



Causes and consequences of the rise of populist radical right parties and movements in Europe

Current Sociology Review
2017, Vol. 65(6) 909–930
© The Author(s) 2017



Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0011392117717294
journals.sagepub.com/home/csi



Jasper Muis and Tim Immerzeel

VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Abstract

This article reviews three strands in the scholarship on the populist radical right (PRR). It covers both political parties and extra-parliamentary mobilization in contemporary European democracies. After definitional issues and case selection, the authors first discuss demand-side approaches to the fortunes of the PRR. Subsequently, supply-side approaches are assessed, namely political opportunity explanations and internal supply-side factors, referring to leadership, organization and ideological positioning. Third, research on the consequences of the emergence and rise of these parties and movements is examined: do they constitute a corrective or a threat to democracy? The authors discuss the growing literature on the impact on established parties' policies, the policies themselves, and citizens' behaviour. The review concludes with future directions for theorizing and research.

Keywords

Anti-immigration parties, far right, populism, radical right, social movements

Introduction

Support for populist radical right (PRR) parties and movements has swelled in previous decades (Backes and Moreau, 2012). This has triggered extensive scholarly debate, which often focuses on electoral politics – for recent reviews on PRR parties, see Golder (2016), Greven (2016) and Mudde (2016).

Corresponding author:

Jasper Muis, Department of Sociology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
Email: muis.jasper@gmail.com

A strict division of labour seems to divide sociologists from political scientists, with each discipline focusing on the non-electoral and electoral channel, respectively (Rydgren, 2007). Social movement protests have generally been dominated by 'the left', while 'the right' mainly uses the electoral channel to voice its discontent, instead of taking to the street (Hutter, 2014). Consequently, social movement scholars focus on egalitarian movements that promote change, rather than reactionary movements (Hirsch-Hoefler and Mudde, 2013). They tend to overlook the most important contemporary actors mobilizing against the consequences of globalization and immigration: the populist radical right (Hutter and Kriesi, 2013). As Caiani et al. (2012: 4) put it: 'social movement studies ... [have] been slow to address the "bad side" of social movement activism'. Only when sociologists widen their perspective to the electoral channel, can we fully grasp the implications of globalization and large-scale immigration for political contention.

This article reviews the scholarship on both PRR parties and movements in contemporary European democracies. First, we discuss the definitional debate about what constitutes the populist radical right (PRR) family. Second, we review demand-side and supply-side explanations for the fortunes of PRR parties and movements. Third, we discuss research on the consequences of the emergence and rise of PRR parties and movements. The review concludes with a discussion of the future directions that theorizing and research could take.

Definitional debate on radical right-wing populism

Different labels such as 'extreme right' (Arzheimer, 2009; Bale, 2003; Lubbers et al., 2002), 'far right' (Golder, 2016; Williams, 2010) and 'populist radical right' (Mudde, 2007) are used interchangeably to refer to the same organizations, such as the French Front National (FN), Austrian Freedom Party (FPÖ) and Flemish Bloc/Flemish Interest (VB). A consensus has emerged that they constitute one single family.

The most important common denominator is their exclusionist, ethno-nationalist notion of citizenship, reflected in the slogan 'own people first' (Betz, 1994; Rydgren, 2005a). This nativist stance means that states should be inhabited exclusively by members of the native group (the nation) and that non-native elements (persons and ideas) threaten homogeneous nation-states (Mudde, 2007). The label 'radical' thus refers to the outspoken position at the far end of the political spectrum on issues related to immigration and ethnic diversity (Akkerman et al., 2016). Since they strongly hold issue-ownership over immigration issues (Abou-Chadi, 2016) some scholars simply refer to 'anti-immigration parties' (Van der Brug et al., 2005). This label however does not suit PRR parties and movements in Eastern Europe very well, since they are more rooted in territorial revisionism and perceived threats from ethnic minorities, such as the Roma (Bustikova and Kitschelt, 2009; Minkenberg, 2017). Compared with Western Europe, the link between anti-immigration attitudes and PRR voting is significantly weaker in post-communist Europe (Allen, 2017).

According to Mudde's (2007) influential definition, two additional features characterize the PRR family: populism and authoritarianism. PRR groups share their populist, anti-establishment rhetoric (Carter, 2005; Ivarsflaten, 2008; Pelinka, 2013). Populism is a communication style or 'thin' ideology that adds a second division between 'us' and 'them': it pits the 'pure people' against the untrustworthy 'corrupt elite' (Mudde, 2007).

Second, authoritarianism implies stressing themes like law and order and traditional values. Relatedly, PRR groups favour strong leaders who reflect ‘the will of the people’ (Inglehart and Norris, 2016). However, there seems no consistent empirical relationship between authoritarian attitudes and PRR party preference in Western Europe (Dunn, 2015). Traits such as conformism or submission to traditional authority are also at odds with the picture painted of far-right social movement activists (Klandermans and Mayer, 2006). As a matter of fact, PRR movements often challenge existing authority (Hirsch-Hoefler and Mudde, 2013).

