Table A1: Extreme right parties in Europe

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Countries***  | ***Extreme Right Parties*** | ***Sources*** |
| Austria | None |  |
| Belgium | Front National (2007), Belgians Rise Up(check) | First: part of: http://aemn.infoSecond: https://www.asiaone.com/world/belgium-bans-anti-semitic-hatefest |
| Bulgaria | Ataka | (Bustikova, 2018) |
| Croatia | None |  |
| Cyprus | National Popular Front (ELAM) | (Katsourides, 2012) |
| Czech Republic | Worker’s Party of Social Justice | (Minkenberg, 2013) |
| Denmark | None |  |
| Estonia | None |  |
| Finland | None |  |
| France | Front National (-2011) | Under Jean-Marie Le Pen due to fascism |
| Germany | National Democratic Party | (Minkenberg, 2013) |
| Greece | Golden Daw | (Vasilopoulou and Halikiopoulou, 2015) |
| Hungary | Jobbik | (Minkenberg, 2013) |
| Ireland | None |  |
| Italy | Fiamma Tricolore, Forza Nuova, CasaPound | (Minkenberg, 2013) |
| Latvia | All for Latvia (-2006) | (Bustikova, 2009) |
| Lithuania | Young Lithuania | (Bustikova, 2018) |
| Luxemburg | None |  |
| Malta | None |  |
| Netherlands | None |  |
| Poland | None |  |
| Portugal | National Renovator Party | (Marchi, 2013) |
| Romania | Greater Romania Party | (Minkenberg, 2013) |
| Slovakia | Our Slovakia | (Bustikova, 2018) |
| Slovenia | Slovenian National Party | (Bustikova, 2009) |
| Spain | Espana 2000, National Democracy | (Alonso and Rovira Kaltwasser, 2015) |
| Sweden | None |  |
| United Kingdom | British National Party | (Minkenberg, 2013) |

