

Anna Silander
School of Politics and International Relations
University of Nottingham
Student ID: 4265715

The Un-Taming of the Discourse: Radical right-wing populist parties and the effect of different institutional roles

Thesis submitted June 2022, Viva Voce 20th October 2022 with examiners Prof Daphne Halikiopoulou and Dr Simon Toubeau.

To begin with, I would like to thank both examiners for their helpful suggestions and comments that have improved and strengthened the thesis. These were especially valuable since I aim to edit the thesis into a book format.

Below, I have copied the examiners' comments, and underneath them, I have summarised how I have addressed them. To make this easier to follow, I have labelled the expected amendments with (a.) through to (f.), depending on the changes suggested, and linked them to the effected ones with the same alphabets. Since most of the proposed amendments have more than one edit corresponding to them, it is only the first one I have marked. This is to show that I have addressed the examiners' comments and to keep the changes easier to follow by not labelling them all. Hence, the page numbers included below are not exhaustive, merely directing to examples.

I hope this makes the reviewing process more straightforward.

Expected and effected amendments

Chapter 1.

Expected amendment:

The literature review should be re-drafted to focus on the outcome investigated in this thesis, i.e. the moderation (or not) of 'discourse' of radical right wing parties. As the external examiner writes:

- "While this is a good overview, it is rather generic. I'm not sure why the literature review focuses so extensively on a DV that is different to the DV the thesis is trying to explain. I think it would be more important to review literature that attempts to answer the thesis' research questions and identify a gap in the literature. As such, my recommendation is to (a.) streamline the theory on success/ support for RRWPs and (b.) focus specifically on theories about RWPP moderation"

Effected amendment:

- I thank the examiner for this comment and have re-drafted the chapter to (a.) exclude mentions of success/support to accommodate the deletion of the original section 1.4. In contrast, (b.) the new section 1.4 now discusses RRWP parties' moderation and radicalisation, which begins by analysing the so-called right-turn on the European political scene, which includes mainstream and RRWP parties. It is noted in the chapter that
 - there has been a turn to the right in the European party system, labelled "verrechtsing" by Mudde (2013). Some argue this is to accommodate the RRWP parties' policy base and thus maximising the mainstream parties' vote share (Bale 2003; Moffitt 2022; Wagner and Meyer 2017; Van Spanje 2010). Whereas others (Williams 2006; Mudde 2013) denote how the turn has not been motivated by RRWP parties and has also taken place in those countries with no notable RRWP parties present (p. 55).
- It then focuses on what is already known about the party family's moderation and radicalisation with examples from parties and literature. The discussion in section 1.4 highlights how
 - measuring and detecting moderation and radicalisation is problematic because it depends on the focus and what is being measured. There are different aspects of party behaviour that may or may not impact moderation and radicalisation, whether it is policy outcomes, goals, strategies, RRWP agenda, election manifestos or discourse. One example of the complexity is how Pappas and Kriesi (2015: 321) note that SVP has moderated its populism, whereas Akkerman (2016: 276) and Akkerman and De Lange (2012: 595) argue the party has retained its radical profile and not mainstreamed. Thus what one is examining and with which parameters will influence the results (p. 62).
- The discussion now not only sets the scene better for the thesis but also highlights the gap in the literature that it aims to fill. Although there is literature on RRWP parties in governmental roles and more in opposition roles, little has been written about the

supporting role. Furthermore, most of the research has been on the parties' impact on policies considered as "theirs", such as immigration and law and order, intra-party relationships and the electoral consequences of incumbency. But less has been focused on the discourse framing the RRWP agenda, whether the parties' institutional roles have varying impacts on it, and how those might differ between the roles.

