



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Kirill Zhirkov

**NEW POLITICAL ISSUES, NICHE
PARTIES, AND SPATIAL VOTING IN
MULTIPARTY SYSTEMS:
IMMIGRATION AS A DIMENSION OF
ELECTORAL COMPETITION IN
SCANDINAVIA**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: POLITICAL SCIENCE
WP BRP 12/PS/2014

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented
at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained
in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

*Kirill Zhirkov*¹

NEW POLITICAL ISSUES, NICHE PARTIES, AND SPATIAL VOTING IN MULTIPARTY SYSTEMS: IMMIGRATION AS A DIMENSION OF ELECTORAL COMPETITION IN SCANDINAVIA

In the present study I use spatial voting model to assess the importance of the left-right and immigration issue dimensions on electoral behavior in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. My findings indicate that distances between parties and voters on both left-right and immigration dimensions do significantly influence voting choice in all three countries, although effect of the latter is substantially lower. I also demonstrate that voting for the niche parties, and especially for the radical right, is much stronger related to the immigration issue than voting for the mainstream parties, both center-left and center-right ones. Finally, my analysis demonstrates that positional spatial voting model shows a good degree of stability even under imperfect measurement of policy preferences. In conclusion, I discuss implications of my findings for the research on new political issues and niche parties.

Keywords: spatial voting, left-right, immigration, Scandinavia

JEL Classification: Z

¹ Higher School of Economics, Laboratory for Comparative Social Research, k.zhirkov@gmail.com

Emergence of the new dimensions of electoral competition represents a popular topic in contemporary political science.² Interest to it can be explained with its particular importance to the field. Emergence of politically relevant issues determines formation of new political parties, even though their electoral success is largely dependent on the institutional setting (Harmel and Robertson 1985). In a two-party system, such as the U.S., development of a new issue dimension can change political positions and electoral bases of the existing parties (Carmines and Stimson 1986). Speaking more generally, changes in the number and content of electorally significant issues lead to the important transformations of political space.

Such changes can be easily demonstrated on the example of Western European politics after the World War II. Up to the late 1960s, West European party systems reflected “frozen” social cleavages which remained surprisingly stable since the beginning of the XX century (Lipset and Rokkan 1967). However, in the 1970s this system began to experience profound and long-lasting transformations. Ronald Inglehart (1971) was one of the first to predict emergence of a new political conflict based on values and lifestyle rather than on preferences with regard to social class and economic policy. This prediction largely fulfilled in 1980s when environmental movement and the green parties appeared as important players in West European politics (Mueller-Rommel 1985). Herbert Kitschelt (1988) linked this breakthrough to the wider phenomenon of the “left-libertarian” parties which he defined through opposition to the primacy of economic policy and, instead, emphasis on issues such as individual autonomy and equality. Nowadays concerns related to immigration and integration, which also cannot be easily projected on the traditional conflict between left and right, represent one of the most important issue

² Generally, in political science literature the term dimension is used to denote a combination of several related political issues. For instance, sociocultural dimension is perceived to involve such issues as abortion, gay rights, and euthanasia. In the present paper I use the two dimensions based on single issues (left-right conflict and immigration respectively) and, therefore, use the two terms interchangeably.

dimensions in West European politics. It is a nearly universal perception that salience of this particular issue led to the emergence and electoral success of the radical right parties throughout the European continent. Therefore, both libertarian-left and radical right parties are often commonly labeled as “niche parties” (Adams et al. 2006; Meguid 2005) which differ from the mainstream parties by focusing their appeal on a particular novel political issue.

The present study aims to advance the debate regarding the relationship between new issue dimensions and parties’ strategies by focusing on the role of immigration in three Scandinavian societies: Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. By doing so, I manage to make several contributions to the existing literature. First, my results strongly indicate that voting motivated by the new issues follows the spatial logic, since respondents take into account distances between themselves and the parties on both left-right and immigration dimensions in their voting choices. Second, I present evidence that even though niche parties do not possess exclusive ownership over the new issue, only radical right parties are voted for primarily on the basis of distances on the immigration dimension. Finally, my analysis demonstrates that the positional spatial voting model shows considerably robust results even under conditions of imperfect measurement of policy positions.

The paper is structured as follows. In the beginning I briefly review recent literature on the dimensionality of contemporary West European politics. In the two following subsections I consider left-right and immigration as respectively “old” and “new” issue dimensions in Western Europe. Then I formulate my analytical model based on the classical spatial voting logic. After presenting the research design, I proceed to description of the results. In conclusion, I discuss implication of my findings for both specific situation with immigration issue in Western Europe and general models of voting behavior.