Table A2: Variables Descriptions and Sources

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Variable*** | ***Description*** | ***Sources*** |
| Vote for extreme right parties (erp\_vote) | Percentage of votes for extreme right parties in National parliamentary elections from 2004-2015 | Various Sources: ParlGov database (Döring and Manow 2019)Political Yearbook: www.politicaldatayearbook.com |
| Transformed Dependent Variable | DV = log(erp\_vote + sqrt(erp\_vote^2 + 1)) | Own Calculation |
| IMF Unemployment (%) | Percentage of Unemployment: years used for each country: year prior to elections (2004-2014) | http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2014/01/weodata/download.aspx(IMF, 2014) |
| real GDP growth (%) | Growth of real GDP, percent change from previous year  | http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2014/01/weodata/download.aspx(IMF, 2014) |
| Quality of Government | Row mean of the variables, control for corruption, rule of law, regulatory quality, government effectiveness, political stability and voice and accountability | Own Calculation:  |
| Control For Corruption (CCE) Index (-2.5 to 2.5) | Control of Corruption - Estimate: ”Control of Corruption” measures perceptions of corruption, conventionally defined as the exercise of public power for private gain. The particular aspect of corruption measured by the various sources differs somewhat, ranging from the frequency of ”additional payments to get things done”, to the effects of corruption on the business environment, to measuring ”grand corruption” in the political arena or in the tendency of elite forms to engage in ”state capture”. Years used for each country: year prior to elections if applicable, otherwise the elections years. | Worldbankhttp://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home(Kaufmann et al., 2010) |
| Rule of Law (RLE) Index (-2.5 to 2.5) | Rule of Law - Estimate: ”Rule of Law” includes several indicators which measure the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society. These include perceptions of the incidence of crime, the effectiveness and predictability of the judiciary, and the enforceability of contracts. Together, these indicators measure the success of a society in developing an environment in which fair and predictable rules form the basis for economic and social interactions and the extent to which property rights are protected. Years used for each country: year prior to elections if applicable, otherwise the elections years. | Worldbankhttp://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home(Kaufmann et al., 2010) |
| Government Effectiveness | ”Government Effectiveness” combines into a single groupingresponses on the quality of public service provision, the quality of the bureaucracy, the competenceof civil servants, the independence of the civil service from political pressures, and the credibility ofthe government’s commitment to policies. The main focus of this index is on ”inputs” required forthe government to be able to produce and implement good policies and deliver public goods. | Worldbankhttp://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home(Kaufmann et al., 2010) |
| Regulatory Quality | ”Regulatory Quality” includes measures of the incidence of market unfriendlypolicies such as price controls or inadequate bank supervision, as well as perceptions of theburdens imposed by excessive regulation in areas such as foreign trade and business development. | Worldbankhttp://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home(Kaufmann et al., 2010) |
| Political stability and absence of violence | ”Political Stability” combines several indicators which measure perceptionsof the likelihood that the government in power will be destabilized or overthrown by possiblyunconstitutional and/or violent means, including domestic violence and terrorism. | Worldbankhttp://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home(Kaufmann et al., 2010) |
| Voice and Accountability | ”Voice and Accountability” includes a number of indicatorsmeasuring various aspects of the political process, civil liberties and political rights. These indicatorsmeasure the extent to which citizens of a country are able to participate in the selection of governments.This category also includes indicators measuring the independence of the media, which servesan important role in monitoring those in authority and holding them accountable for their actions. | Worldbankhttp://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home(Kaufmann et al., 2010) |
| Control For Corruption and Rule of Law Row Mean (CCE and RLE Row Mean) | Row mean of Control for Corruption and Rule of Law for each country.  | Own Calculation |
| Government Capacity | Row mean of the variables government effectiveness and regulatory quality | Own Calculation |
| Government Selection | Row mean of the variables Political Stability and Voice and Accountability | Own Calculation |
| MRP Positions on Cultural Issues | Measures the positions of mainstream right parties on issues related to immigration.Row Total of the variables: immigration policy, multiculturalism and ethnic minorities. | Own calculation All variables gathered from Chapel Hill Expert Survey Trend File (Baker et al., 2015) |
| MRP Positions on Social Issues | Measures the position of mainstream right parties in EU-28 on social issues.row mean of the variables: gal/tan, civil liberties/law and order, social lifestyle, religious principle, immigration policy, multiculturalism and ethnic minorities. | Own calculation. All variables gathered from Chapel Hill Expert Survey Trend File (Baker et al., 2015) |
| MRPs Incumbent | Measures the extent to which mainstream-right parties were incumbent or not before the elections. | Own Calculation |
| Electoral Rule House | Which electoral rule (proportional representation or plurality) governs the election of the majority ofHouse seats? This is coded 1 if most seats are Plurality, zero if most seats are Proportional. In caseswhere the majority of legislators are appointed or indirectly elected, the variable is coded Indirect. | Database of Political Institutions 2017 (Scartascini et al., 2018) |
| Asylum Seekers (%) | Refugee population by country or territory of asylum (World Development Indicators: <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>(World Bank, 2016) as percentage of Population | Own calculation |
| Effective Number of Parties (votes level) | Effective number of parties on the votes level according to the formula [N2] pro-posed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979). Years used for each country: year prior to elections | Armingeon, Wegner, Wiedemeier, Isler, Knoepfel, Weisstanner and Engler http://www.cpds-data.org/(Armingeon et al., 2018) |
| Electoral Threshold | What is the vote threshold for representation? Records the minimum vote share that a party mustobtain in order to take at least one seat in PR systems. If there are more than one threshold, record the one that governs the most seats. | Database of Political Institutions 2017 (Scartascini et al., 2018) |