- With the amendments, Chapter One offers a solid overview of what the thesis is examining and, especially with the addition of section 1.4, further exposes the difficulties that studying moderation and radicalisation entails and how they are connected to what is being studied and how better highlighting the thesis's contribution and its place within the literature.
- The section that now discusses moderation creates an effective link to Chapter Two's hypotheses building. Although this new section does mention examples of RRWP parties moderating on specific institutional roles, it still differs from the more detailed discussion in the following chapter.
- There are a few changes in section 1.5 on Central and Eastern Europe's RRWP parties to accommodate the deletion of the success/support section, thus portraying a more complete and fitting literature review chapter.
- These variations also further justify this thesis's scope and how moderation's complexities are influenced by the parameters employed in the research and their focus. Discussing these in the new section portrays a more saturated picture of the current state of the field and aids in understanding the hypotheses and their construction in Chapter Two. Thus enhancing the quality of the thesis, as a whole, and the literature review in particular without altering the premises of the initial outlook, research questions or their formation.

Chapter 2.

Expected amendment:

The theoretical framework should be re-drafted to focus better on the main driver of interest -institutional roles- followed by moderators -leadership and issue-ownership. The discussion about electoral incentives to move in a multi-dimensional is relevant, but since it is not examined empirically in the quantitative or qualitative analyses, then (a.) it could be discarded. As the internal examiner writes in his independent report:

- "The development of the theoretical framework in Chapter 2 could be re-drafted to (b.) offer a clearer primary focus on the effect of institutional roles, (c.) which is then followed by the effect of different moderators. Re-formulating such a

framework would also require clarifying certain questions: (d.) How many institutional roles are there? (e.) What is the exact direction of the effect of moderating factors including leadership and issue-ownership? It appeared theoretically and empirically that the effect of both vectors was in the same direction as institutional roles (i.e. lack of moderation), so (f.) how are their effects likely to be dis-entangled?"

Effectuated amendment:

- Thank you for the examiners' second comment that strengthened and streamlined the thesis. (a.) The electoral incentives originally in sections 2.2 and 2.3 have been deleted, with only two paragraphs mentioning them in the new 2.2 section, on pages 77 – 78.
- (b.) The three original sections on drivers, 2.5.1 Opposition, 2.5.2 Governmental and 2.5.3 Support, are now on sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.3, in the same order. They are extended and more in-depth and (c.) are now discussed before the two moderators, leadership and issue ownership. By doing this, the chapter has a more fluent structure and formation of the hypotheses.
- Deleting the discussion on electoral incentives focused the chapter on better developing the theories tested in the thesis and allowed the chapter to concentrate on the main drivers. At the beginning of the section on opposition parties, 2.3.1, there is an essential argument on the role of opposition in representative democracies, which introduced the extended discussion on the institutional roles fittingly. However, as mentioned in the thesis, the opposition parties have been the ones with the most academic literature; hence the section was already relatively detailed and comprehensive. Thus there were fewer amendments needed than in the two other roles.
- The section on government parties now also discusses junior and senior members and has more examples of RRWP parties in government.
- The extended sections also continued to highlight the gap in the literature, not only limited to the support role. Although, the section on them is still largely dependent on other party families. One of the new inclusions in the section is a discussion of an article by Crowley and Moore (2020), who very intriguingly ask whether the support role is a stepping stone, halfway house or road to nowhere when comparing the Green parties supporting minority governments in Sweden, New Zealand and Australia, enlightening the hypothesis further.
- Consequently, the amended discussions now provide a deeper understanding of RRWP parties in different institutional roles and further show evidence of the

expected hypotheses and the gap in the literature that this thesis is contributing to.

