

Chapter 10

The support base of radical right parties in the enlarged European Union

Wouter van der Brug and Meindert Fennema

Universiteit van Amsterdam/ASCoR/IMES and Universiteit van Amsterdam/IMES

Introduction

In the last two decades of the twentieth century many western democracies have seen the rise of parties that have been labelled extreme-right (Ignazi, 1992; Hainsworth 2000), New Radical Right (Kitschelt 1995), Radical Right (Norris 2005), right-wing populist (Van der Brug and Mughan 2007) or anti-immigration parties (Fennema 1997). In this paper we study the motives of citizens in supporting these parties.

Ideologically these parties are a mixed bag. Some of them are directly inspired by fascist intellectuals from the 1930s and speak of the fall of Western civilization (see e.g., Fennema and Pollman, 1998)¹, whereas others have no sympathy at all for the fascist past, and have even criticized the lack of forms of direct democracy in parliamentary democracies. Some have a program that promotes a free market economy, whereas others have objected to free market arrangements, particularly when it comes to international trade. When Fennema (1997) studied the ideologies of the Western European parties that belong to this group, he concluded that the main thing they have in common is their fierce opposition to immigration, which is the reason why he proposed calling them anti-immigrant parties and, more recently, anti-immigration parties. This term is well suited to the description of West-

European parties of the radical right. However, the term ‘anti-immigration’ does not capture what parties from central or Eastern Europe, or from Latin America, are about. Since immigration into these countries is very limited (apart from former East Germany), they have not mobilized against immigrants. Instead, they have promoted strong right wing nationalism and as such have mobilized anti-EU sentiments, as well as anti-Semitism (in particular the Polish Self Defence and the Hungarian Life and Justice parties) and hate for other ethnic groups, particularly the Roma. So, when we look beyond the context of Western Europe, as we do in this paper, the term radical right is to be preferred (see also Norris 2005).

Until the late 1990s, socio-structural models inspired most research into the radical right. According to this perspective, the rise of radical right parties should be seen as a backlash response to modernization. The crux of these explanations is the suggestion that support for radical right parties comes from citizens who feel threatened by rapid changes in postindustrial societies. Manual workers with low education tend to lose their jobs as a result of changes in modes of production. Moreover, they are competing with immigrant groups for scarce resources such as jobs and houses. These “losers of modernity” (Betz 1998) feel threatened by rapid social change and tend to support radical right-wing parties out of general discontent.

More recent contributions have challenged this perspective, which was dominant until the late 1990s. Van der Brug, Fennema and Tillie (2000) showed that socio-structural characteristics of voters explain less of the variance in support for radical right parties than they do variance in support for the more established parties. This means that radical right parties attract their support across various social boundaries, to a greater extent than do more established parties. Moreover, the authors showed that support for radical right parties is motivated by the same kind of ideological and pragmatic considerations as support for established parties. These analyses were based on 1994 data for 7 electoral systems in the EU. A replicating

study of 1999 data in 8 political systems gave a different picture. For the large and successful radical right parties, such as the FPÖ, Vlaams Blok and Alleanza Nazionale these conclusions were still valid. However, in the case of support for small and unsuccessful radical right parties such as the Wallonian Front National, the German Republikaner and the Dutch Centrumdemocraten, this was not the case. They therefore concluded that two groups of radical right parties had developed by 1999. One group of parties is evaluated by their potential supporters on the basis of the same kind of substantive considerations that also motivate support for other parties. We could thus say that citizens treat them as ‘normal’ parties. The other group is apparently not evaluated on the basis of ideological and pragmatic considerations.

The purpose of the current paper is to replicate the analyses of 1994 and 1999 with data from the EES 2004. This will enable us to assess whether the situation has changed compared to 1999. Moreover, these data enable us to assess the determinants of the vote for three radical right parties that were not included in previous studies: Laos (from Greece), the LPF (from the Netherlands) and the Hungarian Justice and Life Party. The EES 2004 also allows us to replicate the findings for 6 parties that were also included in 1999: the Austrian FPÖ, the Danish Folkepartit, the German Republikaner, the Italian Alleanza Nazionale and Lega Nord, and the French Front National.²

What motivates voting for radical right parties?

Different kinds of theoretical approaches exist to explain support for radical right parties, as well as differences in aggregate support for such parties. These approaches have looked at demand side as well as supply side factors. In this paper we focus on the motivation which leads individual voters to support radical right parties, which is why our focus is mainly on the demand

side: voters and their grievances and preferences. Different explanations have been brought forward.

The first sees the main causes of the electoral growth of radical right parties as being the resurgence of market forces, massive unemployment and the atomisation of risk society. According to this explanation, radical right voting can be partially explained by social isolation. Arendt (1951) was the first to propose this explanation and others have later found supporting evidence. For instance, Mayer and Moreau (1995) found a higher level of social isolation, measured by weak trade union ties and low religious affiliation, among Front National voters and among voters for the German Republikaner. Others have, however argued that community leaders, rather than isolated individuals, decide the fate of the traditional parties and lead the voters to new parties (Hamilton 1982; Martin 1997). It may well be that feelings of social isolation do not stem from social atomisation, but rather from a disruption of the traditional relations between local communities and the political power structure. Martin (1997) has stressed the fact that Le Pen voters are found in traditional communities that have lost their lines of communication with the political elites.

