

Neo-Authoritarianisms in Europe and the Liberal Democratic Response



Codebook for Integrated Dataset

July 2025
Version 1

Citation: Enyedi, Zolt, Dean Schafer, Bálint Mikola, Giuliano Formisano, Radosław Markowski, Jan Rovny, Stephen Whitefield, Piotr Zagorski, Marta Zerkowska-Balas, Seraphine Maerz, Carsten Schneider, Franziska Wagner, Mehmet Yavuz. 2025. “AUTHLIB Integrated Dataset” Neo-Authoritarianisms in Europe and the Liberal Democratic Response (AUTHLIB) Project.

This codebook describes the variables in the AUTHLIB Integrated Dataset. The dataset provides indicators mapping the variety of ideological challenges to liberal democracy across seven European countries (Austria, Czechia, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and the United Kingdom). Version 1.0 of the dataset covers 74 parties using 18 indicators (ranging from core authoritarian attitudes to religious fundamentalism, and nationalism). Measures draw on multiple methodological approaches and data sources: an original survey, latent variable analysis, and text analysis of political communication (speeches, social media). The codebook contains information about the composition of each of the variables, the scales used for their measurement, the data used, the time period covered, and the expert teams that created them. Contributors to this version of the dataset include teams from Central European University, the University of Oxford, and SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities. The AUTHLIB indicators can be explored in the [AUTHLIB Interactive Dashboard](#).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Party Names and Abbreviations.....	3
2	Leader Level	6
2.1	Illiberal Speech Index.....	6
2.1.1	Power Dispersion-Concentration (isi_dc)	6
2.1.2	Inclusion-Exclusion (isi_ie)	6
3	Party Level.....	7
3.1	Social Illiberalism (soc_lib).....	7
3.2	Gender Discrimination (authlib_gender).....	8
3.3	Anti-Immigration (authlib_immig).....	8
4	Public Opinion	9
4.1	Authlib Core Indices.....	9
4.1.1	Authoritarianism Core Index (auth_core)	9
4.1.2	Illiberalism Core Index (illib_core).....	9
4.1.3	Populism Core Index (populism)	9
4.2	Authlib Composite Indices	10
4.2.1	Comprehensive Illiberalism Index (illib9)	10
4.2.2	Majoritarian Populism Index (popul6evil).....	10
4.2.3	Traditionalism (tradi3new).....	11
4.2.4	Nationalism Extended Index (nationalism5).....	11
4.2.5	Closed Society Index – Short (closedsoc3).....	11
4.2.6	Authoritarianism Index (author2).....	12
4.2.7	Xenophobia Index (xenoph9).....	12
4.2.8	Power Concentration Index (powerconc3).....	12
4.2.9	Religious Fundamentalism Index (religcons2).....	13
4.2.10	Partisan State Index (partisstate3).....	13

1 PARTY NAMES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Country	Party name	Party name abbreviation used in AUTHLIB	CHES ID	PartyFacts ID
Austria	Alliance for the Future of Austria	BZO	1307	599
Austria	Freedom Party of Austria	FPO	1303	463
Austria	The Austrian Green Party	Grüne	1304	1659
Austria	JETZT – Liste Pilz	PILZ	N/A	6137
Austria	Communist Party of Austria	KPO	N/A	996
Austria	Liberal Forum	LIF	1306	605
Austria	Liberal Forum - The New Austria and Liberal Forum	NEOS	1306	1970
Austria	Austrian People's Party	OVP	1302	1329
Austria	Social Democratic Party of Austria	SPO	1301	1384
Austria	Team Stronach for Austria	STRONACH	1310	1971
Czechia	Action of Dissatisfied Citizens	ANO	2111	2141
Czechia	Czech Social Democratic Party	CSSD	2101	5236
Czechia	Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia	KSCM	2103	1728
Czechia	Pirates	PIRATI&STAN	2114; 2116	2047; 1707
Czechia	Prisaha	Prisaha	N/A	9002
Czechia	Freedom and Direct Democracy	SPD	2115	6125
Czechia	Spolu Coalition/Christian Democratic Union ¹	Spolu/(KDU-CSL)	2104	676
Czechia	Trikolora	Trikolora	N/A	9003
Czechia	Dawn of Direct Democracy	Usvit	2112	2049
France	Debout la France	DLF	628	3207
France	Europe Ecology - The Greens	EELV	605	5650

¹ Spolu (Together) is a coalition that is not included in other party surveys, but its largest constituent party, Christian Democratic Union (KDU-CSL) is, therefore, IDs for the latter are reported in the table