| Voting Turnout | Voting turnout in elections | Armingeon, Wegner, Wiedemeier, Isler, Knoepfel, Weisstanner and Engler http://www.cpds-data.org/(Armingeon et al., 2018) |
| National way of life (MRPs positions) | National Way of Life: Positive – National Way of Life: NegativeNational Way of Life: PositiveFavourable mentions of the manifesto country’s nation, history, and general appeals. May include:• Support for established national ideas;• General appeals to pride of citizenship;• Appeals to patriotism;• Appeals to nationalism;• Suspension of some freedoms in order to protect the state against subversion.National Way of Life: NegativeUnfavourable mentions of the manifesto country’s nation and history. May include:• Opposition to patriotism;• Opposition to nationalism;• Opposition to the existing national state, national pride, and national ideas. | Data gathered from Manifesto Project: <https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/> Volkens, Andrea / Krause, Werner / Lehmann, Pola / Matthieß, Theres / Merz, Nicolas/ Regel, Sven / Weßels, Bernhard(2019): The Manifesto Data Collection. ManifestoProject (MRG / CMP / MARPOR). Version 2019b. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlinfür Sozialforschung (WZB). <https://doi.org/10.25522/manifesto.mpds.2019b> |
| National way of life (positive) | National Way of Life: PositiveFavourable mentions of the manifesto country’s nation, history, andgeneral appeals. May include:• Support for established national ideas;• General appeals to pride of citizenship;• Appeals to patriotism;• Appeals to nationalism;• Suspension of some freedoms in order to protect the state againstsubversion.For all documents that have been coded with version 5 of the CodingInstructions | Data gathered from Manifesto Project: <https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/> Volkens, Andrea / Krause, Werner / Lehmann, Pola / Matthieß, Theres / Merz, Nicolas/ Regel, Sven / Weßels, Bernhard(2019): The Manifesto Data Collection. ManifestoProject (MRG / CMP / MARPOR). Version 2019b. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlinfür Sozialforschung (WZB). <https://doi.org/10.25522/manifesto.mpds.2019b> |
| Far-right issues | Measures mainstream right parties salience on national way of life and multiculturalism. The variable created from four variables gathered from Manifesto Project, and more specifically salience = national way of life positive + multiculturalism negative  | Own Calculation.Data gathered from Manifesto Project: <https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/> Volkens, Andrea / Krause, Werner / Lehmann, Pola / Matthieß, Theres / Merz, Nicolas/ Regel, Sven / Weßels, Bernhard(2019): The Manifesto Data Collection. ManifestoProject (MRG / CMP / MARPOR). Version 2019b. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlinfür Sozialforschung (WZB). <https://doi.org/10.25522/manifesto.mpds.2019b>  |
| Satisfaction with Democracy Index | These index scores represent an average of all country-survey scores available within each country-year observation. Overlapping country-survey are averaged to create unique country-year observations.Scores range from 0 representing the lowest possible level of satisfaction to 100 representing the highest possible level. | Human Understanding Measured Across National (HUMAN) Surveys<https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/KIPB57> (Klassen, 2018) |
| Political Corruption Index | Political corruption. Question: How pervasive is political corruption?Clarification: The directionality of the V-Dem corruption index runs from less corrupt to more corrupt (unlike the other V-Dem variables that generally run from less democratic to more democratic situation). The corruption index includes measures of six distinct types of corruption that cover both different areas and levels of the polity realm, distinguishing between executive, legislative and judicial corruption. Within the executive realm, the measures also distinguish between corruption mostly pertaining to bribery and corruption due to embezzlement. Finally, they differentiate between corruption in the highest echelons of the executive (at the level of the rulers/cabinet) on the one hand, and in the public sector at large on the other. The measures thus tap into several distinguished 640 types of corruption: both ’petty’ and ’grand’; both bribery and theft; both corruption aimed and influencing law making and that affecting implementation. Aggregation: The index is arrived at by taking the average of (a) public sector corruption index; (b) executive corruption index; (c) the indicator for legislative corruption; and (d) the indicator for judicial corruption. In other words, these four different government spheres are weighted equally in the resulting index. V-Dem replace missing values for countries with no legislature by only taking the average of (a), (b) and (d). | Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project: <https://v-dem.net/en/data/> (Coppedge et al., 2017) (Pemstein et al., 2018) |
| Bayesian Corruption Index | The BCI index values lie between 0 and 100, with an increase in the index corresponding to a raise in the level of corruption. This is a first difference with CPI and WGI where an increase means that the level of corruption has decreased.There exists no objective scale on which to measure the perception of corruption and the exact scaling you use is to a large extent arbitrary. However, we were able to give the index an absolute scale: zero corresponds to a situation where all surveys say that there is absolutely no corruption. On the other hand, when the index is one, all surveys say that corruption is as bad as it gets according to their scale. This is another difference with CPI and WGI, where the scaling is relative. They are rescaled such that WGI has mean 0 and a standard deviation of 1 in each year, while CPI always lies between 0 and 100.In contrast, the actual range of values of the BCI will change in each year, depending how close countries come to the situation where everyone agrees there is no corruption at all (0), or that corruption is as bad as it can get (100). By way of illustration, the figure below shows the histogram of the BCI in 2014. The country with the lowest level of corruption is New Zealand (15.4), whilecorruption is most problematic in Somalia (70.9).The absolute scale of the BCI index was obtained by rescaling all the individual survey data such that zero corresponds to the lowest possible level of corruption and 1 to the highest one. We subsequently rescaled the BCI index such that when all underlying indicators are zero (one), the expected value of the BCI index is zero (hundred). | The Bayesian Corruption Index - 2018 update.(Standaert, 2015) |
| Postcommunist dummy | 1 if countries are postcommunist – 0 otherwise Postcommunist countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia | Own calculation |
| South European dummy | 1 if countries are in South Europe – 0 otherwise South European countries: Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain | Own calculation |
| Postcommunist/South European dummy | 1 if countries are either postcommunist or south European – 0 otherwise | Own calculation |

