# Online Appendix

## How the refugee crisis and radical right parties shape party competition on immigration

Theresa Gessler[*]& Sophia Hunger[†]

**Abstract**

While the structure of party competition evolves slowly, crisis-like events can induce short-term change to the political agenda. This may be facilitated by challenger parties who might benefit from increased attention to issues they own. We study the dynamic of such shifts through mainstream parties' response to the 2015 refugee crisis, which strongly affected public debate and election outcomes across Europe. Specifically, we analyse how parties changed their issue emphasis and positions regarding immigration before, during, and after the refugee crisis. Our study is based on a corpus of 120,000 press releases between 2013 and 2017 from Austria, Germany, and Switzerland. We identify immigration-related press releases using a novel dictionary and estimate party positions. The resulting monthly salience and positions measures allow for studying changes in close time-intervals, providing crucial detail for disentangling the impact of the crisis itself and the contribution of right-wing parties. While we provide evidence that attention to immigration increased drastically for all parties during the crisis, radical right parties drove the attention of mainstream parties. However, the attention of mainstream parties to immigration decreased towards the end of the refugee crisis and there is limited evidence of parties accommodating the positions of the radical right.

[*]University of Zurich, Department of Political Science, gessler@ipz.uzh.ch
[†]WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Center for Civil Society Research, sophia.hunger@wzb.eu

# Dictionaries

Note: * represents a wild-card that may include no or several letters. ? is a wildcard that includes exactly one letters.

## Pauwels (2011)

marokk*, türk*, allocht*, asyl*, halal*, kopftuch*, illega*, immigr*, islam*, koran, muslim*, ausländ*,

## Ruedin and Morales (2017)

*toleran*, migrant*, minarett, minderheit*, moschee, islam*, heimatland, jihad*, multikultur*, muslim*, nation*, missbrauch, *heimisch*, assimil*, einbürger*, asylum*, grenze, *genehmigung, burka, rasse, christlich, rassi*, bürger*, radikal, kultur*, flüchtl*, brauch*, religiös, deport*, *zusammenführung, diskrimi*, scharia, vielfalt, ethni*, zuflucht, extremis*, synagoge, ausländ*, terroris*, betrug, tradition*, halal, traumatisier*, kopftuch, unauthorisiert, unterkunft, menschlich*, einigkeit, identität, *schleier, illegal*, western, immigr*, xenophob*, einheimisch*, integrat*, interkulturell*, interrassisch, invasion

## small dictionary

immigr*, *migrat*, *migrant*, migrier*, *einwander*, zuwander*, zugewander*, eingewander*, *fl?chtling*, asyl*, gefl?cht*, obergrenz*, drittstaat*, sans-papiers, integrationspolit*, integrationsgesetz*, integrationspotenzial*, staatsb?rgerschaft*, *einb?rger*,ausschaff*, ausl?nder*, inl?nder*, ?berfremd*

# Classifier Accuracy for Austria, Germany and Switzerland

For all dictionaries we present two different results: One including all press releases with a single dictionary match, the other with a minimum threshold of two matches. This should theoreticlaly help in excluding press releases that merely mention migration or migrants in passing without excluding too many short but relevant articles.

For creating the classifier, we need to use a part of our data set as training data. Thus, the classifier is only evaluated on a smaller number of press releases. We evaluate the dictionaries against the full hand-coded sample to get a more precise evaluation, however, results also hold on the smaller test set used to evaluate the SVM classifier.

We evaluate the following identification strategies:

- GH: dictionary developed in this paper, with threshold (T) and without
- RP: dictionary developed by Rooduijn and Pauwels (2011), with threshold (T) and without
- RM: dictionary developed by Ruedin and Morales (2017), with threshold (T) and without
- SVM: Support Vector Machine

Table 1: Classification Accuracy Germany

|  | GH-T | GH | RP-T | RP | RM-T | RM | SVM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sensitivity | 0.75 | 0.9 | 0.52 | 0.68 | 0.82 | 0.90 | 0.75 |
| Specificity | 0.98 | 0.9 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.66 | 0.41 | 0.96 |
| Overall Accuracy | 0.95 | 0.9 | 0.87 | 0.82 | 0.69 | 0.48 | 0.93 |
| Balanced Accuracy | 0.86 | 0.9 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.74 | 0.66 | 0.86 |