France	Left Front	FDG	N/A	4363
France	Unbowed France	LFI	627	5858
France	Workers' Struggle	LO	614	617
France	The Republicans	LR	609	8168
France	Democratic Movement	MoDem	613	496
France	New Anticapitalist Party	NPA	N/A	6684
France	French Communist Party	PCF	601	1251
France	Socialist Party	PS	602	1478
France	Reconquete	Reconquete	N/A	9064
France	Renaissance	Renaissance	626	5857
France	National Rally	RN	610	433
Hungary	Democratic Coalition	DK	2311	469
Hungary	Fidesz – Hungarian Civic Union	Fidesz	2302	1691
Hungary	Jobbik	Jobbik	2308	42
Hungary	Politics Can Be Different	LMP	2309	1650
Hungary	Mi Hazánk	MiHazank	N/A	7349
Hungary	Hungarian Two-Tailed Dog Party	MKKP	N/A	6129
Hungary	Momentum	Momentum	2314	8249
Hungary	Hungarian Socialist Party	MSZP	2301	1408
Hungary	Dialogue	Parbeszed	N/A	3115
Hungary	Tisza Party	Tisza	N/A	N/A
Italy	Popular Alternative	AP	N/A	9090
Italy	Azione	Azione	N/A	9082
Italy	Center Democrats	CD	843	2278
Italy	Europa	Europa	N/A	
Italy	Forza Italia	ForzaItalia	815	1626, 8058
Italy	Brothers of Italy	Fratelli	844	2280
Italy		GAL	N/A	N/A
Italy	Italia Viva-PSI	IV-PSI	839	742
Italy	Lega	Lega	811	1221
Italy	Five Star Movement	M5S	845	2046
Italy	Mixed Group	Misto	N/A	N/A
Italy	New Centre-Right	NCD	848	2052
Italy	The People of Freedom	PdL	N/A	N/A

Italy	Democratic Party	PD	837	802
Italy	Civic Choice	SCpI	846	2281
Italy	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	UDC	814	1758
Poland	Confederation	Konfederacja	2619	9026
Poland	Lewica Razem	Lewica	2620	4871
Poland	Law and Justice Party	PiS	2605	1565
Poland	Szymon Hołownia's Poland 2050	PL2050	N/A	9027
Poland	Civic Platform	PO	2603	1117
Poland	Polish People's Party	PSL	2606	602
Poland	Together	Razem	2620	4871
Poland	Solidarity Poland	SP	2616	9109
United Kingdom	Conservatives	Conservative	1101	N/A
United Kingdom	Green Party	GreenParty	1107	N/A
United Kingdom	Labour	Labour	1102	N/A
United Kingdom	Liberal Democratic Party	LibDem	1104	N/A
United Kingdom	Reform UK	Reform	1110 (Brexit Party)	N/A
United Kingdom	Plaid Cymru	Plaid	1106	N/A
United Kingdom	Scottish National Party	SNP	1105	N/A
United Kingdom	United Kingdom Independence Party	UKIP	1108	N/A

2 LEADER LEVEL

The illiberal speech index uses the speech of political leaders to place them on an illiberal-liberal scale. The illiberal speech index is composed of two dimensions: power dispersion-concentration, and inclusion-exclusion.

2.1 ILLIBERAL SPEECH INDEX

2.1.1 Power Dispersion-Concentration (isi_dc)

The organization and execution of political power that allows for democratic contestation or pushes for autocratic, hierarchical relations.

Scale: continuous (-10.0 to 10.0)

+10 = Very illiberal	Disparages democratic norms and institutions, advocates for less checks on power, or attacks the role of free press, judiciary, or civil society.
:	
+5 = Rather illiberal	Suggests a preference for power concentration
:	
0 = Mixed/unclear	Mentions norms/institutions without clear stance
:	
-5 = Rather liberal	Suggests a preference for power dispersion
:	
-10 = Very liberal	Endorses the principles of democratic accountability, such as checks and balances, transparency, or a free media and civil society

Method: BERT model trained on hand coded training data

Data Source: Speeches by leader of executive branch from official outlets (presidential websites, youtube channels, etc.)

Years: 1999-2023

Project Team: CEU

2.1.2 Inclusion-Exclusion (isi_ie)

The exclusion or inclusion of specific groups from legitimate participation in the polity on the basis of their identity (ethnic, religious, gender, disability, etc.)

Scale: continuous (-10.0 to 10.0)

+10 = Very illiberal	Clearly advocates excluding certain groups from having political rights, or imposing a singular cultural identity; Disdain for universal rights.
:	
+5 = Rather illiberal	Suggestive of exclusive values
:	
0 = Mixed/unclear	Mentions group identity without clear bias
:	
-5 = Rather liberal	Suggestive of inclusive values
:	
-10 = Very liberal	Strongly supports the inclusion of diverse identities, champions equal human rights, encourages open borders, celebrates multiculturalism.

Method: BERT model trained on hand coded training data

Data Source: Speeches by leader of executive branch from official outlets (presidential websites, youtube channels, etc.)