Figure A1:QoG and ERPs vote share across Europe



Table A3: Correlation between Satisfaction with Democracy and Quality of Government

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Satisfaction with Democracy | Quality of Government |
| Satisfaction with Democracy | 1.0000 |  |
| Quality of Government | 0.8394 | 1.0000 |

Figure A2: Relationship between Satisfaction with democracy and quality of government



Table A4: Summary Statistics of all variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Min | Max |
| ERPs vote share  | 90 | 1.531078 | 3.388663 | 0 | 20.22 |
| Transformed DV | 90 | .6387486 | .998135 | 0 | 3.70043 |
| Quality of Government | 90 | 1.01705 | .5218111 | -.0464918 | 1.908547 |
| Control for Corruption and Rule of Law Mean | 90 | 1.011043 | .7356749 | -.2624495 | 2.24216 |
| Government Capacity | 90 | 1.134887 | .5249662 | -.1705045 | 2.066595 |
| Government Selection | 90 | .9052201 | .3637561 | .232786 | 1.692318 |
| Control for Corruption | 90 | .9539356 | .8479524 | -.303652 | 2.5 |
| Government Effectiveness | 90 | 1.104999 | .62659 | -.316024 | 2.3449 |
| Political Stability and Absence of Violence | 90 | .6987221 | .4250948 | -.305335 | 1.51389 |
| Rule of Law | 90 | 1.06815 | .6428085 | -.227121 | 2.12056 |
| Regulatory Quality | 90 | 1.164774 | .4548137 | -.072293 | 1.90389 |
| Voice and Accountability | 90 | 1.111718 | .3951302 | .295875 | 2.5 |
| MRPs Positions on Immigration, Multiculturalism and Ethnic Minorities  | 90 | 19.6682 | 3.05145 | 9.749269 | 24.76786 |
| MRPs Positions on Social Issues | 90 | 44.6533 | 7.830914 | 27.23757 | 58.48 |
| National way of life (position) | 86 | 2.59436  | 2.631623 | 0 | 12.048 |
| National way of life (positive) (salience) | 87 | 2.54023 | 2.641089 | 0 | 12.05 |
| Far-right issues (salience) | 87 | 3.469425 | 3.625428 | 0 | 18.81 |
| MRPs Incumbent | 90 | .4 | .4926425 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployment (%) | 90 | 9.648122 | 5.016642 | 3.3 | 26.47 |
| Real GDP Growth | 90 | 1.688778 | 4.120205 | -14.35 | 11.09 |
| Asylum Seekers (%) | 90 | .222311 | .3452964 | .00037 | 1.9754 |
| Effective number of parties on votes level | 90 | 4.90402 | 1.559035 | 2.05005 | 10.06918 |
| Voting Turnout | 90 | 68.24667 | 13.497 | 39.2 | 93.3 |
| Electoral Rule House | 90 | .1 | .3016807 | 0 | 1 |
| Electoral Threshold | 84 | 3.942143 | 4.223053 | 0 | 25 |
| Satisfaction with Democracy Index | 88 | 49.59342 | 13.54137 | 20.84309 | 80.09397 |
| Political Corruption Index | 88 | .1988179 | .1858928 | .0059285 | .7857288 |
| Bayesian Corruption Index | 90 | 38.11589 | 12.84644 | 14.5244 | 56.383 |

Figure A3: ERP's Vote Share (2004-2015)



Table A5: Test for Autocorrelation before the transformation of the DV

|  |
| --- |
| Wooldridge test for autocorrelation in panel data |
| H0: no first order autocorrelation |
| F( 1, 22) = 34.703 |
| Prob > F = 0.0000 |

Table A6:Test for Autocorrelation after the transformation of the DV

|  |
| --- |
| Wooldridge test for autocorrelation in panel data |
| H0: no first order autocorrelation |
| F( 1, 22) = 0.724 |
| Prob > F = 0.4041 |

Table A7: Test for heteroskedasticity

|  |
| --- |
| Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity  |
| Ho: Constant variance |
| Variables: fitted values of ihs\_dep2 |
| chi2(1) = 17.42 |
| Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 |

*Table A8: Dependent Variable Summary Statistics (Before and After the transformation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Variance | skewness | kurtosis |
| Vote Share (%) Extreme Right Parties | 90 | 1.531 | 3.389 | 11.48 | 3.354 | 15.99 |
| Transformed Dependent Variable | 90 | 0.639 | 0.998 | 0.996 | 1.408 | 3.783 |

Table A9: Correlation Matrix, Quality of Government variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Control for Corruption | Government Effectiveness | Political Stability and Absence of Violence | Rule of Law | Regulatory Quality | Voice and Accountability |
| Control for Corruption | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government Effectiveness | 0.9451 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| Political Stability and Absence of Violence | 0.5913 | 0.5924 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| Rule of Law | 0.9473 | 0.9408 | 0.5996 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| Regulatory Quality | 0.8968 | 0.8823 | 0.5829 | 0.9095 | 1.0000 |  |
| Voice and Accountability | 0.8637 | 0.8437 | 0.5728 | 0.8535 | 0.8212 | 1.0000 |

*Source*: Data from Worldwide Governance Indicators gathered from Quality of Government Institute.