Table 2: Classification Accuracy Austria

|  | GH-T | GH | RP-T | RP | RM-T | RM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sensitivity | 0.79 | 0.88 | 0.58 | 0.75 | 0.88 | 0.96 |
| Specificity | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.89 | 0.63 | 0.41 |
| Overall Accuracy | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.64 | 0.44 |
| Balanced Accuracy | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.75 | 0.69 |

Table 3: Classification Accuracy Switzerland

|  | GH-T | GH | RP-T | RP | RM-T | RM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sensitivity | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 0.93 | 1.00 |
| Specificity | 0.96 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.82 | 0.35 | 0.11 |
| Overall Accuracy | 0.96 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.41 | 0.20 |
| Balanced Accuracy | 0.92 | 0.89 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.64 | 0.56 |

# Arellano Bond Tests

Table 4: Arellano-Bond tests for autoregressive lags

| Salience | | | Position | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Order | z | Prob > z | Order | z | Prob > z |
| 1 | -3.3199 | 0.0009 | 1 | -3.4171 | 0.0006 |
| 2 | -1.0164 | 0.3094 | 2 | -1.2251 | 0.2269 |

# Robustness checks for regressions

Salience

Position

Table 5: Regression results for mainstream parties' salience of immigration including lag for main IV

| | (1)<br>all | (2)<br>AT | (3)<br>DE | (4)<br>CH | (5)<br>center-right | (6)<br>before | (7)<br>during | (8)<br>after |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RRP's salience of imm. | 0.16*** | 0.32*** | 0.06 | 0.23*** | 0.10* | 0.22** | 0.15*** | 0.12* |
| | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.09) | (0.03) | (0.07) |
| RRP's salience of imm. (lag 1), | 0.02 | -0.10** | -0.02 | 0.12** | -0.02 | 0.11** | 0.05 | 0.11** |
| | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.04) |
| center-right | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | | | | | (0.00) | | | |
| center-right * RRP's salience of imm. | | | | | 0.14** | | | |
| | | | | | (0.06) | | | |
| center-right * RRP's salience of imm. (lag 1) | | | | | 0.10** | | | |
| | | | | | (0.05) | | | |
| asylum applications (N) | 1.03*** | 0.84* | 1.30*** | 1.06 | 1.09*** | 2.89* | -1.08** | -1.23 |
| | (0.32) | (0.45) | (0.41) | (0.90) | (0.32) | (1.56) | (0.54) | (2.31) |
| polls RRP | -0.04 | 0.23 | -0.28*** | 1.37*** | 0.06 | -0.50 | -0.20 | 0.18 |
| | (0.19) | (0.15) | (0.10) | (0.38) | (0.19) | (0.45) | (0.31) | (0.33) |
| public salience | 3.04*** | 3.41*** | 4.08*** | 0.64 | 3.16*** | 7.13 | 3.31*** | 20.60*** |
| | (0.58) | (0.66) | (0.83) | (0.62) | (0.58) | (8.74) | (0.66) | (6.59) |
| salience of immigration (lag 1) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| salience of immigration (lag 2) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Constant | 9.44*** | 0.00 | 12.62*** | -8.53 | 8.08** | 19.25** | 17.19*** | 6.06 |
| | (2.99) | (3.85) | (1.03) | (6.91) | (3.14) | (8.15) | (5.96) | (7.85) |
| Observations | 646 | 209 | 299 | 138 | 646 | 286 | 188 | 172 |
| Number of parties | 14 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 13 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

7

Table 6: Regression results for mainstream parties' salience of immigration by country

|  | (1) AT | (2) DE | (3) CH |
|---|---|---|---|
| RRP's salience of imm. | 0.19*** | -0.01 | 0.15*** |
|  | (0.06) | (0.08) | (0.05) |
| center-right | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| center-right* RRP's salience of imm. | 0.18* | 0.14* | 0.12** |
|  | (0.10) | (0.08) | (0.06) |
| asylum applications (N) | 0.98** | 1.25*** | 0.98 |
|  | (0.48) | (0.44) | (0.87) |
| polls RRP | 0.25 | -0.19 | 1.28*** |
|  | (0.16) | (0.19) | (0.36) |
| public salience | 3.50*** | 4.32*** | 1.08** |
|  | (0.78) | (1.09) | (0.49) |
| salience of immigration (lag 1) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| salience of immigration (lag 2) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Constant | -0.51 | 12.23*** | -0.64 |
|  | (4.25) | (0.85) | (4.30) |
| Observations | 209 | 299 | 138 |
| Number of parties | 4 | 6 | 4 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 7: Regression results for mainstream parties' immigration position including lag for main IV