Issue Dimensions in West European Politics

Recent scholarship observes that issues gradually become more important in West European politics (Green-Pedersen 2007) and that this process is reflected by the parallel decline of cleavage-based voting (Best 2011). However, the exact number of issue dimensions remains a subject of dispute. The debate was largely pioneered by Kitschelt (1995) who suggested that political space in developed democracies is defined by the two dimensions, socialist-capitalist and libertarian-authoritarian. More recent studies based on expert surveys and analyses of party manifestos demonstrate existence of at least three issue dimensions including economy, social issues, and attitudes to the EU (Bakker, Jolly, and Polk 2012). Furthermore, the exact number of politically relevant issues can be even bigger depending on the particular country context (Albright 2010; Benoit and Laver 2006).

There are at least two reasons why the discussion regarding the number of issue dimensions and potential correlations between them is important. First, it has important implications for the relationship between structure of party competition and observed voters' preferences. For instance, Kriesi et al. (2006) argue that existence of the radical right parties in Western Europe reflects an important social cleavage which does not coincide with the traditional left-right divide and is caused by the processes of globalization. Van der Brug and Van Spanje (2009), in turn, demonstrate that parties are still aligned on a single dimension and, as a result, a substantial group of voters characterized by a combination of leftist economic preferences and anti-immigrant attitudes remains not represented by any party.

Second, as it was empirically demonstrated by Taagepera and Grofman (1985), there is a nearly linear dependency between the number of salient issues in a society and an effective number of parties in a political system. The exact nature of this relationship, however, remains

unclear. One explanation, which follows the line of political sociology, links emergence of the new parties to the changes in social cleavages and growing diversity of interest groups (Inglehart 1971; Harmel and Robertson 1985). Alternative logic emphasizes the role of political elites in promoting new issues and strategy of “issue entrepreneurship” pursued by the losing parties (Carmines and Stimson 1986; De Vries and Hobolt 2012). At the same time both approaches agree that success of a niche party largely depends on its ability to campaign on the issue which is least advantageous to its mainstream counterparts.

Left-Right Dimension

It is interesting that the left-right dimension, which can be traced back to the French Revolution, remains the basic tool to operationalize political competition in the beginning of the XXI century. Politics in most societies is still habitually described by reference to the traditional left-right conflict, even though its specific components can be different across countries (Benoit and Laver 2006, 126-28). Wide popularity of the left-right dimension can be attributed to both its simplicity for formal modeling and perceived familiarity to voters (Albright 2010). However, exact content of “left” and “right” ideologies was never fixed—for instance, it changed dramatically since the XIX century—but nowadays it is normally associated with economic policies (Huber and Inglehart 1995). Benoit and Laver (2006, 141-44) report that together with moral issues preferences with regard to the economic policy (lower taxes vs. higher public spending) explain up to two thirds of variance in left-right positioning.

A specific question concerns the relationship between left-right position and party identification among voters. Inglehart and Klingemann (1976) reported that individual’s self-description as “left” or “right” depends on both ideology and identification with a particular party. This claim is clearly based on the U.S.-originated model of electoral behavior which

asserts primacy of party identification in voting choice (Campbell et al. 1960). However, it was demonstrated that in the European context party identification is secondary with regard to voting choice and therefore reflects rather than causes electoral behavior (Thomassen 1992). Therefore, it is possible to suggest that personal ideological preferences remain an important basis of voters' left-right positioning even when party identification is also accounted for (see Huber 1989).

Immigration Dimension

Unlike the long-lasting conflict based on social class and economic preferences, which is usually associated with the left-right dimension, immigration emerged as a political issue in Western Europe relatively recently. However, it quickly became one of the major sources of political conflict in most West European societies. Even though immigration issue is usually linked to the radical right party family, it also heavily influenced mainstream parties as well as the political space in general. For instance, mainstream right-wing parties often borrow anti-immigrant rhetoric of the radical right and use their support to secure parliamentary majority (Bale 2003). Social democratic parties, in turn, found themselves in a deadlock between necessity to retain votes of the working class and predominantly cosmopolitan orientations of their activists (Bale et al. 2010). On the whole, emergence of electorally strong radical right parties generally causes an anti-immigrant shift in the political system (Van Spanje 2010).

Indeed, there is little doubt that immigration issue was particularly important for the radical right parties and their emergence as a significant force of the West European politics in the last decades. There are numerous empirical studies which show that negative attitudes to immigration and migrants represent a crucial motive for the radical right voting across the West European countries (e.g., Lubbers, Gijsberts, and Scheepers 2002; Rydgren 2008). Furthermore, as showed by Ivarsflaten (2008), campaigning focused on the anti-immigrant issue unites all

successful radical right parties in Western Europe. Even though an approach which sees the radical right parties as loose movements of political protest remains relatively popular, there are convincing empirical arguments that electoral support for the radical right is driven by rational considerations, namely by preferences for restrictive immigration policy (Van der Brug, Fennema, and Tillie 2000).