In a nutshell, substantial progress has been made in three respects. First, scholars have diverted their attention away from trivializing definitional debates about what right-wing radicalism or populism really ‘is’. Instead, they have increasingly focused on more informative discussions about theories and hypotheses. Second, scholars increasingly focus on actually measuring the ideological characteristics and policy stances of both PRR and mainstream parties (Eger and Valdez, 2015; Immerzeel et al., 2016; Rooduijn and Pauwels, 2011). As a corollary, most scholars have abandoned reasoning in clear-cut categories. A strict ‘either–or’ logic (Mudde, 2007; Van Kessel, 2015) has been replaced by the argument that populism is more a ‘matter of degree’ (Pauwels, 2011a). Likewise, parties can position themselves somewhere on the left–right or cosmopolitan–nativist dimension (Akkerman et al., 2016; Van Spanje, 2011a).

Nevertheless, for many research questions requiring case selection it is still necessary to delineate which ones deserve the label PRR and which ones not. Relying on expert surveys, Van Spanje (2011a) for instance qualifies parties that score higher than 8 on a 10-point left–right scale (it is unclear what a position on this scale exactly signifies) and an immigration restriction scale as ‘far right’ and ‘anti-immigration’, respectively. Inglehart and Norris (2016) use a similar method with a cultural position scale, which includes promoting traditional values, nationalism, law and order, and opposition to multiculturalism.

Van Spanje (2011a: 295) noted that, despite conceptual unclarity, ‘every researcher seems to know which objects to study’. This however seems less obvious when we study post-communist Europe. Until recently, scholars have often ignored this region (Minkenberg, 2015, 2017; Pirro, 2015; Pytlas, 2016). Due to its more fluid party systems, it is generally more difficult to distinguish the political establishment from (populist) outsiders challenging it (Van Kessel, 2015). Mainstream parties and discourses are often more radicalized than in Western Europe (Minkenberg, 2017). Particularly Law and Justice (PiS) in Poland and Fidesz in Hungary illustrate this difficulty. Minkenberg (2017: 124) considers them ‘right-wing populist with programmatic elements of radical right’, since they remain ideologically more diverse than the PRR family. Nevertheless, these two parties feature prominently in debates about liberal democracy being undermined by right-wing populism. Expert surveys show that PiS and Fidesz have more radical positions than some Western European PRR parties (Inglehart and Norris, 2016).

Explanations for failures and successes: Demand- and supply-side approaches

Explanations for the rise and fortunes of PRR parties and movements are usually grouped into two approaches, demand-side and supply-side: one focusing on grievances and one

on political constraints and opportunities (Koopmans et al., 2005; Mudde, 2007; Rydgren, 2007). These two approaches should be viewed as complementary, rather than competing theories (Van der Brug and Fennema, 2007). Supply-side factors can be further divided into internal factors (De Lange and Art, 2011; Norris, 2005), like organizational characteristics (Art, 2011; De Witte and Klandermans, 2000), and external factors, such as institutional frameworks and elite responses (Arzheimer and Carter, 2006; Kitschelt and McGann, 1995).

The socio-demographic characteristics and attitudes of radical right supporters have been extensively investigated (Arzheimer, 2012; Golder, 2016; Van der Brug and Fennema, 2007). More recent studies also include Eastern European countries (Allen, 2017; Inglehart and Norris, 2016; Werts et al., 2013). The findings can be summarized into two general claims. First, protest is not 'unideological', but clearly directed against policies concerning immigration, integration and law and order (Eatwell, 2000; Swyngedouw, 2001). Voting for PRR parties seems largely motivated by ideological and pragmatic considerations, just like voting for other parties (Van der Brug et al., 2000). These motivations stem from perceived loss of culture and economic deprivation, although citizens perhaps do not clearly distinguish between cultural and economic grievances (Golder, 2016). Moreover, characteristics of followers might differ across contexts. For instance, lower-educated people are generally the 'usual suspects', but the constituency of Jobbik certainly does not consist of the 'losers' of the transition: the young and higher educated are more likely to support this party (Kovács, 2013).

Alternatively, voters for PRR parties are sometimes characterized as irrational and alienated, seemingly unconnected to any particular values or policy preferences. However, social isolation is not related to PRR voting, either in Western or Eastern Europe (Rydgren, 2011; Zhirkov, 2014). In a similar vein, Klandermans and Mayer (2006: 267) conclude that radical right activists are socially integrated and appear as 'perfectly normal people' (cf. Blee and Creasap, 2010: 271).

