under which circumstances would you say it is difficult for agreements struck between social partners to be translated into laws?
1. Section Leader, Labour Market Division, Chamber of Labour, 02 October 2008, Vienna.
* Under which circumstances would you say it is difficult for agreements struck between social partners to be translated into laws?
1. Social Policy Experts, Green Party, 03 October 2008, Vienna.
* Under which circumstances would you say it is difficult for agreements struck between social partners to be translated into laws?

*Interviews Second phase*

1. Former FDP MP (1995-2007), 1 May 2012, phone interview (recorded, partially transcribed).
* During the 1990s, there were a number of compromises in the areas of social policy, including the 10th AHV revision (1995), the second revision of the unemployment insurance (1995). In the 2000s, this kind of compromise is more difficult to come about: the 11th AHV revision failed, and recent revisions of the unemployment insurance or disability are often made without a left. It seems we had a more polarized environment. Would you agree with this evaluation?
* Within the FDP, has there been a change of position, a rightist movement?
* Has the rise of the SVP been explicitly mentioned during this rightward movement within the PRD that you just mentioned?
* Has the SVP played an active role in these reforms?
* In contrast to those cases where the right has tried to force decision without the left, are there still cases where the right and the left could still agree? Parliament still managed to establish a maternity insurance, or harmonize family allowances. How do you explain that?
* The CVP has also lost a lot of seats to the UDC. Did you also see a rightward shift within this party?
* Within the left, have you observed a more combative posture in the face of this hardening by the right.
* In the light of the fact that many reforms passed in the 2000s have failed in referendums, have you observed a learning process?
* The 11th AHV revision failed in 2003. How do you explain this failure?
* The center parties, including the PRD , lost a significant number of seats to the SVP in the 1990s. How has this weakening had an impact on the ability to reform the welfare state?
1. Former SVP MP (1999-2007), 23 May 2012, phone interview (recorded, partially transcribed).
* How important have social insurance schemes in the political agenda of the SVP been during your period in Parliament? Was it a major or minor issue compared to, for example, the issue of immigration? Was this an area that the party emphasised in election campaigns?
* How would you describe the policy of the UDC in the field of social insurance? What were the main policy guidelines? Were there disagreements, different tendencies within the party ?
* How would you describe cooperative relations between the UDC and other bourgeois parties in the field of social insurance schemes? Are there areas where cooperation was easier than in others (e.g disability, pensions, maternity insurance)?
* Since about the 1999 elections, the FDP has lost a fair number of seats to the UDC. Did you feel that the FDP was getting closer to your party, perhaps in an attempt to recover lost votes? Could you observe this in the field of social insurances also (that is to say, through harder positions on fiscal consolidation, for example)?
* In the same vein, have you felt that the party was better able to pass its proposals at the end of your term than at the beginning, because of its larger parliamentary strength?
* Several reforms supported by the SVP (11th revision of state pensions in 2003, the reform of the conversion rate of the second pillar in 2010) in parliament were rejected by popular vote, and in particular by the basis of the UDC itself. How do you explain this phenomenon? Is there according to you a difference of opinion between the base and the party in the area of ​​social insurance?
1. SVP MP (Since 2003), 21 May 2012, phone interview (not recorded, notes taken).
* How important have social insurance schemes been in the political agenda of the SVP during your period in Parliament? Was it a major or minor issue compared to, for example, the issue of immigration? Was this an area that the party emphasised in election campaigns?
* How would you describe the policy of the UDC in the field of social insurance? What were the main policy guidelines? Were there disagreements, different tendencies within the party ?
* How would you describe cooperative relations between the UDC and other bourgeois parties in the field of social insurance schemes? Are there areas where cooperation was easier than in others (e.g disability, pensions, maternity insurance)?
* Since about the 1999 elections, the FDP has lost a fair number of seats to the UDC . Did you feel that the FDP was getting closer to your party, perhaps in an attempt to recover lost votes? Could you observe this in the field of social insurances also (that is to say, through harder positions on fiscal consolidation, for example)?
* In the same vein, have you felt that the party was better able to pass its proposals at the end of your term than at the beginning, because of its larger parliamentary strength?
* Several reforms supported by the SVP (11th revision of state pensions in 2003, the reform of the conversion rate of the second pillar in 2010) in parliament were rejected by popular vote, and in particular by the basis of the UDC itself. How do you explain this phenomenon? Is there according to you a difference of opinion between the base and the party in the area of ​​social insurance?
1. Former PVV MP (2010-2012), The Hague, 16.12.2013 (recorded, partly transcribed).
* Could you explain what your role in the PVV was, how you got involved in it?
* Would you say that social security was an important issue in the agenda of the party in the beginning? Was it something that the party would consider one of its important points?
* To what extent do you think this issue was important for PVV voters?
* Was there a consensus within the party on this issue, or were there different perspectives, different factions?
* On the day after the election of June 2010, Geert Wilders said that the AOW at 65 was no longer a “breekpunt”. Could you give some context to this change of strategy?
* Were you involved in the coalition negotiations that followed? If so, could you explain what kind of concessions were made? Did the PVV seek to temper the drive of the VVD and CDA to cut social spending?
* When it decided to support a minority government, did the party leadership fear an electoral backlash? I mean, given that the VVD and the CDA were determined to implement substantial cuts in social security while the PVV had promised to keep social protection as it was, weren’t you afraid of being blamed for it?
* Parties that are often compared to the PVV, such as the FPÖ in Austria, or even the Lijst Pim Fortuyn in 2002, did not do very well while in office. They faced massive electoral losses. Did you consider these experiences, to try to learn lessons?
* While the PVV was supporting the VVD-CDA coalition, the PVV refused to support an increase in the age of retirement.
* What would you say was the most important reason why the PVV withdrew its support for the government in 2012?
1. Former PVV MP (2010-2013, formerly MEP), The Hague, 16.12.2013 (not recorded, notes taken).
* Would you say that social security was an important issue in the agenda of the party in the beginning? Was it something that the party would consider one of its important points?
* To what extent do you think this issue was important for PVV voters?
* Was there a consensus within the party on this issue, or were there different perspectives, different factions?
* Were you involved in the coalition negotiations that followed? If so, could you explain what kind of concessions were made? Did the PVV seek to temper the drive of the VVD and CDA to cut social spending?
* When it decided to support a minority government, did the party leadership fear an electoral backlash? I mean, given that the VVD and the CDA were determined to implement substantial cuts in social security while the PVV had promised to keep social protection as it was, weren’t you afraid of being blamed for it?
* What would you say was the most important reason why the PVV withdrew its support for the government in 2012?