Table A10: Summary statistics of Quality of Government variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | N | Mean | sd | min | max |
| Control for Corruption | 90 | 0.954 | 0.848 | -0.304 | 2.500 |
| Government Effectiveness | 90 | 1.105 | 0.627 | -0.316 | 2.345 |
| Political Stability and Absence of Violence | 90 | 0.699 | 0.425 | -0.305 | 1.514 |
| Rule of Law | 90 | 1.068 | 0.643 | -0.227 | 2.121 |
| Regulatory Quality | 90 | 1.165 | 0.455 | -0.0723 | 1.904 |
| Voice and Accountability | 90 | 1.112 | 0.395 | 0.296 | 2.500 |
| Control for Corruption and Rule of Law Row Mean | 90 | 1.011 | 0.736 | -0.262 | 2.242 |
| QoG | 90 | 1.017 | 0.522 | -0.0465 | 1.909 |
| Government Selection | 90 | 0.905 | 0.364 | 0.233 | 1.692 |
| Government Capacity | 90 | 1.135 | 0.525 | -0.171 | 2.067 |

*Source*: Data from Worldwide Governance Indicators gathered from Quality of Government Institute. *Note*: The variables Control for Corruption and Rule of Law Row Mean, Quality of Government, Government Selection and Government Capacity are calculated by the author based on data from Worldwide Governance Indicators.

Table A11: Cronbach's Alpha test for QoG variable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Obs | Sign | item-test correlation | item-rest correlation | Average interitem correlation | alpha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control for Corruption | 90 | + | 0.9625 | 0.9444 | 0.7599 | 0.9406 |
| Government Effectiveness | 90 | + | 0.9552 | 0.9336 | 0.7639 | 0.9418 |
| Political Stability  | 90 | + | 0.7230 | 0.6154 | 0.8904 | 0.9760 |
| Rule of Law | 90 | + | 0.9637 | 0.9461 | 0.7592 | 0.9404 |
| Regulatory Quality | 90 | + | 0.9347 | 0.9039 | 0.7750 | 0.9451 |
| Voice and Accountability | 90 | + | 0.9094 | 0.8677 | 0.7888 | 0.9492 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test scale |  |  |  |  | 0.7895 | 0.9575 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A12: Summary Statistics of Ideological Positions of Mainstream Right Parties

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | N | mean | sd | min | max |
| **MRPs Positions on Social Issues** | 90 | 44.6533 | 7.830914 | 27.23757 | 58.48 |
| **MRPs Positions on Cultural Issues** | 90 | 19.67 | 3.051 | 9.749 | 24.77 |
| *GAL-TAN* | 90 | 6.392 | 1.466 | 3.125 | 9.570 |
| *Civil Liberties - Law and Order* | 90 | 6.603 | 1.263 | 4.125 | 9.430 |
| *Social Lifestyle* | 90 | 5.935 | 1.798 | 1.875 | 9.710 |
| *Religious Principle* | 90 | 6.054 | 1.963 | 2 | 9.430 |
| *Immigration Policy* | 90 | 6.646 | 1.142 | 2.611 | 8.455 |
| *Multiculturalism* | 90 | 6.774 | 1.234 | 3.263 | 8.778 |
| *Ethnic Minorities* | 90 | 6.248 | 1.089 | 3.875 | 8.375 |
| Number of id | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |

*Source*: Data from Chapel Hill Expert Survey 1999-2014 trend file. *Note*: The first two variables, Ideology of Mainstream Right and Anti-Immigration Mainstream-Right Parties have been calculated by the author based on data from Chapel Hill Expert Survey.

Table A13: Cronbach's Alpha test for MRP1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | average |  |
|  |  |  | item-test | item-rest | interitem |  |
| Item | Obs | Sign | correlation | correlation | correlation | alpha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *GAL-TAN* | 90 | + | 0.9086 | 0.8665 | 0.4932 | 0.8538 |
| *Civil Liberties - Law and Order* | 90 | + | 0.7422 | 0.6404 | 0.5536 | 0.8815 |
| *Social Lifestyle* | 90 | + | 0.8117 | 0.7324 | 0.5284 | 0.8705 |
| *Religious Principle* | 90 | + | 0.7331 | 0.6285 | 0.5570 | 0.8829 |
| *Immigration Policy* | 90 | + | 0.7039 | 0.5910 | 0.5676 | 0.8873 |
| *Multiculturalism* | 90 | + | 0.8291 | 0.7560 | 0.5221 | 0.8676 |
| *Ethnic Minorities* | 90 | + | 0.7210 | 0.6129 | 0.5613 | 0.8848 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test scale |  |  |  |  | 0.5404 | 0.8917 |