- The question of how many institutional roles there are (d.) is addressed at the beginning of section 2.3, page 80. It states how the section on drivers discusses the three institutional roles with empirical case study chapters dedicated to them: the opposition, government and supportive role. The fourth institutional role, extra-parliamentary so parties with no parliamentary seats, is only briefly discussed in the quantitative chapter and thus not addressed here.
- There were mentions of this in the original thesis (for instance, on pages 156 - 157), but there is now also a new statement on them on page 14, which aids the reader in constructing a better view of what the thesis is examining from the beginning.
- The direction of issue ownership (e.), vital to the central question and not analysed enough in the original thesis, is now discussed in section 2.4.1. and how it directs the RRWP parties' policy "portfolios" and can be argued to neither moderate nor radicalise the discourse but keep the attention on similar levels whilst trying to engage and debate mainstream parties on the issues they own. 'However, if a particular topic is dropped from the agenda, the emphasis decreases, which could be considered moderation. Whereas if a matter is deemed more critical than previously, it can be viewed as a radicalisation' (102).
- Dis-entangling (f.) issue ownership from the drivers is addressed at the end of the section on page 102, acknowledging the related challenges visible in the quote above. Both amendments aid in understanding how RRWP parties construct their discourse and how explanations are intertwined. How RRWP parties manage issue ownership and decide what topics to pursue or when to let go of others are questions worth more scholarly attention than what can be offered here with limited words. Hopefully, these are questions I could return to in the future.
- (e.) The direction of leadership and (f.) dis-entangling it from the drivers is discussed in section 2.4.2. The final paragraph in this section summarises both as follows,

[d]etermining whether the leadership-effect moderates or radicalises the discourse is dependent on the RRWP party, and indeed the leader. As mentioned, the leader may have personal motives to moderate the discourse in attempt to become more influential actor. Yet they may also decide to radicalise the rhetoric if they deem that as the best solution to gain more supporters. Either way, it may impact the party discourse, which again can influence election results. However, to dis-entangle the impact of

the leadership from that of institutional roles should be relatively straightforward since the changes in the leadership are recorded and thus can be monitored separately from the changes in the institutional roles. If both changes happen simultaneously, comparing the old and new leaders' policy preferences and discourse should enlighten the argument further' (p. 107 – 108).

- The amended discussion on leadership justifies the employment of case studies since to dis-entangle it from the institutional role benefits from the detailed, in-depth analysis that case studies provide, as shown in the quote above.
- Amending these two sections on moderators according to the examiners' comments highlighted the deficit in the original chapter and now offers a more explicit basis for the analyses in the case study chapters. They also further justify using case studies and highlight questions for future research.

Chapter 3.

Expected amendment:

In addition, the methodological section of the thesis should also be re-drafted so that (a.) it renounces the notion that process-tracing technique enables the author to advance causal claims about the effect of institutional roles. There are two main justifications for this: the first is that process-tracing is not carried out in the qualitative case-studies in a way that enables a clear causal identification of institutional roles with a 'comparative statics' approach. And even if that were the case, it is not clear that process-tracing enables the investigator to adjudicate between the causal influence of different independent variables. As the external examiner writes:

- "But how can process tracing help establish whether it is the institutional role or something else that caused the discourse? If the aim is to find out what factor, other than the institutional role, has *caused* the moderation, then maybe a more appropriate strategy would be to compare pairs of cases for each institutional role, with a variation in the DV."
- "but the discussion should be (b.) steered towards the choice of research design, and (c.) perhaps a more convincing justification of why PT addresses the RQ better than a comparison"

Effectuated amendment:

- I thank the examiners for this comment and have re-drafted section 3.1.2 to (a., b.) better acknowledge how process tracing is incorporated into my analysis. I accept that my justification for the methods employed was not thorough previously, nor did they address the benefits and weaknesses of process tracing and why it is the appropriate method to examine this thesis's research questions. I hope that the re-drafted section better recognises the limitations of my approach and underscores the conclusions that I still believe can be drawn from them.
- I address the issues relating to both causality and external validity, for instance, in the Chapter's introduction, where on page 111, I now write how