In addition to the social isolation thesis, an ethnic competition thesis has been proposed. According to this explanation, support for radical right parties comes from those citizens who feel threatened by rapid changes in post-industrial societies. Blue-collar workers with low education feel insecure because of globalisation and immigration. They compete with immigrant groups for scarce resources such as jobs and houses. These “losers of modernity” (Betz 1998) feel threatened by rapid social change and tend to support radical right-wing parties out of resentment against immigrants and against politicians in general, who are held responsible for their uncertainty.

Research has shown that voters who fit Betz’ profile —the so called “angry white men”— are more likely than other citizens to support radical right

parties (e.g., Lubbers 2001; Lubbers et al. 2002). However, socio-structural models tend to have very limited ability to explain support for radical right parties (e.g., Mayer 1998; Riedlsperger 1998; Van der Brug et al. 2000; Van der Brug and Fennema 2003). On the contrary, successful radical right parties such as the Austrian FPÖ in 200, and the Dutch LPF in 2002 were more likely to draw their support from all social strata than was the case for established parties (Van der Brug et al. 2000). Recently, Betz (2002) dropped his claims about the “losers of modernity”.

Another popular explanation of support for radical right parties is the *protest vote* model (Mayer & Perrineau 1992; Martin 1996; Mudde & Van Holsteyn 2000; Betz 1994; Derks & Deschouwer 1998; Swyngedouw 2001; Belanger & Aarts 2006). Unfortunately little conceptual clarity exists about what we mean by the term *protest vote*. Van der Brug et al. (2000) conceptualized protest voting as a rational, goal-directed activity. They define protest votes by the motives underlying them. The prime motive behind a protest vote is to show discontent with the political elite. Since radical right parties are treated as outcasts by a large part of the elites in their countries, votes for these parties frighten or shock these elites, which is exactly what the protest voter wants to accomplish (see also: Van der Eijk et al. 1996).

In the literature the concept of the protest vote consists of two elements. The first element distinguishing a protest vote from other types of votes is that discontent with politics (reflected in political cynicism, or lack of political trust) should have a strong effect on support for a radical right party (e.g., Van der Brug 2003; Aarts 2006). The second element is, in the words of Lubbers & Scheepers (2000:69) that “political attitudes ... are expected to be of minor importance”. The main motivation behind a protest vote is, after all, *not* to affect public policies but to express discontent (see also: Kitschelt 1996; Mayer & Perrineau 1992; Kitschelt 1995; Mudde & Van Holsteyn 2000).

In previous studies Van der Brug et al. (2000) and Van der Brug and Fennema (2003) rejected the protest vote hypothesis for most of the radical right parties they studied. These studies were criticized for not having a direct operationalization of discontent (e.g., Norris 2006), and for basing their conclusions instead on indicators of the extent of policy voting for radical right parties. We do not think this critique is warranted. Indeed it was not possible to demonstrate protest voting if it *had indeed occurred*. However, these studies did show that votes for most radical right parties could not be considered protest votes, because the second element of protest voting (a weak effect of policy preferences) did not apply to them.³

Another objection to the conclusions of Van der Brug et al. (2000) is that many voters who support radical right parties may combine anti-establishment feelings with substantive policy considerations (e.g., Swyngedouw 2001; Eatwell 2003). While this is certainly true, we are hesitant to use the term *protest vote* for votes that are to a large extent driven by substantive policy considerations. If we follow this line of reasoning, we could call votes for any opposition parties protest votes if they are cast by citizens who are relatively discontented. However, scholars tend to reserve the term protest vote for those who support radical parties (of the far left or the far right). As a case in point, Belanger and Aarts (2006) studied the effect of discontent on the vote in the Dutch elections of 2002. It turned out that discontent exerted an almost equally weak (and statistically insignificant) effect on the vote for the radical right LPF as on the Christian democratic party, which was the largest opposition party. They interpret this effect — even though it is not significant — as evidence in support of the protest vote hypothesis. Yet they did not answer the question of whether Christian democratic voters should be considered protest voters as well.

We therefore propose to make a qualitative distinction between protest voting and policy voting. In this conceptualization, voters who support a party because they agree with it on important policy considerations will be

called policy voters. If these policies are very different from the policies pursued by government these voters will be discontented. But as long as their vote is driven by these policy considerations, they are policy voters according to our definition, no matter how discontented they are. Protest voters on the other hand are voters who support a party out of discontent, but for whom policy considerations are relatively unimportant.

Models of *policy - and ideological voting* have not been popular among scholars who study the support for radical right parties, because many researchers find it difficult to believe that voters would vote rationally for what they consider a racist or neo-fascist party. Policy voting models consider voters as rational consumers of policy programs and political parties as providers of such programs. In elections several parties provide their policy programs and voters choose from these alternatives. Of course voters do not know the content of all these programs. To be able to choose between these programs despite restricted information, voters rely on other indications of the party programs. They tend to rely on general information and images that refer to the ideological profile of the parties. The policy voting model predicts therefore that, even with limited information, the voters' decisions in the ballot box are based on the content of the party programs (i.e., on issues and ideological positions). Electoral research has shown that votes for many radical right parties — particularly the more successful ones — are predominantly based on policy orientations, which are expressed in left/right positions and attitudes towards immigrants and immigration (Kitschelt 1995; Van der Brug c.s. 2000; Lubbers c.s. 2002; Van der Brug en Fennema 2003; Mughan en Paxton 2003). We will now assess the extent to which this is still the case in 2004, and whether it is true for the nine radical right parties that we included in this study.