Second, it has become clear that a complete and satisfying explanation for PRR popularity needs to go beyond the demand-side model. It fails to explain short-term fluctuations within countries or large differences between otherwise mostly similar countries (Coffé, 2005; Norris, 2005). For instance, Austria, where the FPÖ has enjoyed considerable successes, is hardly more deprived than Germany, where the PRR is weak. Similarly, comparing the divergent fortunes of the Walloon Front National and Flemish VB, it is hard to imagine that immigration and unemployment have created significantly larger electoral demands for the radical right in Flanders compared to the Walloon region (Arzheimer, 2012).

The external supply-side: Political constraints and opportunities

According to external supply-side explanations, successful mobilization is the result of constraints and opportunities that the political-institutional context offers, most importantly the electoral system and the 'political space' left open by political competitors. Several researchers have convincingly shown that such factors matter, both for the action repertoire that PRR actors adopt (Koopmans et al., 2005) and their electoral performances

(Arzheimer, 2009; Arzheimer and Carter, 2006; Carter, 2005; Lubbers et al., 2002; Norris, 2005; Van der Brug et al., 2005).

Institutional framework

Several works have assessed whether the level of federalism and the electoral system affect the popularity of the PRR (Carter, 2002; Hakhverdian and Koop, 2007; Swank and Betz, 2003; Veugelers and Magnan, 2005). According to Kitschelt (2007: 1193), the general lesson is that the impact of institutional effects on PRR party strength is modest. Proportional electoral systems are conducive to the entrance or success of new parties (Tavits, 2006), but findings regarding radical parties in particular have been mixed (Carter, 2005; Golder, 2003; Jackman and Volpert, 1996; Norris, 2005; Van der Brug et al., 2005). Electoral thresholds may induce potential radical right voters to support mainstream parties when they perceive their favourite party to be too weak to overcome the barrier to entry (Givens, 2005). Clearly, the institutional configuration most unfavourable for newcomers exists in Britain (Kitschelt, 2007). That the British PRR has 'failed' is often attributed to the majoritarian electoral system (John and Margetts, 2009).

Political space

The emergence and rise of the PRR is affected by the positioning of the political parties within the policy space (Kitschelt and McGann, 1995). Political space refers to the degree to which mainstream parties (or moderate-right parties in particular) occupy the electoral terrain of the radical right. When they ideologically converge, they leave a 'gap' in the electoral market. Kriesi et al. (2008, 2012) argue that where established parties follow a moderate course in favour of the 'winners' of globalization, they provide an opportunity for the creation of parties that mobilize the 'losers'. Several studies indeed found that ideological convergence between mainstream parties benefited the entrance or success of radical new parties (Arzheimer and Carter, 2006; Carter, 2005; Norris, 2005; but see Veugelers and Magnan, 2005).

We need to distinguish issue positions from issue salience. Mainstream parties have three strategies at their disposal: remain silent on the particular issue (dismissive), distance itself from nativist viewpoints (adversarial), or adopt a similar position (accommodative). Meguid (2008) argues that issue salience will only enhance PRR support if mainstream parties declare hostility toward the niche party's policy position. If mainstream parties employ accommodative tactics, electoral support for PRR contenders will diminish. Many scholars similarly argue that the PRR loses out when mainstream parties adopt restrictive positions on immigration (Arzheimer and Carter, 2006; Kitschelt and McGann, 1995). This strategy may however backfire (Bale, 2003). Eatwell (2000: 423) for instance notes that mainstream parties 'play with fire' when they adopt anti-immigrant themes, because it legitimizes the agenda of the PRR.

Political space is measured in different ways, for different time periods. Therefore, the results of studies on the effect of the political agenda of other parties on the popularity of PRR challengers show a mixed picture. For instance, using Eurobarometer surveys (1980–2002) and party statements on internationalism, multiculturalism, national

lifestyle and law and order from the Comparative Manifestos Project (CMP), Arzheimer (2009; see also Arzheimer and Carter, 2006) found that the ideological position of the established moderate-right party (labelled 'toughness') had no significant effect on cross-national differences in support for the PRR. On the other hand, saliency, the relative amount of these statements in the manifestos of all established parties, had a positive impact on levels of PRR support.

In contrast, Van der Brug et al. (2005) found that PRR parties are more successful when the moderate-right occupies a more centrist position on a general left–right scale. They relied on the European Elections Studies data (1989–1999) and used respondents' perceptions to measure party positions. And in this case, the extent to which the anti-immigration parties' mainstream competitor emphasized the core issue of the radical right was insignificant, although they measured saliency similarly to Arzheimer (using the CMP data) by selecting the issues crime, negative references to multiculturalism and positive references to 'the national way of life'.

The role of the media environment

The above-mentioned contradiction could perhaps be solved when we complement the political space approach with the notion that opportunities and constraints need to become publicly visible in order to become relevant (Koopmans and Olzak, 2004). Populist movements rely heavily on media, because they often lack sufficient organizational and financial means to get their message across to potential adherents. The controversial, tabloid-style language of its leaders flourishes in a 'media logic' in which newsworthiness is increasingly based on conflicts and scandals (Aalberg et al., 2016; Castells, 1997).