Analytical Model

Analytical model used in the present study is based on the rational choice approach to political behavior as formulated by Anthony Downs (1957). With regard to voting it rests on the idea that the primary goal of an election in a democratic country is to select a government. As a result, interests of an individual voter are defined by a possibility to derive utility from governmental policies. Therefore, as soon as a voter has policy preferences, rational behavior dictates to vote for a candidate whose policies are closest to the voter's ideal. Besides this general axiom of voters' rationality, my model involves a number of important assumptions which are derived from the mathematical formulation of a spatial voting model developed by Davis, Hinich, and Ordeshook (1970). First, if a respondent votes, one casts the ballot for the most preferred party. Second, preferences of voters and parties can be ordered on a number of dimensions (in my model I use two dimensions, namely left-right and immigration). Third, these dimensions are continuous, not discrete. Fourth, all voters and parties have preferred position on each dimension. Fifth, voters use similar scale to estimate policy positions. This model offers a straightforward and parsimonious explanation of voting behavior but it was criticized for excessive simplification of both structure of political space and voters' decision-making (e.g., Stokes 1963). However, recent empirical evidence indicates that spatial voting model works

reasonably well (Jesse 2009) and even outperforms rival models such as one of directional voting (Westholm 1997).

An essential problem related to the spatial voting model concerns the fact that the literature shows no agreement with regard to the shape of the utility loss function defined by distance between a voter and a candidate. Most studies, both theoretical and empirical ones, use quadratic policy distances to estimate the loss function (Adams, Merrill, and Grofman 2005; Davis, Hinich, and Ordeshook 1970; Rivers 1988). At the same time, some authors argue that absolute distances should be preferred (see Westholm 1997, 871-72). Furthermore, recent empirical contributions indicate that the power of the loss function fluctuates between 1 and 2 depending on the context (Berinsky and Lewis 2007; Jackson, Mach, and Markowski 2010). Therefore, I directly estimate power of the loss function instead of accepting one of the “default” variants. I also add the interaction between the two distances in order to take into account the fact that they can be not perfectly orthogonal.

As a result, my analytical model can be represented as follows:

$$u_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 \times lrdist_{ij}^q + \beta_2 \times imdist_{ij}^q + \beta_3 \times lrdist_{ij} \times imdist_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

β_{0j} – basic utility of voting for party j ; β_k – coefficients; q – power of the loss function; $lrdist_{ij}$ – distance between voter i and party j on the left-right dimension; $imdist_{ij}$ – distance between voter i and party j on the immigration dimension; ε_{ij} – individual error.

Another necessary adjustment of the classical spatial voting model concerns possible heterogeneity of the sample which results from the possibility that relative importance of the dimensions can vary across the voters (Jackson 1991; Rivers 1988). Such differences can be caused by the fact that in their electoral strategies parties attach unequal weight to various issues. Theoretically this phenomenon is best explained by the approach known as the “issue ownership” (Petrocik 1996). Issue ownership approach assumes that each party has a distinct

profile based on both competence and history of attention to a particular issue. Therefore, parties are expected to focus their campaigning efforts on the topics in which they have a positive image. Even though recent empirical support for the importance of issue ownership in voting behavior is somewhat mixed (see Van der Brug 2004; Belanger and Meguid 2008), I have no ground to reject the hypothesis that distances on left-right and immigration dimensions have unequal effects on voting for different parties. Namely, I assume that distances on the left-right dimension can be more important for the mainstream parties voting, whereas distances on the immigration dimension are more likely to cause support for the niche parties, particularly for the radical right. As a result, for each sample I test two versions of my model, first with uniform effects of the two dimensions (general model) and second with effects allowed to vary for different parties (party-specific model).

Research Design

Data

I use European Social Survey (ESS) cumulative five-wave file as a source of individual-level data for my analysis. The ESS data was collected by an international team of scholars during the years from 2002 to 2010. A major emphasis in the data collection is put on sampling standards and complete cross-country comparability. Totally, the dataset comprises of information on more than 230,000 individuals in 30 European countries but, following the purpose of my study, I analyzed only data for three Scandinavian countries: Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

The three chosen societies represent a good selection of cases for the comparison. They share similar institutional design, namely parliamentary democracy with proportional

representation and relatively low electoral threshold. All three countries currently have diverse multiparty systems historically dominated by social democratic parties which nevertheless experienced some electoral decline during the last 20 years (Blomqvist and Green-Pedersen 2004). Finally, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are developed welfare states with remarkable life standards demonstrated by the levels of GDP per capita and human development which are among the highest in the world. In recent decades all three countries began to experience pressure related to mass immigration from the countries outside Europe but the levels of immigration issue salience as well as electoral fortunes of the radical right parties are surprisingly dissimilar (see Green-Pedersen and Krogstrup 2008).

