**Appendix**

Procedure for selecting sample barangays:

For the NCR:

*Stage 1: Selection of Sample Barangays:* 60 barangays were distributed among the 17 cities and municipalities in such a way that each city/municipality was assigned a number of barangays that was roughly proportional to its population size. An additional provision was that each municipality must have one sample barangay. Barangays were selected at random from within each city/municipality.

*Stage 2: Selection of Sample Households*:In each sample barangays map, interval sampling was used to draw 5 sample households. A starting street corner was drawn at random. The first sample household was randomly selected from the households nearest to the starting street corner. Subsequent sample households were chosen using a fixed interval of 5 households in between the sampled ones; i.e., every 6th household was sampled.

*Stage 3: Selection of the Sample Adult*: In each selected household, a respondent was randomly chosen among household members who were 18 years of age and older, using a probability selection table. To ensure that half of the respondents were males and half were females, only male family members were pre-listed in the probability selection table of odd-numbered questionnaires while only female members were pre-listed for even-numbered questionnaires. In cases where there was no qualified respondent of a given gender, the interval sampling of household continued until five sample respondents were identified.

For the rest of the Philippines:

*Stage 1: Allocation of sample barangays to Regions*: Within each major area, 60 barangays were allocated to the regions proportional to household population size.

*Stage 2: Allocation and Selection of Sample Cities/Municipalities to Regions*: Within each study area, 15 cities/municipalities were allocated to the regions proportional to household population size. Sample cities/municipalities were selected without replacement and with probability proportional to household population size.

*Stage 3: Selection of Sample Barangays*: Once the cities/municipalities have been selected, 60 barangays were distributed among the sample cities/municipalities in such a way that each city/municipality was assigned a number of barangays roughly proportional to its household population size. However, each city/municipality must be assigned with at least one sample barangay.

Sample barangays within each sample city/municipality were selected with equal probabilities.

Figure A1 Populist Attitudes in the Philippines



**Figure A2 Accuracy of Non-Expert Coding of ‘Regular’ and ‘Charismatic’ Leaders in Test Questions**

****

x axis represents percentage of 'judgments' that accurately code the survey description.