Media-related independent variables can be grouped into (1) attention for issues associated with the PRR and (2) attention for PRR actors. Regarding the first, the empirical findings indicate that news coverage on issues that are 'owned' by PRR parties – immigration issues and law and order – enhances the electoral attractiveness of these parties (Boomgaarden and Vliegenthart, 2007; Plasser and Ulram, 2003; Walgrave and De Swert, 2004).

Several researchers have also investigated the effect of news coverage on PRR actors (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2001; Vliegenthart et al., 2012). There are many indications that the 'media factor' benefits PRR groups. For example, the French FN made its electoral breakthrough in 1984 only after Jean-Marie Le Pen was given access to state television (Eatwell, 2005; Ellinas, 2009). Another example is the 'pro-Haider line' of the *Kronen Zeitung*, Austria's largest newspaper (Art, 2007).

Scholars have differentiated between coverage for PRR speakers and responses of other actors, between positive and negative coverage (Bos et al., 2010; Koopmans and Muis, 2009; Muis, 2015), and between the visibility of leaders and parties (Vliegenthart et al., 2012). Research shows that PRR leaders and parties clearly profit from media prominence (Bos et al., 2010; Clarke et al., 2016; Koopmans and Muis, 2009). Vliegenthart et al. (2012) find that party visibility enhanced electoral support for five of the six anti-immigrant parties they investigated, namely VB, Party for Freedom (PVV), Republikaner, National Democratic Party for Germany (NPD) and German People's Union (DVU). The Dutch Centre Democrats (CD) was the one exception.

Muis's (2015) study on the CD showed two opposite effects: negative publicity was electorally harmful, but at the same time it increased media visibility. Support for the party decreased when it achieved media access because the outright racist claims of its leader Hans Janmaat provoked harsh criticism. But when trying to achieve media visibility, it turned out that 'any publicity is good publicity'. This nuances the claim of Stewart et al. (2003) that any media coverage is advantageous for political figures: it enhances their visibility, but not necessarily implies public legitimation. The difficulty is thus to find the right balance between newsworthiness and electoral credibility. Populist leaders face a trade-off between 'being somewhat unusual and provocative ... (in order to guarantee newsworthiness and therefore prominence)' and being 'taken seriously as a party' (Bos et al., 2010: 143).

Repression, cordon sanitaire

This brings us to the role of repression and legal measures, such as bans and prosecutions. A similar logic applies here: the effect of repression is conditional. Its effects may depend on the politician or group targeted and the situation they are in. Another relevant factor is the nature of the statements in question (Van Spanje and De Vreese, 2015). For instance, the hate-speech charges pressed on Geert Wilders in 2009 considerably boosted electoral support for his party (Van Spanje and De Vreese, 2015). Wilders had already established himself as a powerful politician when it was decided that he was to stand trial.

The impact of prosecution is very different for politicians and groups on the fringe. When movement activists are faced with legal and social sanctions (e.g. public disapproval and exclusion), protesting is a costly business and the ability to attract a wider support-base is undermined. Countries differ significantly in laws regulating the Internet, and thus how favourable a national context is for the online activities of radical right-wing groups (Caiani and Parenti, 2013).

In addition to legal measures, PRR parties sometimes suffer political exclusion in the form of a refusal by other parties to cooperate with them, a so-called cordon sanitaire (Akkerman et al., 2016). It is however not clear whether it is an effective strategy if the purpose is to undermine electoral support. Results on the effects of exclusion on electoral outcomes of PRR parties are mixed (Pauwels, 2011b; Van Spanje and Van der Brug, 2009).

Internal supply-side factors: Characteristics of the PRR

From an internal supply-side perspective, we cannot reduce PRR parties and movements to the passive consequences of socio-economic processes and external political conditions. Instead, they are largely shapers of their own fates (Carter, 2005; Goodwin, 2006; Ignazi, 2003; Mudde, 2007). We distinguish two factors: ideology and organizational structure, including leadership (Carter, 2005; Goodwin, 2006).

The role of ideology

What parties most importantly can achieve through their own actions is to find a beneficial position in the policy space. Kitschelt and McGann (1995) claimed that the

ideological ‘winning formula’ combines culturally exclusionist/authoritarian positions with liberal pro-market positions. However, the position that is said to make the PRR successful has changed over time (De Lange, 2007; Kitschelt, 2004). The PRR has abandoned right-wing economic stances (Eger and Valdez, 2015) and adopted protectionism (Rydgren, 2013) and welfare chauvinism (Oesch, 2008).