Table A14: Cronbach's Alpha test for MRP on immigration, multiculturalism and ethnic minorities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | average |  |
|  |  |  | item-test | item-rest | interitem |  |
| Item | Obs | Sign | correlation | correlation | correlation | alpha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Immigration Policy* | 90 | + | 0.8754 | 0.7164 | 0.6713 | 0.8034 |
| *Multiculturalism* | 90 | + | 0.9011 | 0.7693 | 0.6035 | 0.7527 |
| *Ethnic Minorities* | 90 | + | 0.8621 | 0.6901 | 0.7063 | 0.8279 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test scale |  |  |  |  | 0.6604 | 0.8537 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A15: Baseline Model after the inclusion of interaction terms between variables on Quality of Government and Ideological Positions of Mainstream-Right Parties on Social Issues

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Columns | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Key IV | QoG1/Anti-Immigration | QoG1/social Issues | QoG1/National Way of Life |
|  |  |  |  |
| QoG | 11.80\*\* | 7.547 | -3.392\*\* |
|  | (4.734) | (5.020) | (1.604) |
| Anti-Immigration | 0.716\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.175) |  |  |
| QoG # Anti-Immigration | -0.625\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.205) |  |  |
| Social Issues |  | 0.225\*\*\* |  |
|  |  | (0.0735) |  |
| QoG#Social Issues |  | -0.198\*\* |  |
|  |  | (0.0924) |  |
| National Way of Life |  |  | 0.388\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.178) |
| QoG # National Way of Life |  |  | -0.379\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.189) |
| Unemployment (%) | -0.0153 | 0.000116 | -0.0318 |
|  | (0.0330) | (0.0374) | (0.0381) |
| Real GDP Growth | -0.0137 | -0.00696 | -0.000656 |
|  | (0.0273) | (0.0291) | (0.0299) |
| Asylum Seekers (% of population) | 2.178 | 1.999 | 2.513 |
|  | (1.722) | (1.867) | (2.065) |
| Electoral Rule House = Plurality | 0.368 | -0.561 | -0.382 |
|  | (1,580) | (2,027) | (1,046) |
| Constant | -18.20 | -12.99 | 0.105 |
|  | (468.5) | (683.4) | (368.2) |
| Sigma\_u | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | (0.0956) | (0.104) | (0.109) |
| Sigma\_e | 0.655\*\*\* | 0.717\*\*\* | 0.756\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0798) | (0.0880) | (0.0935) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 90 | 90 | 86 |
| Number of id | 28 | 28 | 27 |
| Country FE | YES | YES | YES |
| Log Lik | -47.82 | -52.37 | -55.43 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Table A16

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| VARIABLES | Three-way-interaction with Incumbent | Three-way-interaction with National Way of Life Saliency | Three-way-interaction with Far-right Issues Saliency |
| QoG | 14.57\*\*\* | 10.60\* | 10.74\* |
|  | (5.314) | (5.568) | (5.534) |
| Anti-immigration  | 0.792\*\*\* | 0.647\*\*\* | 0.651\*\*\* |
|  | (0.190) | (0.208) | (0.203) |
| QoG # Anti-immigration | -0.704\*\*\* | -0.550\*\* | -0.554\*\* |
|  | (0.228) | (0.240) | (0.238) |
| MRPs incumbent=1 | 1.382 |  |  |
|  | (3.477) |  |  |
| MRPs incumbent=0 # QoG | 0 |  |  |
|  | (0) |  |  |
| MRPs incumbent=1 # QoG | -3.664 |  |  |
|  | (4.063) |  |  |
| MRPs incumbent=0 # Anti-immigration | 0 |  |  |
|  | (0) |  |  |
| MRPs incumbent=1 # Anti-immigration | -0.0808 |  |  |
|  | (0.174) |  |  |
| MRPs incumbent=0 # QoG # Anti-immigration | 0 |  |  |
|  | (0) |  |  |
| MRPs incumbent=1 # QoG # Anti-immigration | 0.162 |  |  |
|  | (0.200) |  |  |
| National Way of Life (positive) |  | -1.678 |  |
|  |  | (1.138) |  |
| QoG # National Way of Life (positive) |  | 1.929 |  |
|  |  | (1.251) |  |
| Anti-immigration # National Way of Life (positive) |  | 0.0790 |  |
|  |  | (0.0510) |  |
| QoG # Anti-immigration # National Way of Life (positive) |  | -0.0961\* |  |
|  |  | (0.0572) |  |
| Far-right Issues (positive) |  |  | -1.727 |
|  |  |  | (1.060) |
| QoG # Far-right Issues (positive) |  |  | 1.996\* |
|  |  |  | (1.107) |
| Anti-immigration # Far-right Issues (positive) |  |  | 0.0814\* |
|  |  |  | (0.0476) |
| QoG # Anti-immigration # Far-right Issues (positive) |  |  | -0.100\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.0505) |
| Unemployment (%) | 0.0138 | -0.0113 | -0.0123 |
|  | (0.0365) | (0.0313) | (0.0301) |
| Real GDP Growth | -0.00567 | -0.0121 | -0.0145 |
|  | (0.0313) | (0.0266) | (0.0257) |
| Asylum Seekers (% of population) | -0.565 | 2.964\* | 3.555\*\* |
|  | (2.574) | (1.759) | (1.775) |
| Electoral Rule House = 1, Plurality | 0.241 | 0.323 | 0.307 |
|  | (1,462) | (1,777) | (1,550) |
| Constant | -19.90 | -17.56 | -17.89 |
|  | (564.5) | (664.2) | (562.2) |
| Sigma\_u | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | (0.0917) | (0.0892) | (0.0858) |
| Sigma\_e | 0.627\*\*\* | 0.610\*\*\* | 0.585\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0762) | (0.0745) | (0.0714) |
| Observations | 90 | 87 | 87 |
| Number of id | 28 | 27 | 27 |
| Country FE | YES | YES | YES |
| Log Lik | -45.65 | -45.04 | -43.27 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Figure A4: Effect of mainstream-right parties positions on immigration, multiculturalism and ethnic minorities on extreme-right parties support conditional on QoG, by mainstream-right parties incumbency status