The three case studies represent three illustrative “episodes” of RRWP parties in different institutional roles that will provide an in-depth analysis into the parties’ discourse. Although the empirical contribution of the case studies that analyse a broad range of party material is strong, the causality remains limited. Furthermore, [s]ince the case study chapters employ the method of process tracing, which has a low degree of external validity, the finishing Chapter Eight, which compares the three, aims to provide further inferences.
- Although there are weaknesses related to case studies, I still argue that the benefits from them outweighs the weaknesses. This is especially so in this thesis because I wanted to analyse the party material to better understand how the discourse changed and how arguments were justified. As noted in the quote above, the broad range of party material analysed for each chapter offer an empirical contribution and enhances our prior understanding of the three parties.
- As suggested by the examiner (c.), I have added a discussion on the counterfactuals and whether comparing pairs of cases for each institutional role with a variation in the dependent variable would have been better suited for the thesis. However, the discussion on pages 119 – 122 summarises the operational and empirical disadvantages this method would have had if employed and aimed at answering the thesis’ research questions.
- Some of these are: there would have been six cases instead of three, which could have meant shorter periods for parties examined due to time limits, and translation costs for the party material, if preceded by a quantitative study to identify the pairs that differ in the dependent variable, choosing the correct variable from MARPOR would have been challenging, and if, as this thesis shows, the findings are not always reflected from the quantitative to qualitative, the moderation that impacted the MARPOR variable might not take place when analysing party material. This method would have also, most likely, made it impossible to include the support

parties since only two were identified in Chapter Four; hence the research question would have had to be changed.

- Comparing the two methods was beneficial, developing my justification for the chosen one and reinforcing the choice. In my opinion, the detailed, in-depth analysis provided for each of the cases offers more than it excludes. As I argue on page 124, 'case studies, although may lack in causality, make a contribution to our general knowledge, merely by "making a case" and its purpose can 'be manifold: a particular case can confirm, disprove, alter or generate a theory' (Ebbinghaus 2005: 142)'. And more importantly, it makes it possible to include a support party, a role which lacks scholarly attention.
- However, discussing and comparing the two methods ignited an idea of how this research could be succeeded by using this counterfactual method, thus showing how the premises could be extended, further tested and analysed, for which I am grateful to the examiner.

Chapter 8.

Expected amendment:

The comparative chapter should be re-drafted to enable the author to draw inferences from the comparison of the cases. This is particularly important given the comments above concerning the weak potential of process-tracing to yield insights in a single case-study. This is underlined by the external examiner below. In light of this, more should be done in Chapter 8 to effect comparisons that will enable the author to say something about the relative influence of (a.) institutional roles and (b.) mediators.

- "a complementary process-tracing analysis of cases that offers a clear, variable-oriented examination of discourse before and after the event of change in institutional role. At the moment this kind of clear focus is absent from the thick descriptions of the cases, which raises the question the relative effect of the institutional role and the mediators such as leadership or issue-ownership"

Effectuated amendment:

- The comments on Chapter Eight and the amendments that followed have increased the quality of the analysis, not just for this chapter but for the whole thesis, for

which I am grateful to the examiners. The suggestions and revisions made in Chapter Three are now more explicitly followed here, and the linkages between the case study chapters are discussed more in-depth.

- (a.) Where the institutional role did have an impact on the RRWP parties' discourse is now justified more clearly, and although the explanations on the radicalisation or moderation of the discourse varied between the parties on most variables, there were common factors that are now better exposed and analysed.
- For example, in the Conclusion's introduction, on pages 355 - 356, I note how,
[t]he following discussion will show that the governmental and support role radicalised Fidesz's and DF's discourse. With the former, leadership cannot be wholly decoupled from the process, yet it is not as solid and evident as it is with the PS. Analysing the PS's discourse, the inclusion of the nativist fraction, which culminated in a leadership change, resulting in a party split, presents near to two different parties under two different leaders: the first emphasising populism and the second nativism and authoritarianism.
- There is a lengthier summary of the three analyses on pages 386 – 387 and insights throughout the chapter.
- As quoted above and discussed in Chapter Two, (b.) leadership is less challenging to decouple from institutional roles than issue ownership is. Especially with RRWP parties who are known for their topics and defend them eagerly, wanting other parties to debate them on these issues, which is why issue ownership is part of the RRWP identity. As I state on page 102, 'issue-ownership is somewhat entangled with the RRWP parties and thus work in conjunction with the roles they hold', explaining more why the agenda was chosen than whether the emphasis on it radicalises or moderates, as was argued in relation to Chapter Two.
- The challenges of decoupling issue ownership will be a topic I will spend more time studying in the future when editing the thesis into a book format, as I noticed while preparing these amendments that there is no literature covering the topic that I could find.
- To allow more extended discussion on this comparative chapter that now yields insights beyond the single case studies, I deleted a section discussing and comparing the roots of the three parties since this had already taken place at the beginning of each of the chapters. More in-depth discussion focusing on the variables and changes in the discourse seemed more vital to the thesis and addressed the examiners' comments better than comparing the three parties' roots.