Carter (2005) demonstrated a relation between the type of ideology parties employ and their success: more extreme parties are less successful. She encountered some notable exceptions. The Dutch CD was for instance a deviant case: most of the party’s ideological counterparts have flourished, like in Austria (FPÖ), France (FN) and Belgium (VB). The ideological character does not only have direct effects on the fortunes of parties, it also interacts with other explanatory factors. Golder (2003) found that increasing unemployment and high levels of immigration only yield more electoral success for populist radical right parties, but not for the ones that were labelled as ‘neo-fascist’. Despite these two examples, to date, research on such interactions and ideological positioning is relatively scarce (Golder, 2016). Instead of figuring as an explanatory factor, party ideology has played a more dominant role in delimiting the dependent variable.

In any case, despite their common nativist stance as their unique selling point, PRR groups are distinct in their ideological character and framing, and these differences have crucial consequences in terms of their fortunes. The ‘master frame’ (combining nativism with populism) needs to be modified to the particular national context in which these groups operate (Caiani and Della Porta, 2011; Rydgren, 2005b). Scholars have observed that far-right orientations have been adapted. In particular, anti-Semitism has been replaced by Islamophobia (Williams, 2010). In Scandinavia and the Netherlands, ‘new’ PRR parties have stressed progressiveness – liberty, women’s rights, individualism – against reactionary authoritarian standpoints (De Koster et al., 2014; Rydgren, 2005b). In a similar vein, anti-Islam movements such as the English Defence League (EDL) and the Identitarian movement (France) have distanced themselves from anti-Semitism and racism (Fielitz and Laloire, 2016).

Organizational arguments and leadership

Besides ideology, organizational characteristics such as a lack of financial resources, appealing leadership and shortfall of active membership have frequently been proposed as pivotal factors for the performances of PRR parties and movements (Art, 2011). Lack of coherence of party organizations and intra-party conflicts have often hampered PRR parties (Heinisch and Mazzoleni, 2016).

However, organizational characteristics that are supposedly beneficial or indispensable often do not seem to be relevant in order to account for the impressive performance of populist challengers. As pointed out earlier, many leaders rely almost entirely on media attention, and successful trajectories often illustrate how media visibility can compensate for organizational weaknesses (Ellinas, 2009; Mazzoleni, 2008). The growth of membership and improvement of an organization often lag behind success, instead of the other way around: media attention and electoral support are first successfully mobilized, then organizational and financial resources follow. In a review article on party organization effects, Ellinas (2009: 219) states that organizational arguments ‘would need to

carefully trace the evolution of party organisations to establish the direction of causality'. His evidence from the French FN indicates that organizational growth seems the consequence rather than the cause of electoral success, especially during the earlier stages of development. De Witte and Klandermans (2000) identified a 'circle of organisational weakness': weak organizations (like the Dutch CD) remained weak, whereas, in contrast, strong organizations (like VB in Belgium) became stronger over time. In sum, organizational resources seem often both a cause and a result of success. As a genuinely 'independent variable', organizational strength might be more important to explain the persistence of parties after their initial breakthrough (Ellinas, 2007, 2009).

Charismatic leadership is another prominent supply-side explanation in the academic literature (Eatwell, 2005; Lubbers et al., 2002). However, this explanation suffers from circular reasoning (Van der Brug and Mughan, 2007; Van der Brug et al., 2005). Charisma is a legitimization for those who appear to be the 'heroes of a war' and can as suddenly vanish as it appears. If leaders are unsuccessful, charismatic authority can quickly disappear. Max Weber (1947 [1921]) illustrates this by noting that even Chinese monarchs could sometimes lose their status as 'sons of heaven' because of misfortune, such as defeat in war, floods or drought. To conclude, outstanding charismatic appeal is better seen as an emergent situational characteristic, rather than attributed to the skills and personality of the leader concerned.

Consequences of PRR party and movement success

In addition to the causes of PRR fortunes, scholars have increasingly investigated the consequences of the emergence and rise of PRR parties and movements (Mudde, 2013; Rosanvallon, 2008). It is often stated that radical right populism endangers some of the constitutional foundations of liberal democracies: pluralism and the protection of minorities (Abts and Rummens, 2007; Betz, 2004; Mudde, 2007).

At the same time, however, scholars agree that it distinguishes itself from political extremism, in the sense that PRR supporters and activists respect democracy, whereas extremist groups are hostile to democratic political processes (Betz and Johnson, 2004; Minkenberg, 2011; Rydgren, 2007). PRR parties could actually correct democratic deficiencies by speaking to a large group of citizens disillusioned with mainstream politicians (Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser, 2012). Citizens feel that there is someone who 'listened to their grievances' (Ivarsflaten, 2008) and enables them to become passionately, rather than rationally, involved in politics (Mouffe, 2005).

The question of whether there is a relationship between PRR successes and various outcomes associated with the quality of democracy (such as voter turnout) can be empirically tested (Immerzeel, 2015). Therefore, and related to the observation that the PRR has assumed more stable positions within the party system (De Lange, 2012; Zaslove, 2008), we have witnessed a rise in studies on the impact of PRR success on several domains, including the party system (Mudde, 2014) and media debate (Rooduijn, 2014). We restrict ourselves here to the impact on policies, on PRR groups themselves and on the public. Studies generally focus on Western Europe; despite some exceptions, evidence for the impact of the PRR is largely absent from the literature on the East European radical right (Minkenberg, 2017).