Source: Table A16, Model 1

Figure A5: Effect of mainstream-right parties positions on immigration, multiculturalism and ethnic minorities on extreme-right parties support conditional on QoG, by mainstream-right parties salience on national way of life and multiculturalism



Source: Table A16, Model 2

Figure A6: Effect of mainstream-right parties positions on immigration, multiculturalism and ethnic minorities on extreme-right parties support conditional on QoG, by mainstream-right parties salience on far-right issues



Source: Table A16, Model 3

Table A17: List of Mainstream Right Parties

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country Name | Election Date | MRP name | Party Abbreviation |
| Austria | 01-Oct-06 | Austrian People’s Party | ÖVP |
| Austria | 28-Sep-08 | Austrian People’s Party | ÖVP |
| Austria | 29-Sep-13 | Austrian People’s Party | ÖVP |
| Belgium | 10-Jun-07 | New Flemish Alliance | N-VA |
| Belgium | 13-Jun-10 | New Flemish Alliance | N-VA |
| Belgium | 25-May-14 | New Flemish Alliance | N-VA |
| Bulgaria | 25-Jun-05 | National Movement Simeon the Second | NDSV |
| Bulgaria | 05-Jul-09 | Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria | GERB |
| Bulgaria | 12-May-13 | Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria | GERB |
| Bulgaria | 05-Oct-14 | Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria | GERB |
| Croatia | 25-Nov-07 | Croatian Democratic Union | HDZ |
| Croatia | 04-Dec-11 | Croatian Democratic Union | HDZ |
| Croatia | 08-Nov-15 | Patriotic Coalition |
| Cyprus | 21-May-06 | Democratic Coalition | DISY |
| Cyprus | 22-May-11 | Democratic Coalition | DISY |
| Czech Republic | 03-Jun-06 | Civic Democratic Party | ODS |
| Czech Republic | 29-May-10 | Civic Democratic Party | ODS |
| Czech Republic | 26-Oct-13 | Civic Democratic Party | ODS |
| Denmark | 08-Feb-05 | Liberals | V |
| Denmark | 13-Nov-07 | Liberals | V |
| Denmark | 15-Sep-11 | Liberals | V |
| Denmark | 18-Jun-15 | Liberals | V |
| Estonia | 04-Mar-07 | Estonian Reform Party | ER |
| Estonia | 06-Mar-11 | Estonian Reform Party | ER |
| Estonia | 01-Mar-15 | Estonian Reform Party | ER |
| Finland | 18-Mar-07 | National Coalition | KK |
| Finland | 17-Apr-11 | National Coalition | KK |
| Finland | 19-Apr-15 | National Coalition | KK |
| France | 10-Jun-07 | Union for a Popular Movement | UMP |
| France | 10-Jun-12 | Union for a Popular Movement | UMP |
| Germany | 18-Sep-05 | Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union | CDU/CSU |
| Germany | 27-Sep-09 | Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union | CDU/CSU |
| Germany | 22-Sep-13 | Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union | CDU/CSU |
| Greece | 07-Mar-04 | New Democracy | ND |
| Greece | 16-Sep-07 | New Democracy | ND |
| Greece | 04-Oct-09 | New Democracy | ND |
| Greece | 06-May-12 | New Democracy | ND |
| Greece | 17-Jun-12 | New Democracy | ND |
| Greece | 25-Jan-15 | New Democracy | ND |
| Greece | 20-Sep-15 | New Democracy | ND |
| Hungary | 09-Apr-06 | Alliance of Federation of Young Democrats - Hungarian Civic Union - Christian Democratic People's Party | FiDeSz-MPSz-KDNP |
| Hungary | 11-Apr-10 | Alliance of Federation of Young Democrats - Hungarian Civic Union - Christian Democratic People's Party | FiDeSz-MPSz-KDNP |
| Hungary | 06-Apr-14 | Alliance of Federation of Young Democrats - Hungarian Civic Union - Christian Democratic People's Party | FiDeSz-MPSz-KDNP |
| Ireland | 24-May-07 | Familiy of the Irish |
| Ireland | 25-Feb-11 | Familiy of the Irish |
| Italy | 10-Apr-06 | Go Italy | FI |
| Italy | 13-Apr-08 | People of Freedom | PdL |
| Italy | 24-Feb-13 | Brothers of Italy - National Centre-right | FDI-CDN |
| Latvia | 07-Oct-06 | People’s Party | TP |
| Latvia | 02-Oct-10 | Unity |  |
| Latvia | 17-Sep-11 | Unity |  |
| Latvia | 04-Oct-14 | Unity |  |
| Lithuania | 12-Oct-08 | Homeland Union - Lithuanian Christian Democrats | TS-LKD |
| Lithuania | 14-Oct-12 | Homeland Union - Lithuanian Christian Democrats | TS-LKD |
| Luxembourg | 13-Jun-04 | Christian Social People’s Party | CSV/PCS |
| Luxembourg | 07-Jun-09 | Christian Social People’s Party | CSV/PCS |
| Luxembourg | 20-Oct-13 | Christian Social People’s Party | CSV/PCS |
| Netherlands | 22-Nov-06 | Christian Democratic Appeal | CDA |
| Netherlands | 09-Jun-10 | People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy | VVD |
| Netherlands | 12-Sep-12 | People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy | VVD |
| Poland | 25-Sep-05 | Law and Justice | PiS |
| Poland | 21-Oct-07 | Law and Justice | PiS |
| Poland | 09-Oct-11 | Law and Justice | PiS |
| Portugal | 20-Feb-05 | Social Democratic Party | PSD |
| Portugal | 27-Sep-09 | Social Democratic Party | PSD |
| Portugal | 05-Jun-11 | Social Democratic Party | PSD |
| Portugal | 04-Oct-15 | Portugal Ahead | PàF |
| Romania | 28-Nov-04 | Justice and Truth Alliance | ADA |
| Romania | 30-Nov-08 | National Liberal Party | PNL |
| Romania | 09-Dec-12 | Social Liberal Union | USL |
| Slovakia | 17-Jun-06 | Slovak Democratic and Christian Union - Democartic Party | SDKÚ-DS |
| Slovakia | 12-Jun-10 | Slovak Democratic and Christian Union - Democartic Party | SDKÚ-DS |
| Slovakia | 10-Mar-12 | Ordinary People and Independent Personalities | OľaNO |
| Slovenia | 03-Oct-04 | Slovenian Democratic Party | SDS |
| Slovenia | 21-Sep-08 | Slovenian Democratic Party | SDS |
| Slovenia | 04-Dec-11 | Slovenian Democratic Party | SDS |
| Slovenia | 13-Jul-14 | Slovenian Democratic Party | SDS |
| Spain | 14-Mar-04 | People's Party | PP |
| Spain | 09-Mar-08 | People's Party | PP |
| Spain | 20-Nov-11 | People's Party | PP |
| Spain | 20-Dec-15 | People's Party | PP |
| Sweden | 17-Sep-06 | Moderate Coalition Party | MSP |
| Sweden | 19-Sep-10 | Moderate Coalition Party | MSP |
| Sweden | 14-Sep-14 | Moderate Coalition Party | MSP |
| United Kingdom | 05-May-05 | Conservative Party | Conservatives |
| United Kingdom | 06-May-10 | Conservative Party | Conservatives |
| United Kingdom | 07-May-15 | Conservative Party | Conservatives |

Table A18: Correlation Matrix, Quality of Government against MRPs positions on Immigration, Multiculturalsim and Ethnic Minorities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Anti-immigration mainstream right parties | QoG |
| Anti-immigration mainstream right parties | 1.0000 |  |
| QoG | 0.0247 | 1.0000 |