Data about party positions on left-right and immigration dimensions were taken from the most recent Chapel Hill Expert Survey (Bakker et al. 2012). Representing a good combination of economy and easy access, expert scores make an attractive option for use in scholarly research of party politics (see Benoit and Laver 2006, 75-77). Furthermore, empirical studies demonstrate that expert evaluations show a good degree of both internal and external validity when compared to other indicators (Steenbergen and Marks 2007).

As a result, my final sample consisted of individuals in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden who met a number of conditions. First, I selected only the respondents who are eligible to vote, namely citizens of the respective countries who were 18 years or above at the moment of the survey. Second, final analysis included only those who voted for a party which a) was present in all five ESS waves and b) was evaluated by the Chapel Hill experts. Sample sizes as well as the lists of parties can be found in the respective regression tables.

Variables

The dependent variable of my study, *party choice*, was nominal as it consisted of the unique codes for the parties included in the analysis. It was constructed using the country-specific ESS questions in which respondents were asked about the party they voted for at the most recent national election. Two main explanatory variables, *left-right distance* and *immigration distance*, were calculated as absolute values of differences between parties and voters on the two respective dimensions. As a result, each voter obtained a number of scores which show his/her distances to each party in the country. Party positions on both issue dimensions were taken from the Chapel Hill Expert Survey. Respondent position on the left-right scale was based on their self-placement which was included in the ESS as one of the questions. Respondent position on immigration was assessed as an average of three survey questions asking about impact of immigration on respondent's country. All positional variables were measured using the 11-point scale ranging from 0 to 10 (so that 10 means most right and most anti-immigrant) and, therefore, were fully comparable.

Method

In order to estimate the effects of respectively left-right and immigration policy distances on voting I chose a discrete choice logistic model. These types of models are extensively used in economics, especially in transportation research, but less so in political science even though they represent a nearly perfect tool for estimation of spatial voting models (Thurner 2000). For the estimation procedure I employed BIOGEME, free open source software developed by Michel Bierlaire. It was specifically designed for the estimation of discrete choice models and, therefore, has two important advantages over traditional statistical packages. Through the option of

“generalized utility” it permits specification of nonlinear models which is extremely important for the direct estimation of the loss function power.

Results

Denmark

For all countries, I estimated, first, a general model with uniform utility loss coefficients and, then, a party-specific model in which utility loss coefficients were allowed to vary across different parties. Results of the two models for Denmark are represented in Table 1. General model demonstrates that an average Danish voter takes into account both left-right and immigration distances in a voting choice but the former has more weight in a decision than the latter. Insignificance of an interaction between the two distances indicates that their effects on voting behavior are effectively independent.

--- Table 1 about here ---

The party-specific model makes the picture somewhat more complicated. As for the effects of left-right distances, they appear to be lower for the right-wing parties compared to their left-wing counterparts. This is particularly true for the radical right Danish People’s Party as effect of left-right distance on voting for it is much lower than for other parties. Immigration distances show even more multifaceted effects with regard to different parties. For instance, voting for the left-wing Socialist People’s Party and the center-left Social Democrats is relatively little affected by the immigration issue, although the effect is statistically significant. Two mainstream right-wing parties, Conservatives and Liberals, show positive effects of immigration distance suggesting that probability of voting for them actually increases with distance. This is a surprising finding which clearly contradicts the logic of spatial voting model and, more widely, the rational choice assumption. The three parties which demonstrate the highest prominence of

immigration issue in their electoral profile are the radical left Red-Green Alliance, the Social Liberal Party, and the radical right Danish People's Party. At the same time only for the People's Party immigration represents a core issue of its electoral appeal as it affects a choice in favor of this party more strongly than distance on the traditional left-right dimension.

Norway

Results of the general model and the party-specific model for Norway are represented in Table 2. The former shows that in Norway both left-right and immigration dimensions affect electoral behavior and, as well as in Denmark, the "old" issue is more important than the "new" one. Interaction of the two suggests that they are significantly related but the magnitude is relatively low.