Policies and mainstream party positions

Given the PRR's alleged threatening effect on the position and rights of immigrants, it comes as no surprise that scholars have paid attention to the extent to which the PRR was successful in implementing policies derived from its nativist, anti-immigration ideology. Scholars have investigated whether governments that included PRR members introduced tougher policies on immigration and integration (Akkerman, 2012; Heinisch, 2003; Luther, 2011; Zaslove, 2004). These studies generally find no or a limited impact of the PRR on the policies implemented. For instance, Akkerman (2012) concludes on the basis of a comparative analysis of the immigration and integration output of 27 cabinets in nine countries (1996–2010) that when the PRR is in office, cabinets generally introduce stricter immigration and integration legislation than centre(-left) cabinets. Yet, centre-right cabinets that do *not* include a PRR are similar in terms of strictness of immigration policy as those including a PRR. Apparently, the difficulties these parties face in adapting to public office hinder their effectiveness to implement stricter policies (Akkerman, 2012; cf. Van Spanje, 2011b). The finding of Zaslove (2008) that the Austrian Freedom Party and Italian Lega Nord (LN) have been instrumental in passing more restrictive immigration policy may thus be more due to the performance of the conservative mainstream parties that cooperate with them than because of the performance of the PRR itself (cf. Heinisch, 2003).

The PRR could also influence policy making *indirectly*, via its impact on other parties' positions (Schain, 2006). As such, scholars have investigated whether the PRR's success influences the policy positions on immigration, multiculturalism, populism, law and order, and more style-related issues, such as anti-establishment rhetoric (Bale, 2003; Bale et al., 2010; Han, 2014; Immerzeel et al., 2016; Rooduijn et al., 2014; Van Spanje, 2010; Williams, 2006). To study these effects, scholars used either expert surveys (e.g. Immerzeel, 2015; Van Spanje, 2010), or assessed the salience of typical PRR issues in party manifestos (e.g. Alonso and Da Fonseca, 2012).

The results of these studies can be easily summarized: the PRR affects the stances of mainstream parties on immigration and integration issues, but not on other issues. Based on various expert surveys, Van Spanje (2010) concluded that other political parties have generally become more restrictive with respect to immigration and integration due to the PRR's success. Using manifesto data, Han (2014) and Akkerman (2015) found similar effects. More specifically, a fine-grained manifesto content analysis (1989–2011) by Akkerman (2015) shows that mainly Liberals were tempted to co-opt far-right positions, whereas Social Democrats are not affected – or at least their reaction is far from uniform (Bale et al., 2010). Han (2014: 1) shows that left-wing parties only become less multicultural 'when the opinion of party supporters on foreigners becomes more negative or when the parties lost more votes in the previous election than their opponent right-wing mainstream parties did'.

With regard to other issues, such as populism and law and order, mainstream parties seem to hold to their original ideological position (Bale et al., 2010). On the basis of manifesto data (Rooduijn et al., 2014) and expert surveys (Immerzeel et al., 2016), scholars do not find that mainstream parties have become more populist and authoritarian.

To conclude, PRRs have an indirect, but modest influence on policy outcomes. This impact is generally limited to the issue of immigration and integration (Mudde, 2013).

Specifically mainstream right-wing parties employ a convergence strategy that puts them ideologically closer to the PRR (Meguid, 2008; Williams, 2006). However, mainstream right parties are often inclined to move toward stricter immigration policy anyway, independently of PRR successes (Akkerman, 2015; Alonso and Da Fonseca, 2012; Bale, 2003).

Consequence for PRR parties/movements

There is a growing scholarship on how PRR successes affect these groups themselves. Most importantly, what effect does the inclusion into a governing coalition have on parties, both in terms of their ideological positions and their electoral success (Akkerman and De Lange, 2012; Akkerman et al., 2016; Albertazzi and McDonnell, 2015; Van Spanje, 2011b)? Heinisch (2003) argued that right-wing populist parties thrive in opposition, but have trouble with actually participating in a government. He argued that governing leads to moderation and hence to electoral losses. In contrast, Mudde (2013) argues that they will uphold their oppositional image and radical rhetoric, to avoid the risk of being perceived as part of 'the corrupt elite'.

Although there are several case studies, systematic tests of the so-called inclusion-moderation thesis are scarce (Akkerman et al., 2016). Albertazzi and McDonnell (2010, 2015) dismiss the received wisdom that populist parties have inherent problems with assuming power. Their case studies of three parties in Italy and Switzerland – Popolo della Libertà (PDL), LN and Schweizerische Volkspartei (SVP) – show that PRR parties can keep 'one foot in and one foot out' of government: they can thrive and maintain radical positions after taking up government responsibility (cf. Frölich-Steffen and Rensmann, 2007). Likewise, an extensive recent study of Akkerman et al. (2016) concludes that there is no trend toward mainstreaming of Western European PRR parties when it comes to positions on their core issues immigration and integration, European integration and authoritarianism. Overall, there is thus no indication that PRR parties are becoming less radical.