Data and method

In order to assess whether policy considerations exert a strong or a weak effect on the electoral attractiveness of radical right parties, we must compare the motivations for voting for radical right parties with motivations to vote for other parties. Data from the European Elections Studies provide an excellent opportunity to make this comparison, because the data sets contain comparable information about a large number of parties from all sorts of ideological denominations. For this study we will use data from the European Election Studies 2004, which was conducted immediately following elections to the European Parliament. It consists of cross-sectional surveys using random samples from the electorates of most of the member states of the European Union. In this study we use the surveys from eight countries with one or more parties of the radical right. In Austria 1,010 respondents were interviewed, in Denmark this was 1,317, in France 1,406, in Germany 596, in Greece 500, in Hungary 1,200, in Italy 1,553 and in the Netherlands 1,586. The total sample in these countries thus consists of 9,162 respondents, which is about 1,145 on average per country.

To compare the motives for supporting a radical right party with the motives for supporting other parties we employ a method that was proposed by Van der Eijk and Franklin (1996). In each country voters were asked, for each party in their political system,⁴ how likely it was (on a scale of 1 to 10) that they would *ever* vote for it. These questions have been carefully designed to yield measures that can be interpreted as the propensity to vote for each of the parties (van der Eijk and Franklin 1996; van der Eijk 2002; Van der Eijk et al. 2006). For ease of exposition these measures can be regarded as preferences, but we know that voters make their choice in each election for the party they most prefer.⁵

Having measures of vote propensity serves many purposes, but in this paper the most important is to provide us with a dependent variable that is

comparable across parties (from the same party system, as well as from different party systems): the propensity to vote for a party. When the data matrix is stacked so that each voter appears as many times as there are parties for which her utility has been measured (and other variables have been appropriately transformed as explained below), we can pose the question, “What is it that makes a vote for a party attractive to voters?” We already know that voters almost always choose to vote for the party to which they give highest propensity to vote (see note 5). An answer to the question, “What is it that makes a vote for a party attractive to voters?” is therefore also an answer to the question, “What determines which parties are voted for?” The use of this measure to analyze the determinants of party choice has been validated elsewhere (Tillie 1995; Van der Eijk et al. 2006). There are three conceptual and methodological reasons for using the ‘propensity to support’ questions as a dependent variable to answer our research questions.

The first is that the ‘propensity to support’ items allow for a research design that is truly comparative (see below). Were we to use party choice as our dependent variable, we would have to conduct separate analyses for each of the countries. Now we can analyse party preference in one single analysis in which all parties from all countries are included. Alternatively, one could do a comparative analysis with a research design proposed by Lubbers, Gijsberts & Scheepers (2002). They estimated a logistic regression model in which the dependent variable has two values: whether the respondent voted for a radical right party (1) or not (0). We cannot use this design to answer our research question, because it does not allow one to assess whether voters use different criteria in evaluating radical right parties than in evaluating other parties.⁶

Secondly, some of the radical-right wing parties that we are interested in attract so few votes that estimates of the effects of different variables on decisions to vote for any of these parties are highly unreliable. Since the

'propensity to support' items are asked of all respondents, the parameter estimates are more robust.

Finally, if we want to understand the choice process, we cannot afford to look only at the result of that process (the party or candidate voted for) so we cannot use party choice as the dependent variable. This is because we lack important information that we need to model this choice process, such as the relative preferences for parties that a voter does not choose as well as the strength of preference for the party that was chosen. This information is essential because we know that most voters in Western European countries find more than one party attractive. Therefore, in order to model the motivations underlying support for radical right parties, we need information about the attractiveness of all parties to all respondents. Since this is what the 'propensity to support' questions actually measure, we can analyse the choice process by using them as our dependent variable (this argument has been elaborated in more detail elsewhere. See, Van der Eijk 2002; Van der Eijk et al. 2006; Van der Brug et al. forthcoming).

The EES 2004 asked this question for 9 radical right parties, all mentioned in the introduction, from eight European countries: Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy and the Netherlands. To assess whether voters evaluate these 9 parties by the same criteria as they apply to other parties, our study concentrates on the electoral attractiveness of all parties (58 in total) in the eight political systems included in this study. A valid way to analyse individual and inter-party level variations in party preferences simultaneously can be achieved by arranging the data in the so-called 'stacked' (or 'pooled') form that was first proposed by Stimson (1985) and after that applied frequently in electoral research (e.g., MacDonald, Listhaug and Rabinowitz, 1991; van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996; Westholm, 1997). In this stacked data matrix each respondent is represented by as many 'cases' as there are parties for which (s)he was asked to indicate vote propensity. This matrix allows us to apply multiple regression in order to explain parties'

electoral attractiveness. By adding characteristics of political systems and parties as variables in the stacked data matrix, such characteristics can be included as variables in these regression analyses. In order to assess whether voting for radical right parties involves a different kind of decision than does voting for other parties, we will estimate interaction terms for a radical right party on the one hand and a set of independent variables on the other. Before we do this, let us discuss which independent variables in the equation can predict parties' electoral attractiveness and how these are treated in the stacked matrix.

The first predictor of party preference is the subjectively perceived distance between a voter and his or her party in the data matrix on a left-right continuum. Policy voting implies that the closer a party is to someone's own position in terms of policy position, the more attractive this party will be for the person in question. The questionnaire contained a battery of items in which respondents were asked to indicate their own position as well as that of each political party on a 10-point scale, the extremes of which were labelled left and right. These positions are indicative of very general policy preferences. From these responses perceived left-right distances were computed. The stronger the effect of perceived left-right distance on electoral attractiveness, the stronger the extent of ideological voting.

The likelihood of someone voting for radical right parties will also increase when (s)he agrees with its stance on some concrete issues (e.g., Billiet & De Witte, 1995). The European Elections Study 2004 contains just one position issue for which respondents' positions and their perceptions of party positions were measured: European integration. This item yields one more predictor of party preference, i.e., the perceived distance on this scale between each respondent and their respective party in the data matrix.