**Figure A3 Distribution of Dependent Variables**
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**Figure A4 Institutional Trust**
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**Table A1 Test Descriptions of Charismatic and Regular Leadership**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Coding** | **Justification** |
| honest | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Honesty does not signify that the leader being described has a special or unique characteristic in the perception of the respondent. |
| corrupt | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Corrupt is a description that can be applied to any leader. It is not distinctive to charismatic ones. |
| heroic | Charismatic | Classic description of charismatic leader. Heroism is a typical characteristic associated with Charisma. Regular leaders are very unlikely to be described in this way. |
| mean | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Mean is negative personal characteristic that could be applied to any regular leader. The respondent clearly does not believe that the leader being described is charismatic. |
| majestic | Charismatic | Classic description of charismatic leader. The respondent in this case believes that the leader has special, royal, or even divine qualities. A regular leader would not be described in this way. |
| competent | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Competency is a common way of describing any professional leader. It is not a characteristic of the kind of exceptional, personal qualities that are associated with charisma. |
| articulate | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Charismatic leaders may be great speakers, but to describe someone as articulate implies that they are viewed as professional and competent. |
| fantastic | Charismatic | This is a likely emotional description of charismatic leader. Fantastic implies that the respondent believes there is something special, if hard to describe, about the leader. |
| believes in people | Charismatic | The respondent is describing a special connection between leader and his followers. This is indicative of charismatic more than regular leadership. |
| trustworthy | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Trustworthiness is a common way of describing any professional leader. It is not a characteristic of the kind of exceptional, personal qualities that are associated with charisma. |
| Is blessed by God | Charismatic | The respondent is describing someone with an extraordinary, divine gift. This is very clearly indicative of the charisma of the person being described. |
| A powerful and persuasive character, I would follow him no matter what | Charismatic | That the respondent would support the leader “no matter what” implies an almost irrational or devotional level of support. It is not calculated in a way that is typical to the support of regular leaders. |
| A firm follower of the law | Regular | A regular leader would be expected to follow all norms and legal rules. A charismatic leader in contrast aims to write his or her own rules and depends on no one but the people for his or her authority. |
| efficient | Regular | Characteristic of normal political leader. Efficiency is a common way of describing any professional leader. It is not a characteristic of the kind of exceptional, personal qualities that are associated with charisma. |
| She is compassionate leader who instinctively knows what is best for her people | Charismatic | The respondent is saying that the leader has a special understanding of what the people want. |
| Knows what is going on so deserves complete discretion in running government | Charismatic | The respondent is saying that the leader has an instinctive understanding of what is needed to run government and that he or she shouldn't be constrained by any rules or processes in doing so. |
| A bit boring | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| Friendly | Regular | While this is a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| not afraid of standing up to regular politicians | Charismatic | The respondent is drawing a distinction between the leader and "regular" politicians. Clearly the respondent favors the way the leader does this. It should be viewed as charismatic. |
| unlike any other leader in the world and in my view the best | Charismatic | The respondent is drawing a very positive distinction between the leader being described and all other leaders. The respondent believes there is something special and good about the leader. |
| is very convincing. I don't know why. | Charismatic | The respondent finds that the leader is persuasive. Regular leaders can also be persuasive but it tends to be for rational reasons that people can easily understand. In this case, the respondent finds the leader persuasive on some emotional or irrational level. |
| a dog | Regular | The respondent clearly finds the leader objectionable. This is not a charismatic trait. |
| I think God sent him to us | Charismatic | The respondent is saying that the leader is blessed or divine. This is strongly associated with charisma. |
| blessed | Charismatic | The respondent is saying that the leader has divine approval. This is strongly associated with charisma. |
| fair | Regular | While this is a trait for a leader of government to have, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| A really strong leader who can take on anybody who challenges him | Charismatic | The leader being described is especially gifted with the ability to resist any normal challengers. This should be associated with charisma. |
| has word of honor | Regular | While this is a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| possesses an amazing empathy for his people. I think we can trust him completely. | Charismatic | The respondent is saying that the leader has an instinctive understanding of what the people are thinking and that people can believe in the leader fully. |
| is somehow able to convince anybody to do whatever he wants. | Charismatic | The respondent finds that the leader is persuasive. Regular leaders can also be persuasive but it tends to be for rational reasons that people can easily understand. In this case, the respondent finds the leader persuasive on some emotional or irrational level. |
| greedy | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| He has no respect for women | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| He is a manipulator of people | Regular | Both regular and charismatic leaders can be manipulative. This is not unique to charismatic leaders. |
| Has a lot of years of experience which is valuable | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| has many extraordinary accomplishments that I don't think any other leader could ever match | Charismatic | The respondent is describing a leader with extraordinary or unique achievements that make him or her special. |
| intelligent | Regular | While this is a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| straight talker | Regular | While this is usually considered to be a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| discreet | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| the people simply adore her | Charismatic | The leader being described is not just respected or followed but 'loved'. This is not typical of a regular politician but of a leader with charisma. |
| distinguished | Regular | While this is a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| elitist | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| She is a truly outstanding leader the likes of which the world will never see repeated | Charismatic | The respondent is describing a uniquely briliant leader. This kind of description is commonly associated with charismatic leaders. |
| studious | Regular | While this is a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |
| serious | Regular | This is not a special trait associated with charisma. |
| calm | Regular | While this is a positive character trait, it could be associated with any regular leader. |

**Table A2 Populist Attitudes and Attribution of Charisma to Duterte by Region**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Mean Populist Attitudes** | **Mean Duterte Charisma** |
| NCR | 0.6152083 | 0.365 |
| Balance Luzon | 0.6393056 | 0.3816667 |
| Visayas | 0.6508333 | 0.385 |
| Mindanao | 0.6363889 | 0.4566667 |