Years: 1999-2023

Project Team: CEU

3 PARTY LEVEL

3.1 SOCIAL ILLIBERALISM (SOC_LIB)

Illiberalism is evaluated across 6 key dimensions of social illiberalism: immigration, diversity and inclusion, gender equality, gender identity, sexual orientation, and religion.

Scale: continuous 0.0 - 1.0 scale (binary classifications at the document level are aggregated by party-year)

Method: Each dimension is assessed using a 5-point scale based on a manual evaluation of tweets, determining whether they express support for or opposition to these concepts. These scores are first converted into a binary scale. The final illiberalism score is then derived by aggregating the binary scores using a majority rule (i.e., the most frequently assigned code). A full list of dimension-specific questions is provided in the Appendix.

Questions for Manual Annotations by Human Coders

- Irrelevance: Is this tweet irrelevant? (Y/empty)
- Gender equality: Does the tweet express support for traditional gender roles? (1-5 scale, with 1 being "strongly traditional" and 5 being "strongly diverse")
- Gender Identity: Does the tweet express support for binary sexual identity or gender fluidity? (1-5 scale, with 1 being "strongly traditional" and 5 being "strongly diverse")
- Sexual orientation: Does the tweet express support for traditional sexual orientation? (1-5 scale, with 1 being "strongly traditional" and 5 being "strongly diverse")
- Immigration: Does the tweet express support or opposition to immigration into the country? (1-5 scale, with 1 being "strongly oppose" and 5 being "strongly support")
- Religion/Secularisation: Does the tweet express support for secularisation, or does it suggest that religion should play a more prominent role in public life? (1-5 scale, with 1 being "strongly suggests support for secularisation" and 5 being "strongly suggests a belief that religion should play a more prominent role in public life")
- Diversity, Inclusion, Intolerance: Does the tweet express support for Diversity, Inclusion, Intolerance vs against? (1-5 scale, with 1 being "strongly against inclusion" and 5 being "strongly support inclusion")

Data Source: Tweets of official party accounts

Years: 2007-2023

Project Team: Oxford

3.2 GENDER DISCRIMINATION (AUTHLIB_GENDER)

Does the speaker discriminate against LGBTQ identities or use inclusive language? Does discussion of gender roles emphasize hierarchy and tradition or equality and fairness?

Scale: continuous (-3.0 = very liberal to 3.0 = very illiberal)

Method: Word embeddings are trained on speeches given by party members in parliament. Three dictionaries define the topic of gender, illiberal speech, and liberal speech. The continuous scale is produced by first measuring the cosine similarity between the terms in the gender dictionary and illiberal dictionary, then second doing the same for the liberal dictionary, and finally taking the mean difference between the two.

$$\text{Cosine Similarity}_{\text{gender \& illiberal dictionary}} - \text{Cosine Similarity}_{\text{gender \& liberal dictionary}}$$

Data Source: Speeches in Parliament (Kuzman et al. 2023)

Years: 2005-2022

Project Team: CEU

3.3 ANTI-IMMIGRATION (AUTHLIB_IMMIG)

To what extent do parties villainize immigrants as an invasion and emphasize border security? Or on the other hand, do they discuss immigration in the context of pluralistic values?

Scale: continuous (-3.0 = very liberal to 3.0 = very illiberal)

Method: Word embeddings are trained on speeches given by party members in parliament. Three dictionaries define the topic of immigration, illiberal speech, and liberal speech. The continuous scale is produced by first measuring the cosine similarity between the terms in the immigration dictionary and illiberal dictionary, then second doing the same for the liberal dictionary, and finally taking the mean difference between the two.

$$\text{Cosine Similarity}_{\text{immigration \& illiberal dictionary}} - \text{Cosine Similarity}_{\text{immigration \& liberal dictionary}}$$

Data Source: Speeches in Parliament (Kuzman et al. 2023)

Years: 2005-2022

Project Team: CEU

4 PUBLIC OPINION

4.1 AUTHLIB CORE INDICES

4.1.1 Authoritarianism Core Index (auth_core)

Scale: continuous (factor scores)

Confirmatory factor analysis. Original items:

1. How acceptable for you would it be for the [COUNTRY] to have a strong leader who is above the law?

(0=Not at all acceptable; 10=completely acceptable)

Level of agreement with the following statements:

2. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn
3. The government should be able to bend the law in order to solve pressing social and political problems

(1=Strongly agree; 2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Somewhat disagree; 5=Strongly disagree)

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: SWPS

4.1.2 Illiberalism Core Index (ilib_core)

Scale: continuous (factor scores)

Confirmatory factor analysis. Original items:

Level of agreement with the following statements:

1. What our society needs is protection against international influences, not further opening-up
2. Leaders should always follow the interests of their country, even if this means going against international rules.
3. Those who claim that there are powerful organizations in the world which conspire against the [COUNTRY] have a good point.
4. These days the leading contribution white people have made to human culture is being downplayed

(1=Strongly agree; 2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Somewhat disagree; 5=Strongly disagree)

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: SWPS

4.1.3 Populism Core Index (populism)

Scale: continuous (factor scores)

Confirmatory factor analysis. Original items:

Level of agreement with the following statements:

1. The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities
2. The [COUNTRY] is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves
3. Politicians constantly over-complicate simple matters instead of effectively solving them

(1=Strongly agree; 2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Somewhat disagree; 5=Strongly disagree)

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: SWPS

4.2 AUTHLIB COMPOSITE INDICES

4.2.1 Comprehensive Illiberalism Index (illib9)

Measures comprehensive illiberal attitudes including both political and cultural dimensions

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with nine statements:

- How important for democracy that media are free to criticise the government [Reversed]
- How important for democracy that rights of minorities are protected [Reversed]
- How important for democracy that courts treat everyone the same [Reversed]
- How acceptable to have a strong leader who is above the law
- Women should be prepared to cut down on paid work for the sake of family
- Teaching tolerance towards LGBTQ minorities in schools can cause harm
- The will of the majority should always prevail, even over minority rights
- Government should be able to bend law to solve pressing problems
- Society needs protection against international influences, not opening up

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.2 Majoritarian Populism Index (popul6evil)

Measures populist attitudes regarding direct democracy, anti-elitism, and popular sovereignty

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with five statements:

- How important for democracy that citizens have the final say through direct referendums
- How important for democracy that ordinary people's views prevail over political elite
- How important for democracy that the will of the people cannot be stopped
- [Country] is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves
- Politicians constantly over-complicate simple matters instead of effectively solving them
- Politics is ultimately a struggle between good and evil

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.3 Traditionalism (tradit3new)

Measures traditional values regarding family, gender roles, and state support for traditional institutions

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis

Key Items/Components:

- Women should be prepared to cut down on paid work for the sake of the family.
- Same-sex marriages should be prohibited by law
- Women should be free to decide on matters of abortion [Reversed]

4.2.4 Nationalism Extended Index (nationalism5)

Measures nationalist attitudes with emphasis on cultural superiority and conspiracy beliefs

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with five statements:

- Leaders should always follow the interests of their country, even if this means going against international rules
- It is impossible for an organisation to serve the interests of our nation if most of its funding comes from foreign sources
- Those who claim that there are powerful organisations in the world which conspire against [Country] have a good point
- These days the leading contribution white people have made to human culture is being downplayed
- Generally speaking, [Country] is a better country than most other European countries

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.5 Closed Society Index – Short (closedsoc3)

Measures opposition to social progressivism and international influences

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with three statements:

- Women should be prepared to cut down on paid work for the sake of the family
- Teaching teenagers about tolerance towards transgender and homosexual minorities in schools can cause harm
- What our society needs is protection against international influences, not further opening up

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.6 Authoritarianism Index (author2)

Measures fundamental authoritarian attitudes focusing on respect for authority and support for harsh punishments

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with two statements:

- Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn
- People who break the law should be given much harsher sentences than they are these days

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.7 Xenophobia Index (xenoph9)

Measures xenophobic attitudes through social distance preferences and views on immigration

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on nine items:

- Unwillingness to have as neighbors: Muslims
- Unwillingness to have as neighbors: Jews
- Unwillingness to have as neighbors: Unmarried couples living together
- Unwillingness to have as neighbors: Homosexuals
- Unwillingness to have as neighbors: People who speak a different language
- Unwillingness to have as neighbors: People of a different race
- Views on immigration's impact on country's economy
- Views on immigration's impact on cultural life
- Views on immigrants' rights to social benefits and services

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.8 Power Concentration Index (powerconc3)

Measures support for concentrated executive power and restrictions on media freedom

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with three statements:

- How important for democracy that media are free to criticise the government [Reversed]
- How acceptable to have a strong leader who is above the law
- Government should be able to bend law to solve pressing problems

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.9 Religious Fundamentalism Index (religcons2)

Measures religious conservative attitudes and support for religion's role in governance

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with two statements:

- How important do you think it is for democracy in general that religious authorities ultimately interpret the laws
- Those who don't believe in God are not suitable for governing this country

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU

4.2.10 Partisan State Index (partisstate3)

Measures opposition to minority rights and equal treatment under law

Scale: Continuous (factor scores)

Method: Principal Component Analysis. Composite index based on agreement with three statements:

- How important for democracy that rights of minorities are protected [Reversed]
- How important for democracy that courts treat everyone the same [Reversed]
- The will of the majority should always prevail, even over minority rights

Data Source: Authlib survey

Years: 2024

Project Team: CEU