Other predictors of party preference are three attitude scales: approval of the current national government, approval of the European Union and

satisfaction with the way democracy works. The latter is not regularly included in models of party choice, but since this paper investigates radical right parties that are sometimes critical of parliamentary democracies, we included this measure. The survey also contained the question “what is the most important problem facing the country?” The responses were coded in categories and we created dummy variables, one for each of the categories. These were used to assess the influence of political priorities on party preferences.

In addition to these attitude scales, we included a number of socio-structural and demographic variables in the model: social class, education, gender, religion and age. Class is measured using a variable asking for the respondent’s subjective idea of his/her social class. Religion is a composite variable made up of religious denomination and church attendance.

Creating the stacked data matrix produces a dependent variable, party preference, that is generic in the sense of having no party-specific meaning. The problem here, though, is that the relationships between dependent and independent variables are usually directionally specific. For example, church attendance can be expected to have a negative effect on support for a liberal party and a positive one on support for a Christian democratic party. In the case of the effect of left/right ideology, this directionality problem could be easily overcome when computing the ideological distance between each party and each respondent. This was not the case for the socio-structural and the attitude scales, however, since the surveys do not contain matching party characteristics for them. In order, therefore, to create generic independent variables that can be stacked on top of each other, we adopted a procedure that involves the linear transformation of the original socio-structural and issue variables (see e.g., Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996; Van der Brug, 2004). One outcome of this transformation of some of the predictor variables is that their influence will *always be positive*.⁷

Finally, we included a variable at the party level, *party size*, which represents a strategic consideration that voters may take into account: when two parties are almost equally attractive on all relevant counts, voters tend to vote for the largest one because it stands a better chance of achieving its policy goals. We called this type of voting 'pragmatic'. Party size is measured by each party's proportion of seats in parliament.

In a number of steps we will assess the extent to which support of radical right parties is determined by particular considerations that exert less (or no) effect on support of other parties. These party specific considerations are detected in the following way. First, we will start with an estimation of the regression model using the stacked matrix that includes all 58 parties. We will also do the same for the subgroup of 9 radical right parties, and for the 49 other parties. These analyses will only allow for an *ad oculum* comparison of differences in the effect parameters. As a final step we will therefore explore whether significant interaction effects exist between each of the radical right parties on the one hand and various predictors of party preference on the other. This will be done for the model that was estimated for the total of 58 parties. Such interaction effects, were they to exist, would indicate that support of radical right parties is determined by *party specific* factors. If we cannot find such interaction effects, or if they turn out to be very small, then we will have to conclude that voters treat radical right parties just like any other party.

Results

Table 1 presents the results of three regression analyses. In the first one the model is estimated for all 58 parties, in the second only the 9 radical right parties are included, and the third analysis includes the 49 other parties. In the analyses of all 58 parties a (dummy) variable was included that distinguishes the 9 radical right parties from the 49 others. The regression coefficient for this variable tells us whether any differences exist between the

electoral attractiveness of radical right parties on the one hand and 'mainstream' parties on the other, after controlling for the effects of the other independent variables. In other words, the coefficient tells us whether – after we take the effects of social characteristics, policy preferences, etceteras into account – radical right parties are considered more or less attractive than other parties. Here the findings are somewhat different from those in 1994 and 1999 (see Van der Brug et al. 2000; Van der Brug and Fennema 2003). In those years the dummy variable that distinguishes radical right parties from mainstream parties turned out to yield the only parameter in the equation that did not deviate significantly from zero. However, in 2004 and for the selection of parties included here, the dummy variable for radical right parties is negative and significant. This means that, after all factors that affect preferences for parties have been taken into account, preferences for radical right parties are still on average lower than preferences for other parties (0.65 units on a 10-point scale).

Because different issues are included in the European Elections Studies of 1994, 1999 and 2004, the results presented in Table 1 are not fully comparable to those in previous studies. However, a few general remarks can be made about the model that we tested for 58 parties. In all three years the left/right distance between parties and voters is the strongest determinant of electoral preferences judging by the magnitude of the standardized coefficients. The significance of the left/right dimension for structuring the behaviour of voters has been observed by many scholars (e.g., Fuchs and Klingemann, 1990; Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996; Hix, 1999; Schmitt, 2001).

Another stable finding is that *party size* is the variable with the second strongest effect on party preference. The positive effect of party size shows that, after controlling for policy positions and social characteristics, voters consider a larger party more attractive than a smaller one. Voters who wish to influence policy making take into account the strategic consideration that a

large party has a better chance than a smaller one of realising its policy goals. So, electoral preferences are determined by a combination of *ideological* and *pragmatic* considerations.