Citizens' attitudes and behaviour

Third, the PRR's emergence and success might affect citizens, in the sense that they shift their views toward more anti-immigration and authoritarian positions, or change their political behaviour (Andersen and Evans, 2003; Bohman, 2011; Dunn and Singh, 2011; Immerzeel, 2015; Ivarsflaten, 2005; Semyonov et al., 2006; Sprague-Jones, 2011; Wilkes et al., 2007). PRR groups can also make some issues more salient (Bale, 2003; Ivarsflaten, 2005).

Studies on the impact of PRR success on immigration attitudes provide a mixed picture (Dunn and Singh, 2011; Semyonov et al., 2006; Sprague-Jones, 2011). Some conclude that successful and visible PRR parties undermine support for multiculturalism (Bohman, 2011), whereas others find no effects. An extensive recent study, based on European Social Survey data (2002–2012), showed that PRR parties have not driven anti-immigration attitudes in Europe (Bohman and Hjerm, 2016). The main difficulty is the lack of longitudinal studies, modelling the attitudinal consequences of PRR success

over time. Evidence based on German and Dutch panel data showed that perceptions of threatened group interests *precipitate* rather than *follow* citizens' preferences for PRR parties (Berning and Schlueter, 2016).

Regarding political involvement and trust, one might expect that PRR parties foster voter turnout because they reintroduce electoral competition and trigger politically disengaged people to become actively or passionately involved in politics (Jansen, 2011; Mouffe, 2005). For instance, Fallend (2012) concludes that the Austrian FPÖ addressed issues neglected by other parties, such as immigration and integration. Accordingly, over the period 1996–2001, the party gave voice to an apolitical part of the electorate, who increasingly felt that politicians listened to them.

However, based on a Dutch six-wave panel study (2008–2013), Rooduijn et al. (2016) find that the popularity of populist parties fuels political discontent, rather than dampens it. In the same vein, based on an analysis of 33 European countries in the period 2002–2012, Immerzeel and Pickup (2015) find there is no general positive influence of the PRR's popularity on electoral turnout. Yet, the Western European PRR encourages some social groups to turn out for national elections. These groups are, however, people who are actually repelled by them: the more highly educated and politically interested are more inclined to 'keep the rascals out'. To conclude, to speak of the PRR as 'corrective of democracy' seems – in terms of increasing electoral turnout or political satisfaction – a misunderstanding.

Another interesting question is how institutionalized and non-institutionalized forms of political participation are related. Hutter (2014) finds that the more successful the populist radical right is in electoral terms, the more it tends to abstain from protest activities. Furthermore, Koopmans' (1996) cross-national comparison showed an inverse relation between the success of PRR parties and the incidence of racist violence. Access to political power in a number of Western European countries over the past years might have contributed to less right-wing violence (Ravndal, 2016). Hence, the electoral channel seems to effectively substitute for street activity and violence (see Koopmans et al., 2005). However, a recent study comparing the German *Bundesländer* found a positive relation between PRR voting and xenophobic violence (Jäckle and König, 2017).

Particularly in the United Kingdom and Germany, xenophobic sentiments can hardly be canalized through the electoral channel. It therefore should perhaps not come as a surprise that both countries have experiences with large-scale street movements. The rise of EDL and Britain First is a corollary of the decay of the British National Party (Alessio and Meredith, 2014; Allen, 2014). The EDL 'offered a more attractive and confrontational alternative to perennial failure at the ballot box' (Ford and Goodwin, 2014: 8). The movement relied heavily on social media to get its message across and recruit supporters (Busher, 2013).

In sum, a weak or fragmented party sector corresponds with a strong movement sector or environment of violence (Minkenberg, 2011). It remains to be seen whether UKIP (in the UK) and Alternative for Germany (AfD) will change this picture in the future. Patzelt and Klose (2016) conclude that the number of Pegida protesters has shrunk since the AfD has increasingly succeeded to put their grievances on the political agenda. Although several AfD politicians have distanced themselves from Pegida (Geiges et al., 2015), a survey showed that 57% of the Pegida demonstrators in Dresden would vote for AfD, and only about 4–5% for NPD (Reuband, 2015).

Future directions: How to proceed?