*N* = 2,400

**Table A3 Mindanao Effect on Populist Attitudes and Attribution of Charisma to Duterte**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mindanao** | **Non-Mindanao** | **Adjusted Wald test (significance)** |
| Populist Attitudes | 0.6376822 | 0.6372952 | F = 0.00  (0.9651) |
| Duterte Charisma | 0.4576378 | 0.3827174 | F = 9.91  (0.0017) |
| *N* | 600 | 1,800 |  |

**Table A4 Class and Populist Attitudes and Attribution of Charisma to Duterte**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Social Class ABC** | **Social Class DE** | **Adjusted Wald test (significance)** |
| Populist Attitudes | .6297081 | .6358899 | 0.04  (0.8482) |
| Duterte Charisma | .3389831 | .4017094 | 0.32  (0.5713) |
| *N* | 177 | 2,223 |  |

**Table A5 Sex and Populist Attitudes and Attribution of Charisma to Duterte**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Men** | **Women** | **Adjusted Wald test (significance)** |
| Populist Attitudes | .6439239 | .630859 | 7.73  (0.0057) |
| Duterte Charisma | .409261 | .3899198 | 0.78  (0.3762) |
| *N* | 1,200 | 1,200 |  |

**Table A6 Populist Attitudes and Attribution of Charisma to Duterte by year**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **Adjusted Wald test (significance)** |
| Populist Attitudes | 0.6243488 | 0. 6501699 | 8.17  (0.0044) |
| Duterte Charisma | 0.4612051 | 0.3391108 | 24.97  (0.000) |
| *N* | 1,200 | 1,200 |  |

**Table A7. Populist attitudes and the attribution of charisma to Duterte**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| Charismatic leader | -0.00224 | -0.00294 |
|  | (0.00588) | (0.00581) |
|  |  |  |
| Educational attainment |  | 0.000195 |
|  |  | (0.00154) |
|  |  |  |
| Socio-economic class |  | -0.00459 |
|  |  | (0.0132) |
|  |  |  |
| Age Cohort |  | -0.00185 |
|  |  | (0.00190) |
|  |  |  |
| Woman |  | -0.0133\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.00454) |
|  |  |  |
| Area fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Survey fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.603\*\*\* | 0.615\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0104) | (0.0159) |
| Observations | 2,400 | 2,400 |
| R2 | 0.0170 | 0.0205 |
| Clustered standard errors in parentheses: \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01 | | |

**Table A8 Partial Correlations between Dependent Variables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Support the war on drugs** | **Rating on crime policy** | **Rating on enforcing the law** |
| Support the war on drugs | 1.000 |  |  |
|  | (0.000) |  |  |
| Rating on crime policy | 0.228 | 1.000 |  |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) |  |
| Rating on enforcing the law | 0.169 | 0.513 | 1.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |

P-values in parentheses

**Table A9 Ordered logit models of support for anti-drug campaign with Barangay Fixed Effects**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  |  |  |
| Populist attitudes | 1.280\*\* | 1.198\* |
|  | (0.647) | (0.658) |
|  |  |  |
| Charismatic leadership | 0.453\*\*\* | 0.461\*\*\* |
|  | (0.143) | (0.142) |
|  |  |  |
| Educational attainment |  | 0.0367 |
|  |  | (0.0325) |
|  |  |  |
| Socio-economic class |  | 0.207 |
|  |  | (0.248) |
|  |  |  |
| Age Cohort |  | 0.0688 |
|  |  | (0.0462) |
|  |  |  |
| Woman |  | -0.507\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.113) |
|  |  |  |
| Barangay fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Year fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 1,789 | 1,789 |
| Wald χ2 | - | - |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.1437 | 0.1525 |