Table 1: regressions of full models for the explanation of part support in 8 countries

	All 58 parties			9 radical right parties			49 established parties		
	b	SE	Beta	b	SE	Beta	b	SE	Beta
Social class	0.558	0.037	.075**	0.681	0.126	.077**	0.544	0.039	.076**
Religion	0.625	0.034	.115**	0.813	0.104	.111**	0.607	0.033	.117**
Gender	0.675	0.12	.035**	0.951	0.182	.060**	0.645	0.133	.033**
Education	0.509	0.051	.056**	0.456	0.117	.047**	0.516	0.055	.059**
Age	0.414	0.058	.041**	0.956	0.33	.028*	0.397	0.059	.043**
Importance of issues	0.619	0.045	.076**	0.696	0.09	.111**	0.608	0.05	.074**
EU approval	0.503	0.045	.065**	0.676	0.095	.102**	0.472	0.049	.061**
Government approval	0.655	0.019	.223**	0.597	0.047	.141**	0.649	0.02	.232**
Satisfaction with democracy	0.335	0.04	.045**	0.574	0.086	.077**	0.311	0.044	.043**
Perceived distance European unification	-0.06	0.009	-.044**	-0.062	0.013	-.064**	-0.06	0.01	-.042**
Perceived distance on left right	-0.373	0.009	-.286**	-0.255	0.013	-.262**	-0.402	0.01	-.296**
Radical right party (dummy variable)	-0.651	0.037	-.015**						
Party size	4.353	0.089	.221**	6.133	0.528	.134**	4.301	0.089	.248**
R ² -adjusted	0.365			0.255			0.353		
Number of clusters (respondents)	7,470			7,274			7,461		
Number of units of analysis	56,080			8,358			47,722		

*: significant at p < .01; **: significant at p < .001

The magnitude of the effects of socio-structural variables, issue priorities and attitudes towards the EU, is also remarkably stable. There is only one major difference in comparison with the other years, Government approval has a substantively stronger effect in 2004 than it had in the other election years. In

1999, the standardized effect of government approval was 0.09, whereas in 2004 it is 0.22. Voters tend to base their electoral preferences on their evaluation of the performance of parties in government more than in previous years. Since it is beyond the scope of this paper, we will not explore this matter further here.

How does this general model compare to the model for the 9 radical right parties? The most important conclusion from Table 1 is that most of the effects are quite similar in magnitude. Note that as a result of the linear transformations of most of the independent variables, those parameters are necessarily positive, so that no conclusions can be drawn about the direction of the effects. Socio-structural and demographic characteristics — gender, age, religion, social class and education — have almost the same weak effect on electoral preferences for radical right parties as on electoral preferences for other parties. The effect of left/right distance on electoral preferences is also very similar for the two groups of parties.

Judging by the standardized coefficients, two variables exert weaker effects. The first one is party size, but this difference may be caused by the fact that the variation in party size is substantially smaller among the radical right parties than among the other parties. Note also that the unstandardized coefficient is higher, so that we have to be particularly careful when comparing these effects across different equations. The other effect that is substantially weaker among radical right parties than among other parties is approval of the government. The most likely explanation for this weaker effect is that there are relatively few government parties among the radical right parties, and that this variable has a particularly strong effect on electoral preferences for government parties. We may conclude, however, that support for radical right parties is not strongly determined by dissatisfaction with the government.

In contrast to what one might expect *a priori* on the basis of the nationalist ideologies of parties of the radical right, differences on the issue of European integration exert an effect on preferences for radical right-wing parties that is very similar to the effect it has on preferences for other parties. The same goes for citizens' satisfaction with the EU and satisfaction with the way democracy functions. Despite the anti-parliamentarian rhetoric of these parties, dissatisfaction with democracy is not an important motive for citizens to support these types of parties.

In 1989 and 1994 negative attitudes towards immigrants turned out to be a strong determinant of the vote for radical right parties. The EES of 2004 does not contain measures of attitudes towards immigrants, so the effect of this issue cannot be tested. In many countries the issue will be incorporated in the left/right dimension, so to some extent the strong effect of left/right distances reflects the effect attitudes towards immigrants, but the explained variance of the model would certainly have been higher if these attitudes had been measured.

A final important observation is that socio-structural and demographic variables exert only very weak effects on electoral preferences for either radical right or other parties. Various scholars have observed that cleavage politics is declining in most countries and that this decline is largely compensated for by an increase in policy voting (Franklin, 1992:400). Instead of relying on social positions as a cue when deciding which party to vote for, the increasingly autonomous citizens vote largely on the basis of their policy preferences (e.g., Rose and McAllister, 1986; Dalton, 1996). Our results show that this is just as true of supporters of radical right parties as it is of voters for other parties. Radical right parties do not attract the 'losers of modernity' as Betz used to call them, but they do attract their supporters from across all social strata.

The comparisons between electoral preferences for various radical right parties and those for other parties have so far been made for all 9 parties of the radical right together, and on an *ad oculum* basis. The design of our analysis, with a stacked data matrix in which electoral preferences are studied for all parties simultaneously, provides the opportunity to study differences between radical right-wing parties systematically, and, also to study those between radical right-wing parties and other parties. If a variable has a different effect for one party than it does for all other parties, the regression model should contain an interaction term between the respective party on the one hand and this variable on the other.

To estimate these interactions, we developed two models. The first is the model in Table 1 which is estimated for all 58 parties with three interactions added to the model: interactions between a dummy variable that separates the 9 radical right parties from the other 49 on the one hand, and party size, left/right distance and distance on the issue of European unification on the other.⁸ Model 1 in Table 2 presents the parameter estimates of these interaction terms as well as the main effects of party size, left/right distance and distance on European unification. The models also included the effects of the other independent variables presented in Table 1, but these are not presented, because in order to assess whether the determinants of support for radical right parties are different from the determinants of support for other parties, we need only look at the interaction effects.