--- Table 2 about here ---

The party specific model suggests that voters of Norwegian parties do attach different importance to different issues. Even though the left-right distances significantly affect voting for all the parties, these effects are clearly lower for the radical right Progress Party than for all others. Immigration issue, in turn, shows highly unequal importance for different parties. For instance, people who vote for the Centre Party and Christian Democratic Party are not significantly affected by the immigration distances. Voting for the Conservative Party is positively related to a distance on immigration dimension, meaning that voters who are far away from the party are more likely to vote for it. Since the same effect was found for the mainstream right parties in Denmark, this finding can reflect specificity of moderate right politics in contemporary West European democracies. Immigration distances are most important in voting for the Socialist Left Party, Liberal Party, and, as expected, radical right Progress Party. It is

important to underline that for all parties except the radical right left-right dimension is substantially more important than the immigration one.

Sweden

Results for the Sweden are represented in Table 3. General model indicates that, as well as in other two Scandinavian countries, both left-right and immigration dimensions are significant in explaining electoral behavior with the former being stronger than the latter. Effects of the two show some interdependence because interaction between the two appears to be statistically significant.

--- Table 3 about here ---

Party-specific results demonstrate that effects of the left-right distances, while being nearly equal for most parties, are much less important for the voters of radical right Sweden Democrats. Immigration distances affect only voting for the parties of the left-wing coalition, whereas they showed no significant effects for the center-right parties. Sweden Democrats, in turn, demonstrate a pattern which is common for the radical right parties in Scandinavia, since voting for them was primarily motivated by the immigration issue, whereas effect of the traditional left-right conflict is substantially lower and less significant.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this section I account for the implications of this study. I begin from the summary of my findings with regard to the immigration issue in three Scandinavian countries. Most importantly, I found that voting motivated by the immigration issue follows spatial logic and in this regard is similar to the traditional left-right cleavage. Respondents do estimate differences in their own preferences and party positions on both left-right and immigration dimension and take them into account in their voting decisions. It is also necessary to notice that, on average, left-

right distances are more important in explaining electoral behavior and that the two dimensions are effectively independent in their effects. This general pattern, however, does vary across the parties as only some of them do rely on immigration issue in their electoral strategy. This definitely applies to the radical right parties, which attract voters with anti-immigrant attitudes, and, on the other hand, to the radical left, green, and social liberal parties, which are supported by those who oppose strict immigration policy. At the same time only for the radical right parties immigration issue represents a primary source of electoral support, whereas for all other parties traditional left-right conflict remains more significant. In other words, radical right parties do not possess exclusive ownership over the immigration issue but only for them it represents the core of electoral appeal.

I suggest that results of the present study can have important implications for the ongoing research on the new political issues and niche parties as well as for the spatial voting model more generally. My findings indicate that voting motivated by the new political issues can generally follow positional logic. Even though a new issue can emerge as a “valence” one (see Stokes 1963, 337), its evolution can easily lead to formation of a second ideological pole. For instance, immigration initially emerged as an electorally relevant issue in Western Europe through a call for stricter entry and integration policies articulated by the radical right. Later, as a response to both anti-immigrant rhetoric and rise of the radical right parties, there developed a counter-movement largely grouped around libertarian-left and social liberal parties. Mainstream parties, on the other hand, remain relatively indifferent to the new issues and try to build their campaigning efforts on the left-right dimension. I argue that this logic can be potentially applied to other political issues which emerged in Western Europe in the last decades, such as green politics or attitudes towards the EU.

An essential limitation of my study is related to the imperfect measurement of distances between voters and parties. Most importantly, preferences for restrictive immigration policies among the voters were measured indirectly through the perception that immigration has negative effect on their countries' economy and culture. Another point of criticism can concern the fact that the expert scores, which I employed to estimate party positions on the two dimensions, are not necessarily fully comparable to the scales used by voters to evaluate parties. On the other hand, combination of information from different sources can help to avoid the problem of projection whereby voters attach their own attitudes to liked candidates (see Krosnick 1988, 198). My results show that even under imperfect measurement spatial voting model demonstrates substantial stability and acceptable fit (a pseudo- R^2 of about 0.3 is generally considered to be very good for a discrete choice model). On the whole, my results make an additional argument in favor of further use of a spatial voting model in research on voting behavior in multiparty systems.

There is, however, another finding which clearly contradicts the basic assumption of the spatial voting model. Namely, my results indicate that at least three moderate right Scandinavian parties, namely Conservative People's Party and Venstre in Denmark and Conservative Party in Norway, represent an important exception from the proximity logic. I found that respondents are more likely to vote for these parties if they are farther rather than closer to them on the immigration policy dimension. Such tendency to support a party which is more distant from a voter on one of the ideological dimensions is effectively opposite to the logic beyond the spatial voting model and, more broadly, to the rational choice framework. There are two potential explanations for this controversial finding. First, it can be caused by the imperfect measurement of policy positions which was discussed above. It should be noted, however, that this

discrepancy was found only for the moderate right parties whereas proximity logic worked relatively well for all other party families. Therefore, there is a possibility that my finding can have a substantive explanation related to a specific place of moderate right parties in contemporary West European politics.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the number of questions posed by my study is larger than the number of answers it provides. Therefore, more research is needed to properly address the topics of spatial voting and issue ownership in multiparty systems with regard to new political issues and niche parties. Most importantly, it is necessary to increase the sample of countries and the number politically relevant issue dimensions in order to understand whether findings presented in this study can be generalized.