We conclude this review with a discussion of possible avenues for future research. Concerning research questions, scholars need to pay more attention to the temporal dimension of political contention (Golder, 2016). Remarkably, whereas cross-national comparisons have become commonplace, comparisons in time are still scarce (Ellinas, 2007; Kitschelt, 2007). A dynamic view could reveal whether explanations for and consequences of PRR parties and movements change during their trajectory. For instance, before groups pass the ‘threshold of relevance’ (Carter, 2005; Ellinas, 2007) – i.e. are big enough to matter – organizational attributes might have no effect on their performance. And once populist outsiders have established themselves as credible alternatives, traditional parties may not win back electoral support if they adopt similar agendas (Van Kessel, 2015). Likewise, the impact of government responsibility depends on how long parties exist and whether they have institutionalized (De Lange and Art, 2011).

Cross-national comparisons focus mainly on the PRR’s electoral strength. The strength of social movements and the interaction between electoral politics and other forms of political mobilization, including street protests and racist violence, have received relatively little attention. There are only a few comparative overviews of the non-party sector (Minkenberg, 2011). Individual-level research is needed on the question whether the electoral channel effectively substitutes for street activity (Hutter, 2014; Koopmans, 1996). To what extent do people refrain from using non-parliamentary means to voice their grievances about multiculturalism and immigration, due to electoral successes or government inclusion of PRR parties (Minkenberg, 2011)? Again, a dynamic perspective is important: over time, movements can turn into political parties, and parties can engage in street demonstrations when they face political obstruction.

This brings us to future avenues for theoretical progress. Both PRR parties and movements and its competitors/opponents can adjust their action repertoire and ideology over time, and continually respond to what other agents are doing, which is insufficiently addressed by static, spatial comparisons. Future scholarship could theorize more from such an evolutionary perspective. We should elaborate more sophisticated behavioural models of party strategies (Kitschelt, 2007). We should not only try to identify a certain policy package that ‘works’ beneficially. In addition, we need to reveal the mechanism by which parties are able or inclined to arrive at successful positions over time. Only a few accounts of far-right populism clearly explicate why or how successful populist leaders are able to find ‘successful positions’ and why most other attempts fail to do so (Muis and Scholte, 2013).

In terms of confronting theories with empirical evidence, future studies could be enriched by greater attention to PRR parties and movements’ presence on the Internet. The current debate on the role of the Internet is characterized by much theoretical speculation; we know little about how these groups use the Internet for political communication and mobilization (Caiani and Parenti, 2013). Future work in this field could make progress in two ways. To date, to assess where PRR groups stand, scholars mainly rely on manifestos (Akkerman et al., 2016; Eger and Valdez, 2015), expert surveys (Immerzeel et al., 2016) and traditional media (Kriesi et al., 2008). These methods could be supplemented with sources that are widely consumed by citizens (few people actually read

party manifestos) and controlled by PRR actors themselves (media coverage might be biased), namely social media. Second, social media analyses could also enrich our understanding of supporters and sympathizers, in addition to surveys or interviews. For instance, Arzheimer (2015) concludes that the German AfD does not qualify as either nativist or populist, but statements of Facebook followers hint at more radical currents among its supporters. The topics that people devoted most attention to (Islam and immigration) were hardly mentioned in AfD's own messages.

To conclude, the scholarship on the populist radical right has become a 'minor industry' (Arzheimer, 2012: 35), but there are still important gaps and challenges. In addition to the ample static country-comparisons, upcoming studies could pay more attention to the fact that both PRR actors and its environment are dynamic over time. They could also make progress by thereby investigating the interplay between the electoral channel and all other types of political mobilization, such as demonstrations. Since the stances and supporters of street movements are difficult to investigate with conventional methods such as surveys and manifesto coding, scholars could rely more on social media data.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Aalberg T, Esser F, Reinemann C et al. (eds) (2016) *Populist Political Communication in Europe*. New York: Routledge.
- Abou-Chadi T (2016) Niche party success and mainstream party policy shifts: How green and radical right parties differ in their impact. *British Journal of Political Science* 46(2): 417–436.
- Abts K and Rummens S (2007) Populism versus democracy. *Political Studies* 55(2): 405–424.
- Akkerman T (2012) Comparing radical right parties in government: Immigration and integration policies in nine countries (1996–2010). *West European Politics* 35(3): 511–529.
- Akkerman T (2015) Immigration policy and electoral competition in Western Europe: A fine-grained analysis of party positions over the past two decades. *Party Politics* 21(1): 54–67.
- Akkerman T and De Lange SL (2012) Radical right parties in office: Incumbency records and the electoral cost of governing. *Government and Opposition* 47(4): 574–596.
- Akkerman T, De Lange SL and Rooduijn M (2016) *Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe: Into the Mainstream?* London: Routledge.
- Albertazzi D and McDonnell D (2005) The Lega Nord in the second Berlusconi government: In a league of its own. *West European Politics* 28(5): 952–972.
- Albertazzi D and McDonnell D (2010) The Lega Nord back in government. *West European Politics* 33(6): 1318–1340.
- Albertazzi D and McDonnell D (2015) *Populists in Power*. London: Routledge.
- Alessio D and Meredith K (2014) Blackshirts for the twenty-first century? