

**Austerity and Anti-Austerity:
the political economy of refusal in ‘low resistance’ models of capitalism**

Online Appendix

Calibration

The following sets out the scoring system for each of the indicators discussed in the article.

Scores are presented in parentheses.

Outcome of interest: substantial impact of refusal?

This was made up of the following elements:

1. Obstacles?

One obstacle experienced – mild (0.5)

Two obstacles – moderate (1)

Three obstacles or more – substantial (2)

2. Adopted?

With no concessions (0)

With minor concessions (1)

With moderate concessions (2)

With substantial concessions (4)

3. Consequences?

Mild (0.5)

Moderate (1)

Substantial (2)

In cases where the proposal for austerity was not adopted, we considered the proposal for austerity to have been capitulated upon, and therefore marked it with the highest mark possible (9).

The total score for the impact of refusal was subsequently calculated by adding together the figure for each of these three elements.

The calibration of the impact score was subsequently assessed as any outcome with a total score of 4 and above was considered to be a case where substantial impact had occurred as a result of the acts of refusal experienced (that is, any austerity that was adopted was done so only with substantial concessions, or with moderate concessions and substantial obstacles and consequences as a result of the refusal experienced). For the purposes of the fsQCA, we considered a score of 6 to be fully in the set of outcomes in which substantial impact had occurred as a result of acts of refusal, 2 to be fully out, and 3.9 to be the turning point.

Condition 1: substantial proposal for austerity? (scale)

This was calculated by combining two of the conditions in table 1, as follows:

Severity:

Mild (1)

Moderate (2)

High (3)

Target:

Insiders (1)

Universal/sectoral (2)

Outsiders (3)

The *scale* condition was then calculated by adding the two scores together – giving a total score for the scale of the austerity measure that combined the degree to which it could be considered to have an impact in terms of welfare retrenchment, and the degree to which the measure would have a regressive effect.

The calibration of the *scale* score was subsequently assessed so that any score of 4 or above was considered to be a case where the proposal for austerity was substantial.

For the purposes of the fsQCA, we considered a score of 5 to be fully in the set of proposals where the proposal for austerity was substantial, 3 to be fully out, and 3.9 to be the turning point.

Condition 2: coordinated model of capitalism? (CME)

Each of the Japanese cases were scored 1 (fully in the set of CMEs) and each of the UK cases were scored 0 (fully out).

Conditions 3, 4, 5, 6: significant refusal?

Each of the four different types of refusal (*impercept, non-disrupt, disrupt, militant*) were given a score as follows:

No such acts of refusal (0)

Limited acts of such refusal (1)

Moderate levels of acts of such refusal (2)

Substantial levels of acts of such refusal (3)

The calibration of the score for each type of refusal was subsequently assessed so that any score above 1 was considered to be a case where the proposal for austerity was substantial. For the purposes of the fsQCA, we considered a score of 2 to be fully in the set of cases where the level of refusal of that particular type had been significant, 1 to be fully out, and 1.5 to be the turning point.

Table A.1: Fuzzy-set truth table: Substantial impact on austerity proposals

Scale	Imper- ceptible dissent	Non- disruptive public opposition	Disruptive public opposition	Militant refusal	CME	No.	Impact	raw	PRI	SYM
								consist.	consist.	consist
1	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	0.930894	0.92093	1
1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	0.974359	0.973545	1
1	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	0.968153	0.967105	1
1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.02551	0	0
1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0.038095	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.047619	0	0
1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.103448	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0.733766	0.585859	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.752381	0.675	0.870968

Table A.2. Parsimonious analysis of sufficient conditions for substantial impact upon proposals for austerity

Solution	<i>cme*scale</i>	+	<i>militant</i>
cases	Tax hike I (JP), Tax hike II (JP), zero overtime (JP), DWL amendment (JP), pension reform (JP)		workfare (UK), university tuition fees (UK)
raw	0.47		0.25
coverage			
unique	0.47		0.25
coverage			
consistency	0.95		0.97
solution			0.72
coverage			
solution			0.95
consistency			

Table A.3. Conservative analysis of sufficient conditions for substantial impact upon proposals for austerity

Solution	<i>non.disrupt*cme*</i> <i>scale*~disrupt*~</i> <i>militant</i>	+	<i>militant*disrupt*non.disrupt*impercept*</i> <i>scale*~CME</i>
cases	Tax hike I (JP), Tax hike II (JP), zero overtime (JP), DWL amendment (JP), pension reform (JP)		workfare (UK), university tuition fees (UK)
raw	0.47		0.24
coverage			
unique	0.47		0.24
coverage			
consistency	0.95		0.97
solution			0.71
coverage			
solution			0.95
consistency			