References

- Adams, James, Michael Clark, Lawrence Ezrow, and Garrett Glasgow. 2006. "Are Niche Parties Fundamentally Different from Mainstream Parties? The Causes and the Electoral Consequences of Western European Parties' Policy Shifts, 1976-1998." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 513-29.
- Adams, James F., Samuel Merrill III, and Bernard Grofman. *A Unified Theory of Party Competition: A Cross-National Analysis Integrating Spatial and Behavioral Factors*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Albright, Jeremy J. 2010. "The Multidimensional Nature of Party Competition." *Party Politics* 16 (6): 699-719.
- Bakker, Ryan, Catherine de Vries, Erica Edwards, Liesbet Hooghe, Seth Jolly, Gary Marks, Jonathan Polk, Jan Rovny, Marco Steenbergen, and Milada Anna Vachudova. 2012. "Measuring Party Positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill Expert Survey Trend File, 1999–2010." *Party Politics*, published online on November 29. DOI: 10.1177/1354068812462931.
- Bakker, Ryan, Seth Jolly, and Jonathan Polk. 2012. "Complexity in the European Party Space: Exploring Dimensionality with Experts." *European Union Politics* 13 (2): 219-45.
- Bale, Tim. 2003. "Cinderella and Her Ugly Sisters: The Mainstream and Extreme Right in Europe's Bipolarising Party Systems." *West European Politics* 26 (3): 67-90.
- Bale, Tim, Christoffer Green-Pedersen, Andre Krouwel, Kurt Richard Luther, and Nick Sitter. 2010. "If You Can't Beat Them, Join Them? Explaining Social Democratic Responses to the Challenge from the Populist Radical Right in Western Europe." *Political Studies* 58 (3): 410-26.
- Belanger, Eric, and Bonnie M. Meguid. 2008. "Issue Salience, Issue Ownership, and Issue-Based Vote Choice." *Electoral Studies* 27 (3): 477-91.
- Benoit, Kenneth, and Michael Laver. 2006. *Party Policy in Modern Democracies*. London: Routledge.
- Berinsky, Adam J., and Jeffrey B. Lewis. 2007. "An Estimate of Risk Aversion in the U.S. Electorate." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 2 (2): 139-54.
- Best, Robin E. 2011. "The Declining Electoral Relevance of Traditional Cleavage Groups." *European Political Science Review* 3 (2): 279-300.

- Bierlaire, Michel. 2003. "BIOGEME: A Free Package for the Estimation of Discrete Choice Models." Proceedings of the 3rd Swiss Transportation Research Conference, Ascona, Switzerland.
- Blomqvist, Paula, and Christoffer Green-Pedersen. 2004. "Defeat at Home? Issue-Ownership and Social Democratic Support in Scandinavia." *Government and Opposition* 39 (4): 587-613.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Carmines, Edward G., and James A. Stimson. 1986. "On the Structure and Sequence of Issue Evolution." *American Political Science Review* 80 (3): 901-20.
- Davis, Otto A., Melvin J. Hinich, and Peter C. Ordeshook. 1970. "An Expository Development of a Mathematical Model of the Electoral Process." *American Political Science Review* 64 (2): 426-48.
- De Vries, Catherine E., and Sara B. Hobolt. 2012. "When Dimensions Collide: The Electoral Success of Issue Entrepreneurs." *European Union Politics* 13 (2): 246-68.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper.
- Green-Pedersen, Christoffer. 2007. "The Growing Importance of Issue Competition: The Changing Nature of Party Competition in Western Europe." *Political Studies* 55 (3): 607-28.
- Green-Pedersen, Christoffer, and Jesper Krogstrup. 2008. "Immigration as a political issue in Denmark and Sweden." *European Journal of Political Research* 47 (5): 610-34.
- Harmel, Robert, and John D. Robertson. 1985. "Formation and Success of New Parties: A Cross-National Analysis." *International Political Science Review* 6 (4): 501-23.
- Huber, John D. 1989. "Values and Partisanship in Left-Right Orientations: Measuring Ideology." *European Journal of Political Research* 17 (5): 599-621.
- Huber, John, and Ronald Inglehart. 1995. "Expert Interpretations of Party Space and Party Locations in 42 Societies." *Party Politics* 1 (1): 73-113.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1971. "The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies." *American Political Science Review* 65 (4): 991-1017.
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Hans D. Klingemann. 1976. "Party Identification, Ideological Preference, and the Left-Right Dimension among Western Mass Publics." In *Party Identification and Beyond: Representations of Voting and Party Competition*, edited by Ian Budge, Ivor Crewe, and Dennis Farlie, 243-73. New York: Wiley.