The analysis using one dummy variable for the 9 radical right parties together, yields significant positive interaction effects for left/right distance and for party size. These interaction effects must be compared with the main effects in order to interpret them. The main effect of left-right distance on electoral attractiveness (for all parties) is -.401. This negative effect is as expected: the larger the ideological distance the less attractive a party is. The positive interaction effect of left/right distance shows that the negative effect of left-right distance is somewhat weaker for radical right-wing parties than

for the other parties: the unstandardized effect for radical right parties is -.252 (-.401 + .148). The positive interaction effect of party size in Table 2 shows that radical right-wing parties gain more by becoming larger than do other parties. We should, however, take into account the fact that the radical right parties in our sample tend to be relatively small. So, the larger effect could be indicative of certain threshold effects for small parties, as a result of which small parties may benefit more from growth than large parties would. The third interaction term, the one for European unification, turns out not to be statistically significant so this issue has the same weak effect on preferences for radical right parties as on preferences for other parties. In other words, anti-EU feelings contribute little to support for the radical right.

Table 2: Interactions with radical right parties

		Ideological distance (Left-right)	Distance European Unification	Party size
Model 1	Main effects	-.401**	-.059**	4.309**
	9 radical right parties	.148**	-.011	1.510*
Model 2	Main effects	-.401**	-.059**	4.309**
	FPÖ	.149**	-.035	-
	Dansk Folkeparti	.068	-.135**	-
	FN (French)	.120**	-.020	-
	Republikaner	.253**	.027	-
	LAOS	.190**	.014	-
	Alleanza Nazionale	-.065	.032	-
	Lega Nord	.148**	-.055	-
	LPF	.073*	-.016	-
	Justice and Life	.193**	.025	-

Source: European Elections Study 2004

* significant at p<.01; **: significant at p<.001

In the second model we look at all 9 radical right parties separately. Therefore, instead of using a single dummy variable for the 9 radical right parties combined, we added a dummy for each one of them. And we added the interactions between these dummy variables and distances on left/right and on European unification. The relevant results of this model (Model 2) are presented in the lower half of Table 2.

Our findings for 2004 have so far largely confirmed the findings of 1999. However, when we look at the differences among the various parties of the radical right, we must conclude that in 2004 things are different from the way they were back in 1999 and much more different from 1994. In 1994 there was only one single party – the Dutch Centrumdemocraten – for which we found weaker effects of left/right ideology. In 1999 there were more parties for which this was the case: the effect of left/right distance was significantly weaker for the Centrumdemocraten, the Wallonian Front National, the German Republikaner, the Lega Nord, the French Front national and the Danish Fremskridtpartiet. In that year there were four exceptions: the FPÖ, Alleanza Nazionale, Vlaams Blok and Dansk Folkeparti., which were the four most successful radical right parties. Their support was at least as heavily determined by ideology as were votes for other parties. Even though a comparison over time is hindered because we are looking at different parties, the results in 2004 suggest that the trend seems to have continued. The effect of left/right distance is significantly weaker for 7 radical right parties (the German Republikaner, the Italian Lega Nord, the French Front national, the Dutch LPF, the Greek Laos, the Hungarian party for Justice and Life, and the Dutch LPF) than it is for other parties. The effects are of the same magnitude for only two parties; the Danish FP and the Italian AN. It therefore appears that the effect of left/right distances on electoral support for radical right parties has declined overall since 1994.

Conclusion and discussion

Are radical right parties different from other parties in terms of how they attract votes? In the analysis we focused on the differences, and indeed we found some important differences between radical right parties and other parties. The most important difference is that the effect of left/right tends to be weaker. However, when we focus on these differences we tend to overlook large similarities.

A first similarity between the processes that generate support for radical right wing parties and processes generating support for other parties is that the effects of socio-structural variables are weak. This means that radical right wing parties, like most other parties, attract their support from across all strata in society. Secondly, left/right distance is the strongest predictor of support for radical right parties as well as for other parties, even though the effect is weaker for the former than the latter. Thirdly, the effect of party size is at least as important for radical right parties as it is for other parties, so that we may conclude that the pragmatic consideration that a larger party is more attractive than a smaller one because it is in a better position to affect public policies, is just as important to voters when judging a radical right party as it is when judging other parties. Finally, neither dissatisfaction with the functioning of democracy, dissatisfaction with European unification, nor dissatisfaction with the government exerts a strong effect on support for radical right parties. Because of all these similarities, we should be careful not to think of supporters of radical right parties as being the 'losers of modernity' as Betz (1994) used to call them, or as supporting these parties to express general feelings of discontent.

On the other hand, our analyses have revealed large changes since Van der Brug, Fennema and Tillie (2000) concluded, on the basis of the 1994 EES data, that there were hardly any differences between the determinants of support for radical right parties and the determinants of votes for other parties. Nowadays the main difference is that the effect of left/right is weaker. So, why do voters no longer evaluate these parties by their left/right position as much as they used to?

A possible explanation could be that many of these parties, such as the FPÖ, the Republikaner, and Front National, which were once evaluated in left/right terms, have lost whatever credibility they used to have as a result of poor performance as government parties (FPÖ) and internal party conflicts (which have occurred in all of these three). In addition, mainstream right-leaning

parties in many countries have to some extent co-opted the anti-immigration positions of the radical right. It is conceivable that the single issue character of these parties became more evident and more problematic when their prime issues were co-opted. We expect the effect of left/right to be weaker for single issue parties than for parties with a broader ideological profile, because left/right is a generic ideological dimension. Moreover, when these parties lose their 'unique selling proposition' because the mainstream right co-opts their core issues their protest character may also become more visible.

The parties that resisted this trend, the Dansk Folkepartit and Alleanza Nazionale, have managed to build up a good, functioning party organization. They have either been members of a coalition government (AN) or have passively supported a government (DFP), without creating internal party struggles. Because of this they have been able to promote the further restriction of immigration,⁹ but they are still evaluated in generic terms and not only in connection to the issue of immigration. This may be the key to their sustained electoral success.