- The order in which the variables were discussed remained the same, as did some other analyses in the chapter. However, now that was accompanied by statements and arguments that better reflect the generalisability that comparison of the case studies, using process tracing, offer.
- Also, the difference between generalisability and case specific factors is now better acknowledged in the chapter, as are the benefits of process tracing, highlighting the more ad hoc or surprising explanations behind the party discourse.
- The vital references and linkages to the central hypotheses are also more frequently made than previously; thus, executing the amendments for this chapter underlined the weakness of the original analyses, which have now strengthened the entirety of the thesis and its conclusions.
- Executing the amendments to this chapter did highlight the advantages of summarising the three analyses and if the word limit would have allowed it, I could have written another comparative chapter. Redrafting and spending more time on this last empirical chapter emphasised the parties' similarities and differences, as well as the difficulties related to RRWP parties' moderation and radicalisation. Yes, all three radicalised their discourse on nativism, for instance, but the reasons behind that differed, and furthermore, the attention given to different codes that measured nativism also differed. Not all of the nativist codes showed radicalisation, and again, the reasons behind that were varied, and not all variables showed radicalisation, which underlines the thesis' contribution. Due to the nuances of this particular topic, the thesis is not as much about changing our existing knowledge as it is about enhancing it.

Conclusion (and introduction):

Expected amendment:

Both the internal and external examiner felt the concluding chapter could be strengthened to makes a clearer claim about the contribution that the thesis makes. As the internal examiner writes:

- "As it stands, (a.) the thesis is missing a discussion of how its findings change our priors and how they move the field forward."
- "I think (b.) the contribution could be explained much more clearly in the introduction and Conclusion. This latter section should also mention some limitations- for example the question of (c.) causality and (d.) case selection constraints."

Effected amendment:

- Once the amendments were made to the above chapters, reading through the thesis, it became clearer where further changes were needed to reflect the revisions made and strengthen the basis of the thesis, the analyses and the discussions. The amendments found their positions effortlessly after the suggested feedback by the examiners.
- As I argue in the previous comments, the thesis does perhaps little to change prior knowledge. This is because there is little existing knowledge of the hypotheses tested here, which is specifically examining RRWP parties' discourse, focused on the RRWP agenda, in different institutional roles. There is research on other aspects of RRWP parties' moderation and radicalisation, even in opposition and governmental roles, but there is not on how those roles impact the RRWP discourse.
- The literature discussed in Chapters One and Two are indicative but do not explain how the institutional role may impact RRWP parties' discourse. In the case of the support parties, this is even more obvious. And even though I could argue that the findings may differ from some made previously and thus change the previous knowledge, this could be challenged by specifying that, indeed, the parameters in the studies I was referring to were different to the ones I am employing in this thesis. Hence this thesis does not as much change what is already known as it does enhance the knowledge that has been based on the varying aspects of RRWP parties' behaviour.
- I revised the Abstract slightly to (b.) outline better the contribution, which is now explained also clearer in the Introduction, for example, on page 12, which summarises how 'the thesis contributes to three areas of study, firstly on radical right-wing populism and RRWP parties, secondly on institutional roles and their impact on political parties, and thirdly on the field of discourse'.
- Additional notions explaining the contribution in more detail are also made throughout the Introduction and Conclusion. For example, on the first page of the Conclusion, where I write:

Although there have been studies explaining RRWP parties' behaviour in parliament, both in opposition and governmental roles, they have focused either on the parties' impact on policies considered as "theirs", such as immigration and law and order (Akkerman and De Lange 2012; Heinisch 2003; Minkenberg 2001; Mudde 2013). Or how their presence impacts mainstream parties (Abou-Chadi and Krause 2018; Bale 2008; Rooduijn et al.