- Ivarsflaten, Elisabeth. 2008. "What Unites Right-Wing Populists in Western Europe?" *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (1): 3-23.
- Jackson, John E. 1991. "Estimation of Models with Variable Coefficients." *Political Analysis* 3 (1): 27-49.
- Jackson, John E., Bogdan W. Mach, and Radosław Markowski. 2010. "Party Strategies and Electoral Competition in Post-Communist Countries: Evidence from Poland." *Electoral Studies* 29 (2): 199-209.
- Jesse, Stephen A. 2009. "Spatial Voting in the 2004 Presidential Election." *American Political Science Review* 103 (1): 59-81.
- Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1988. "Left-Libertarian Parties: Explaining Innovation in Competitive Party Systems." *World Politics* 40 (2): 194-234.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1995. *The Radical Right in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschier, and Timotheos Frey. 2006. "Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared," *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (6): 921-56.
- Krosnick, Jon A. 1988. "The Role of Attitude Importance in Social Evaluation: A Study of Policy Preferences, Presidential Candidate Evaluations, and Voting Behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 55 (2): 196-210.
- Lipset, Seymour. M., and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction." In *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*, edited by Seymour M. Lipset and Stein Rokkan, 1-64. New York: Free Press.
- Lubbers, Marcel, Merove Gijsberts, and Peer Scheepers. 2002. "Extreme Right-Wing Voting in Western Europe." *European Journal of Political Research* 41 (3): 345-78.
- Meguid, Bonnie M. 2005. "Competition Between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success." *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 347-59.
- Mueller-Rommel, Ferdinand. 1985. "The Greens in Western Europe: Similar but Different." *International Political Science Review* 6 (4): 483-99.
- Norris, Pippa. 2005. *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Petrocik, John R. 1996. "Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections, with a 1980 Case Study." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (3): 825-50.
- Rivers, Douglas. 1988. "Heterogeneity in Models of Electoral Choice." *American Journal of Political Science* 32 (3): 737-57.
- Rydgren, Jens. 2008. "Immigration Sceptics, Xenophobes or Racists? Radical Right-Wing Voting in Six West European Countries." *European Journal of Political Research* 47 (6): 737-65.
- Steenbergen, Marco D., and Gary Marks. 2007. "Evaluating Expert Judgments." *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (3): 347-66.
- Stokes, Donald E. 1963. "Spatial Models of Party Competition." *American Political Science Review* 57 (2): 368-77.
- Taagepera, Rein, and Bernard Grofman. 1985. "Rethinking Duverger's Law: Predicting the Effective Number of Parties in Plurality and PR Systems – Parties Minus Issues Equals One." *European Journal of Political Research* 13 (4): 341-52.
- Thomassen, Jacques. 1992. "Party Identification as a Cross-National Concept: Its Meaning in the Netherlands." In *Classics in Voting Behavior*, edited by Richard G. Niemi and Herbert F. Weisberg, 263-66. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Turner, Paul W. 2000. "The Empirical Application of the Spatial Theory of Voting in Multiparty Systems with Random Utility Models." *Electoral Studies* 19 (4): 493-517.
- Train, Kenneth E. 2003. *Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van der Brug, Wouter. 2004. "Issue Ownership and Party Choice." *Electoral Studies* 23 (2): 209-33.
- Van der Brug, Wouter, Meindert Fennema, and Jean Tillie. 2000. "Anti-Immigrant Parties in Europe: Ideological or Protest Vote?" *European Journal of Political Research* 37 (1): 77-102.
- Van der Brug, Wouter, and Joost Van Spanje. 2009. "Immigration, Europe and the 'New' Cultural Dimension." *European Journal of Political Research* 48 (3): 309-34.
- Van Spanje, Joost. 2010. "Contagious Parties: Anti-Immigration Parties and Their Impact on Other Parties' Immigration Stances in Contemporary Western Europe." *Party Politics* 16 (5): 563-86.
- Westholm, Anders. 1997. "Distance versus Direction: The Illusory Defeat of the Proximity Theory of Electoral Choice." *American Political Science Review* 91 (4): 865-83.