Clustered standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01

**Table A10 OLS models of support for anti-drug campaign**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| Populist attitudes | 0.377\*\* | 0.355\* |
|  | (0.190) | (0.191) |
|  |  |  |
| Charismatic leadership | 0.132\*\*\* | 0.134\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0444) | (0.0441) |
|  |  |  |
| Educational attainment |  | 0.0142 |
|  |  | (0.0107) |
|  |  |  |
| Socio-economic class |  | -0.0110 |
|  |  | (0.0772) |
|  |  |  |
| Age cohort |  | 0.0321\*\* |
|  |  | (0.0152) |
|  |  |  |
| Woman |  | -0.154\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.0361) |
|  |  |  |
| Area fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Survey fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | 3.879\*\*\* | 3.785\*\*\* |
|  | (0.135) | (0.169) |
| Observations | 1,789 | 1,789 |
| Adjusted *R*2 | 0.031 | 0.043 |

Clustered standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01

**Table A11 Ordered logit models of support for anti-drug campaign with varied charisma agreement thresholds**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | 60 percent | 70 percent | 90 percent | 100 percent |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Populist attitudes | 1.359\*\* | 1.386\*\* | 1.344\*\* | 1.354\*\* |
|  | (0.560) | (0.559) | (0.546) | (0.547) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Charismatic leader | 0.380\*\*\* | 0.371\*\*\* | 0.304\*\* | 0.199 |
|  | (0.111) | (0.110) | (0.149) | (0.157) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Educational attainment | 0.0303 | 0.0312 | 0.0332 | 0.0347 |
|  | (0.0274) | (0.0273) | (0.0274) | (0.0273) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Socio-economic class | 0.0435 | 0.0151 | 0.000483 | 0.00216 |
|  | (0.224) | (0.221) | (0.222) | (0.224) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Age cohort | 0.0697\* | 0.0734\* | 0.0659\* | 0.0658\* |
|  | (0.0387) | (0.0388) | (0.0383) | (0.0385) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | -0.426\*\*\* | -0.427\*\*\* | -0.424\*\*\* | -0.425\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0923) | (0.0923) | (0.0927) | (0.0931) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Area fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Survey fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 1,789 | 1,789 | 1,789 | 1,789 |
| Wald χ2 | 92.13 | 91.75 | 82.66 | 82.11 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.0375 | 0.0376 | 0.0350 | 0.0341 |

Clustered standard errors in parentheses\* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01

**Table A12 Ordered Logit models of belief in necessity of Martial Law**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  |  |  |
| Populist attitudes | -0.468 | -0.496 |
|  | (0.638) | (0.641) |
|  |  |  |
| Charismatic leadership | -0.138 | -0.165 |
|  | (0.118) | (0.121) |
|  |  |  |
| Educational attainment |  | 0.0243 |
|  |  | (0.0309) |
|  |  |  |
| Socio-economic class |  | 0.0956 |
|  |  | (0.355) |
|  |  |  |
| Age cohort |  | -0.0407 |
|  |  | (0.0363) |
|  |  |  |
| Woman |  | 0.0296 |
|  |  | (0.100) |
|  |  |  |
| Area fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| Wald χ2 | 3.96 | 6.03 |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.0022 | 0.0032 |

Clustered standard errors in parentheses: \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01

**Table A13 OLS models of Institutional Trust**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| Populist attitudes | 0.521\*\*\* | 0.509\*\*\* |
|  | (0.156) | (0.159) |
|  |  |  |
| Charismatic leadership | 0.0272 | 0.0304 |
|  | (0.0314) | (0.0326) |
|  |  |  |
| Educational attainment |  | -0.00416 |
|  |  | (0.00838) |
|  |  |  |
| Socio-economic class |  | -0.0505 |
|  |  | (0.0908) |
|  |  |  |
| Age cohort |  | 0.000789 |
|  |  | (0.0119) |
|  |  |  |
| Woman |  | -0.0371 |
|  |  | (0.0305) |
|  |  |  |
| Area fixed effects | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | 3.255\*\*\* | 3.305\*\*\* |
|  | (0.103) | (0.133) |
| Observations | 1,180 | 1,180 |
| *R*2 | 0 .0584 | 0.0605 |

Clustered standard errors in parentheses: \* *p* < 0.10, \*\* *p* < 0.05, \*\*\* *p* < 0.01