| | (1) all | (2) AT | (3) DE | (4) CH | (5) center-right | (6) before | (7) during | (8) after |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RRP's position on immigration | 0.00 | 0.14 | -0.08*** | 0.04 | 0.02 | -0.06 | 0.16** | 0.03 |
| | (0.03) | (0.13) | (0.03) | (0.09) | (0.04) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.10) |
| RRP's position on immigration (lag 1), | -0.02 | -0.12 | -0.03 | -0.12 | -0.06 | -0.04 | -0.12 | 0.03 |
| | (0.04) | (0.21) | (0.07) | (0.08) | (0.07) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.09) |
| center-right | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | | | | | (0.00) | | | |
| center-right * RRPs' position | | | | | -0.04 | | | |
| | | | | | (0.06) | | | |
| center-right * RRPs' position (lag 1) | | | | | 0.11 | | | |
| | | | | | (0.07) | | | |
| asylum applications (N) | 0.00 | 0.02** | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.04*** | -0.20 |
| | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.04) | (0.01) | (0.17) |
| polls RRP | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.01 |
| | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.03) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| public salience | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.13 | -0.00 | 0.45 |
| | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.28) | (0.01) | (0.31) |
| position on immigration (lag 1) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| position on immigration (lag 2) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Constant | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.10 | -0.43 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.31*** | 0.36 |
| | (0.08) | (0.29) | (0.11) | (0.43) | (0.08) | (0.23) | (0.10) | (0.33) |
| Observations | 646 | 209 | 299 | 138 | 646 | 286 | 188 | 172 |
| Number of parties | 14 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 13 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

Table 8: Regression results for mainstream parties' immigration position by country

|  | (1) AT | (2) DE | (3) CH |
|---|---|---|---|
| RRP's position on immigration | 0.24** | -0.08* | -0.07 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.04) | (0.12) |
| center-right | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| center-right*RRPS' position | -0.18*** | -0.01 | 0.25* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.06) | (0.13) |
| asylum applications (N) | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.00 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| polls RRP | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.03 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.03) |
| public salience | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) |
| position on immigration (lag 1) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| position on immigration (lag 2) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Constant | 0.33 | 0.10 | -0.38 |
|  | (0.29) | (0.13) | (0.39) |
| Observations | 209 | 299 | 138 |
| Number of parties | 4 | 6 | 4 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

# Party Positions

Table 9: Average and Stability of party positions

| Party | Avg. Position | SD | POLCON I | POLCON II |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | | | | |
| FPÖ | -0.78 | 0.10 | -0.80 | -0.74 |
| Green Party | 0.41 | 0.25 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| NEOS | 0.42 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| OVP | -0.06 | 0.20 | -0.33 | -0.81 |
| SPÖ | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.43 | 0.00 |
| **Germany** | | | | |
| AfD | -0.95 | 0.33 | -0.33 | -1.00 |
| CDU | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.44 | -0.12 |
| CSU | -0.25 | 0.39 | NA | NA |
| FDP | -0.24 | 0.22 | 1.00 | -0.56 |
| Green Party | 0.48 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Left Party | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| SPD | 0.22 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.59 |
| **Switzerland** | | | | |
| CVP | -0.02 | 0.20 | 0.00 | -0.07 |
| FDP | 0.02 | 0.25 | -0.20 | 0.00 |
| Green Party | 0.10 | 0.34 | 1.00 | 0.05 |
| SPS | 0.25 | 0.34 | 0.86 | 0.85 |
| SVP | -0.49 | 0.24 | -1.00 | -0.77 |

# References

Pauwels, Teun. 2011. "Measuring Populism: A Quantitative Text Analysis of Party Literature in Belgium." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 21 (1): 97–119.

Rooduijn, Matthijs, and Teun Pauwels. 2011. "Measuring Populism: Comparing Two Methods of Content Analysis." *West European Politics* 34 (6): 1272–83.

Ruedin, Didier, and Laura Morales. 2017. "Estimating Party Positions on Immigration: Assessing the Reliability and Validity of Different Methods." *Party Politics*, 1–12.