Notes

¹ Some even used 1930s jargon, such as the "fall of the Occident".

² Unfortunately, we cannot include Vlaams Blok from Flanders, Front National from Wallonia, New Democracy from Sweden, the British National Party from Britain and the National Party from Poland, because the relevant variables are missing.

³ For some smaller radical right parties, such as the Dutch Centrumdemocraten, these studies found only very weak effects of policy preferences. This could mean that the supporters of such parties were indeed protest voters, but in the absence of indicators of discontent, this cannot be established.

⁴ In practice the parties asked about included only those with representation in the national parliament or those widely expected to obtain representation in the European Parliament.

⁵ In practice this occurs about 93% of the time in established EU member states.

⁶ Moreover, a dependent variable that distinguishes only between the radical right and other parties does not realistically reflect the electoral process.

⁷ Except for odd cases where statistically insignificant effects can become negative in multivariate models.

⁸ The method does not allow us to estimate interaction effects for the other variables in the model. This is because their effects were originally estimated using a procedure that involves a linear transformation of the original variables. This procedure provides a valid way to estimate the strength of each of the independent variables, but at the same time rules out the possibility of estimating interaction effects. As this paper focuses primarily on the effect of party size and left-right distance (two variables that were not transformed) we do not consider this to be a problem here.

⁹ The position of Alleanza Nazionale on this issue is diffuse. AN's leader Fini was, as a minister, responsible for the Bossi-Fini law to restrict immigration, but he also supported a proposal to grant the right to vote in municipal elections to legal immigrants in Italy. Apparently, AN is an anti-immigration party, but not an anti-immigrant party.

References

- Betz, H-G. (1994). *Radical Right-wing Populism in Western Europe*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Betz, H-G. (1998a). Introduction, In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 1-10.
- Betz, H-G. (1998b). Against Rome: The Lega Nord. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 45-58.
- Betz, H-G. & S. Immerfall (1998). *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Billiet, J. & H. de Witte (1995). Attitudinal dispositions to vote for a "new" extreme right-wing party: the case of "Vlaams Blok". *European Journal of Political Research* 27 (2): 181-202.
- Brug, W. van der (1999). Voters' perceptions and party dynamics. *Party Politics* 5 (2): 147-169.

Brug, W. van der, M. Fennema & J. Tillie (2000). Anti-immigrant parties in Europe: Ideological or protest vote? *European Journal of Political Research* 37:77-102.

Brug, W van der & M. Fennema (2000). Is een cordon sanitaire wel gezond? *Streven* September 2000: 692-696.

Budge, I. & D. J. Farlie (1983). *Explaining and Predicting Elections. Issue Effects and Party Strategies in Twenty-three Democracies*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Budge, I., D. Robertson, & D. Hearl (1987). *Ideology, Strategy and Party Change: Spatial Analyses of Post-War Election Programs in 19 Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton, R.J. (1996). *Citizen Politics in Western Democracies; Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Chatham: Chatham House.

Derks, A. & K. Deschouwer (1998). Vrijzinigen, ongelovigen en protest. In: Marc Swyngedouw, Jaak Billiet, Ann Carton & Roeland Beerten (eds.), *Kiezen is verliezen. Onderzoek naar de politieke opvattingen van Vlamingen*. Acco, Leuven/Amersfoort:85-112.22.

Donselaar, J. van (1993). Post-war fascism in the Netherlands, *Crime, Law and Social Change* 19: 87-100.

Eatwell, Roger (1998). The Dynamics of Right-wing Electoral Breakthrough. *Patterns of Prejudice* 32: 1-31.

Eijk, C. van der (2002). Design Issues in Electoral Research: Taking Care of (Core) Business. *Electoral Studies* 21 (in print).

Eijk, C. van der & M. Franklin (1996). *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Eijk, C. van der, M. Franklin, & W. van der Brug (1999). Policy Preferences and Party Choice. In: H. Schmitt & J. Thomassen (eds.), *Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eijk, C. van der, M. Franklin & H. Schmitt (1999). *European Elections Study 1999: Design, Implementation and Results*. Cologne: Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung.

Evans, J., K. Arzheimer, G. Baldini, T. Bjørklund, E. Carter, S. Fisher, G. Ivaldi (2001). Comparative Mapping of extreme right electoral dynamics: an overview of EREPS ('Extreme Right Electorates and Party Success'). *European Political Science* 1(1): 42-53.

Fennema, M. (1997). Some conceptual issues and problems in the comparison of anti-immigrant parties in Western Europe. *Party Politics* 3: 473-492.

Fennema, M. (2000). Legal repression of extreme-right parties and racial discrimination. In: R. Koopmans & P. Statham (eds), *Challenging immigration and ethnic relations politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 119-144.

Fennema, M. & M. Maussen (2000). Dealing with Extremists in Public Discussion: Front national and "Republican Front" in France. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 8:379-400.

Fennema, M. & C. Pollmann (1998). Ideology of Anti-Immigrant Parties in the European Parliament. *Acta Politica* 33: 111-138.

Franklin, M. (1992). The Decline of Cleavage Politics. In: M. Franklin, T. Mackie, & H. Valen (eds.), *Electoral Change. Responses to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fuchs, D. & H.D. Klingemann (1990). The left-right scheme: theoretical framework. In: M.K. Jennings & J. van Deth (eds.), *Continuities in Political Action: A Longitudinal Study of Political Orientations in Three Western Democracies*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Griffin, R., 1996. The 'post-fascism' of the Alleanza Nazionale: a case study in ideological morphology. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 1: 123-145.