2014), intra-party relationships (Albertazzi and McDonnell 2015) and what have been the electoral consequences of incumbency.

Yet, not much has been written about the discourse framing the RRWP agenda and whether the parties' institutional roles have varying impacts on it (Bobba and McDonnell 2016). Furthermore, since these parties began to participate in national parliaments more commonly in the 2000s, there still is not a vast amount of data nor analysis on how that participation may affect their messaging. This is the void that this thesis aimed to elaborate on and thus enlighten the field's current state (p. 391).

- Furthermore, in the Conclusion, I specify the contribution of the different chapters and similar changes were also made throughout the thesis in other chapters where they suited and fitted the text. These include for instance, contribution to policy and practice design, chapters that would be fitting for students, Chapter Four's contribution to future research and the summary of the European RRWP parties it offers, the empirical contribution of the case studies and how they can be employed in future studies and the further findings from the last empirical chapter.
- Overall, this thesis contributes to the study of RRWP parties and the impact institutional roles have on their discourse but many more details can be identified and compared to or argued against. There is also a considerable amount of new data on the three roles that will be moving the field forward.
- Since the amendments throughout the thesis discuss the weaknesses of process tracing, they also address the strengths of in-depth case studies, one of them being the enhanced knowledge of the three parties that do not as much change the previous knowledge we had but add to it.
- Similarly, in relation to support parties, little literature is available on RRWP parties in this role and how it may impact their RRWP discourse is a gap to be filled more than challenging or changing the existing knowledge on the topic. Hence that part of the thesis has a significant contribution to the field.
- Regarding the two other roles, the literature discussed in Chapters One and Two examines different aspects of the RRWP parties' behaviour. As has been argued, defining moderation and radicalisation is not straightforward and can differ considerably depending on what part of the RRWP behaviour is scrutinised. Hence, the thesis contributes to enhancing our understanding and knowledge.
- The Introduction and Conclusion have also been edited to better address (c.) causality and (d.) case selection limitations. Especially the former is now mentioned throughout the thesis, which shows that it was not addressed sufficiently enough in the original work, with more examples in the next section. The statements on causality are linked to process tracing, for instance, in the Introduction on page 8.

- The Conclusion, on pages 394 - 395, compares the limitations of the case studies, causality included, to the benefits of a detailed, in-depth analysis, which has been addressed in the above comments.
- The specific limitations that could be argued Fidesz has, as was raised in the Viva Voce, are addressed explicitly in the Conclusion, on page 399, and further in Chapter Six, as mentioned below.
- Executing the amendments above clarified the contribution of different aspects that the thesis provides, which benefits the edition of the thesis into a book, for which I am thankful to the examiners.

Throughout thesis:

Expected amendment:

related to this, (a.) broader claims about external validity made throughout the thesis should be tamed to acknowledge the limitations on the generalizability of the dissertation's findings.

The external examiner writes:

- "On p.9 the author suggests that 'although this research is conducted on European RRWP parties, the findings could be transferable everywhere, even more so when considering the variety of democracies in Europe, their age differences and varying political systems'. However, throughout the thesis I didn't find a convincing discussion of external validity."

Effectuated amendment:

- Similarly to the comments above, once the amendments on other chapters were executed, reading the thesis from the beginning, the modifications for the rest of the study seemed straightforward to fit into the text to acknowledge what the examiners wished for me to achieve and how the suggestions have strengthened this work. I understood what had been lacking in the original thesis and how the wording of some findings had perhaps exaggerated what can be concluded with process tracing, and how tying the different methods together and discussing them connected now deliver higher quality research.
- What also benefitted from this process is how the weaknesses were addressed and how they highlighted the benefits that I now discuss more. For instance, the case studies that analyse a large amount of data provide three "episodes" of RRWP parties

in different institutional roles. As such, the case studies have value, enhancing the existing understanding of the three parties.