Table X. Effects of Ideological Distances on Party Choice in Denmark

Predictor	General model		Party-specific model	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Left-right distance	-0.404***	0.017		
Red-Green Alliance			-0.548***	0.084
Socialist People's Party			-0.530***	0.051
Social Democrats			-0.432***	0.036
Social Liberal Party			-0.535***	0.060
Venstre, Denmark's Liberal Party			-0.172***	0.070
Conservative People's Party			-0.256***	0.039
Danish People's Party			-0.111**	0.043
Immigration distance	-0.150***	0.011		
Red-Green Alliance			-0.262***	0.067
Socialist People's Party			-0.110*	0.043
Social Democrats			-0.110***	0.022
Social Liberal Party			-0.317***	0.045
Venstre, Denmark's Liberal Party			0.055*	0.023
Conservative People's Party			0.107***	0.031
Danish People's Party			-0.233***	0.025
Distances interaction	0.008	0.008		
Red-Green Alliance			0.170***	0.033
Socialist People's Party			0.071	0.036
Social Democrats			0.021	0.019
Social Liberal Party			0.093*	0.041
Conservative People's Party			-0.127***	0.016
Venstre, Denmark's Liberal Party			-0.100***	0.027
Danish People's Party			-0.021	0.016
Pseudo-R ²		0.302		0.323
Log-likelihood		-7534.389		-7299.398
Number of parameters		9		27
LR test for model equivalence				469.982 (18)***

Note. N = 5,544. Power of the loss function is 1.3 in both models

SE = standard error. LR = likelihood-ratio

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Table X. Effects of Ideological Distances on Party Choice in Norway

Predictor	General model		Party-specific model	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Left-right distance	-0.325***	0.012		
Socialist Left Party			-0.424***	0.036
Labour Party			-0.319***	0.024
Centre Party			-0.389***	0.050
Christian Democratic Party			-0.288***	0.037
Liberal Party			-0.311***	0.060
Conservative Party			-0.283***	0.039
Progress Party			-0.126***	0.023
Immigration distance	-0.110***	0.007		
Socialist Left Party			-0.199***	0.027
Labour Party			0.009	0.017
Centre Party			-0.071*	0.031
Christian Democratic Party			-0.015	0.029
Liberal Party			-0.260***	0.048
Conservative Party			0.108***	0.021
Progress Party			-0.137***	0.014
Distances interaction	0.047***	0.008		
Socialist Left Party			0.100***	0.028
Labour Party			0.023	0.020
Centre Party			0.065	0.041
Christian Democratic Party			0.046	0.035
Liberal Party			0.050	0.059
Conservative Party			-0.075**	0.026
Progress Party			0.001	0.013
Pseudo-R ²		0.258		0.282
Log-likelihood		-8827.244		-8541.367
Number of parameters		9		27
LR test for model equivalence				571.754 (18)***

Note. N = 6,117. Power of the loss function is 1.5 in both models

SE = standard error. LR = likelihood-ratio

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Table X. Effects of Ideological Distances on Party Choice in Sweden

Predictor	General model		Party-specific model	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Left-right distance	-0.434***	0.014		
Left Party			-0.447***	0.044
Green Party			-0.425***	0.051
Social Democratic Party			-0.327***	0.022
Centre Party			-0.402***	0.052
Christian Democratic Party			-0.427***	0.055
Liberal People's Party			-0.525***	0.051
Moderate Party			-0.525***	0.041
Sweden Democrats			-0.198*	0.098
Immigration distance	-0.159***	0.014		
Left Party			-0.170***	0.031
Green Party			-0.321***	0.044
Social Democratic Party			-0.093***	0.027
Centre Party			-0.001	0.046
Christian Democratic Party			-0.051	0.050
Liberal People's Party			0.038	0.039
Moderate Party			0.011	0.030
Sweden Democrats			-0.412***	0.080
Distances interaction	0.068***	0.011		
Left Party			0.072*	0.031
Green Party			0.094*	0.044
Social Democratic Party			0.056**	0.021
Centre Party			0.030	0.041
Christian Democratic Party			-0.023	0.048
Liberal People's Party			0.039	0.037
Moderate Party			-0.031	0.028
Sweden Democrats			0.097*	0.049
Pseudo-R ²		0.327		0.339
Log-likelihood		-8563.833		-8417.439
Number of parameters		10		31
LR test for model equivalence				292.788 (21)***

Note. N = 6,463. Power of the loss function is 1.4 in both models

SE = standard error. LR = likelihood-ratio

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Kirill Zhirkov

Higher School of Economics, Laboratory for Comparative Social Research, k.zhirkov@gmail.com

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.