Hainsworth, Paul, ed. 2000. *The Politics of the Extreme Right: From the Margins to the Mainstream*. London: Pinter.

-
- Hix, S. (1999). Dimensions and Alignments in European Union Politics: Cognitive Constraints and Partisan Responses. *European Journal of Political Research* 35:69-106.
- Holsteyn, J. van, 1990. En wij dan? De kiezers van de Centrumdemocraten. *Socialisme en Democratie* 47: 158-161.
- Ignazi, P. (1992), 'The silent counter-revolution: Hypotheses on the emergence of extreme right-wing parties in Europe'. *European Journal of Political Research* 22(1): 3-34.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Style among Western Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kitschelt, H. (1995). *The Radical Right in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Klingemann, H.D., R.I. Hofferbert, & I. Budge (1994). *Parties, Policies, and Democracy*. Boulder, Col: Westview Press.
- Lubbers, M. (2001). *Exclusionistic Electorates. Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe*. Nijmegen: ICS-dissertation.
- Lubbers, M., M. Gijsberts & P. Scheepers (2002). Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe. Accepted for publication in the *European Journal of Political Research*.
- Lubbers, M., P. Scheepers & J. Billiet (2000). Individual and Contextual Characteristics of the Vlaams Blok vote. *Acta Politica*, 35: 363-398.
- Lubbers, M. & P. Scheepers (2000). Individual and Contextual Characteristics of the German extreme right vote in the 1990s. *European Journal of Political Research* 38 (1): 63-94.
- Lucardie, P. (1998). The Netherlands: The Extreme Right Center Parties. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 111-124.
- Lucardie, P. (2000). Prophets, purifiers and prolocutors: towards a theory of emergence of new parties. *Party Politics* 6, 2: 175-186.

Macdonald, S.E., O. Listhaug, & G. Rabinowitz (1991). Issues and Party Support in Multiparty Systems. *American Political Science Review* 85:1107-31.

Mayer, Nona (1998). The French National Front. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 11-26.

Mayer, N. & P. Perrineau (1992). Why do they vote for Le Pen? *European Journal of Political Research* 22 (1): 123-141.

Mayer, N. & P. Moreau (1995). Electoral support for the German Republikaner and the French National Front 1989-1994. Paper presented at the Workshop on Racist Parties in Europe of the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Bordeaux 27 April - 2 May 1995.

Mudde, C. & J. van Holsteyn (2000). The Netherlands: explaining the limited success of the extreme right. In: P. Hainsworth (ed.), *The Politics of the Extreme Right. From the Margins to the Mainstream*. London and New York: Pinter: 144-171.

Nieuwbeerta, P. & W. Ultee (1999). Class Voting in Western Industrialized Countries, 1945-1990: Systematizing and Testing Explanations. *European Journal of Political Research* 35:123-160.

Riedlsperger, M. (1998). The Freedom Party of Austria: From Protest to Radical Right Populism. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan:27-44.

Rose, R. & I. McAllister (1986). *Voters Begin to Choose*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Schmitt, H. (2001). *Politische Repräsentation in Europa*. Frankfurt: Campus.

Stimson, J.A. (1985). Regression in Space and Time: A Statistical Essay. *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 914-47.

Stouthuysen, P. (1993). *Extrem-Rechts in na-oorlogs Europa*. Brussel: VUB Press.

Svasand, L. (1998). Scandinavian Ringt-Wing Radicalism. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 77-94.

Swyngedouw, M. (1998). The Extreme Right in Belgium: Of a Non-existent Front National and an Omnipresent Vlaams Blok. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 59-76.

Swyngedouw, M., J. Billiet, A. Carton & R. Beerten (1998). *De (on)redelijke kiezer. Onderzoek naar de politieke opvattingen van Vlamingen. Verkiezingen van 21 mei 1995*. Leuven: ACCO.

Tillie, J. (1995). *Party Utility and Voting Behaviour*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Westholm, A. (1997). Distance Versus Direction: The Illusory Defeat of the Proximity Theory of Electoral Choice. *American Political Science Review* 91:865-83.

Winkler, J. & S. Schumann (1998). Radical Right-Wing Parties in Contemporary Germany. In: Hans-Georg Betz & Stephan Immerfall (eds.), *The new politics of the right: neo-populist parties and movements in established democracies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 95-110.

Appendix

The stacked matrix, combining party preferences for the 58 parties from 8 political systems has a total of 56.080 units of analysis, after deletion of missing cases in the dependent variable. To estimate the parameters of the regression models, units of analyses are weighted in two steps. As a result of the weight factor applied in the first step respondents in each system are weighted in such a way that their party choice in the European Elections 2004 reflect exactly the actual election results. In the second step this weight variable is multiplied by a (different) constant for each system, so that the

eight systems in the stacked matrix contain the same number of cases. This weight variable was used for the analyses in which all parties from the 8 different political systems are analysed simultaneously. Each time groups of parties are selected, the variable generated in the first stage is multiplied by yet different constants for each system, so that in all regressions presented in Table 1 the eight systems in the stacked matrix contain the same number of units of analysis each.

Because we stacked the data, the unit of analysis is no longer the individual respondent, but the respondent/party combination. Since these are not independent observations, we computed panel corrected standard errors, and reported significance on the basis of these tests. To be precise, we did these analyses in STATA, using the robust estimate of variance (known as the Huber/White/Sandwich estimate of variance) and the “cluster” option to adjust for the dependency among observations pertaining to the same respondent (Rogers, 1993; Williams, 2000). Each of the 7.470 respondents was defined as a separate cluster.