- The above quotation in the comment has been amended, reflecting better the external validity of the thesis, and now states:

[a]lthough this research is conducted on European RRWP parties, the findings could be transferable in other countries with prominent RRWP parties that share the characteristics identified with RRWP parties in this thesis, even more so when considering the variety of democracies in Europe, their age differences and varying political systems (p. 10).

- (a.) Acknowledgements of the limitations on causality were added to the thesis. The following quote is from page 8, but other mentions can be found, for instance, on pages 26, 112, 154 - 155, 394 - 395.

After the case studies, the thesis compares the three in-depth chapters to add validity and generalisability, which are the weaknesses of process tracing and will also be strengthened by the initial quantitative results. Thus the triangulation occurs at three levels, which all donate to the conclusions and understanding of RRWP parties' discourse in different institutional roles.

- How the case studies were "episodes" of RRWP parties in different institutional roles more than generalisable studies is reflected throughout the thesis, as shown in the remarks in Chapter Three, for instance.

Additional amendments in chapters not specified by the examiners

I also made additional amendments to chapters Four to Seven to better reflect the changes made elsewhere in the thesis. These comments were added to the introductions and conclusions of each of the four chapters highlighting the suggested amendments made elsewhere in the thesis.

- In Chapter Four, there is now a paragraph explaining the importance of the quantitative chapter to precede the case studies, which employ process tracing. By doing this, I recognise the importance of the chapter and once again highlight the weakness of process tracing in relation to causality and generalisability. By doing this, I address the examiners' point regarding Chapter Three and Introduction and Conclusion.
- In the Conclusion of Chapter Four, I have stated one of the contributions that the chapter delivers for future research and how when more data becomes available on MARPOR, the analysis could be extended and compared to see how the RRWP

parties may have changed with time. This would add to the field's understanding of the evolution of these parties, addressing the examiners' comments on Introduction and Conclusion.

- On Chapter Five's introduction, I have added a clarification of how the chapter illustrates the discourse of one specific RRWP party and thus, for generalisability, it is Chapter Eight that is relevant. By doing this, I better reflect the expected amendments put forward by the examiners that were expressed in the last comments.
- In the Chapter Five conclusion, three additional mentions are related to the examiners' comments. Firstly, I link the leadership change to Chapter Two's discussion on moderators. Secondly, I address the benefits of process tracing and how it allows the researcher to focus on the so-called "surprising" elements of in-depth analysis. The third statement underlines the same issue raised in the chapter's introduction: this is merely the story of one RRWP party and does not allow reflecting the findings on other parties.
- In Chapter Six, the amendments address the possible limitations of having Fidesz as a case study. On page 260, I justify the inclusion of a party with a supermajority as an illustration of a governmental party, whereas on page 261, I point out how the *PopuList* defines Fidesz, at the time of the writing, as an RRWP party instead of something else, for instance, an authoritarian party.
- Further justification on Fidesz, based on the two amendments above, is added to the chapter's Conclusion. By doing this, I further address the case selection limitations raised in relation to suggested comments on the Introduction and Conclusion.
- Lastly, in Chapter Seven, to better accommodate the changes made elsewhere in the thesis, I thought it would be appropriate to add a comment reflecting the role of the in-depth case study in the introduction, which will be strengthened in Chapter Eight in the aim to add external validity to the findings. This addresses the comment on the last point, marked "Throughout thesis".
- In the conclusion, I mention the chapter's contribution to future research, which further acknowledges the gap in the literature on support parties.
- I also finish the chapter with a look ahead to the following one and how the last empirical chapter should tie the research together, noting the limitations of process tracing.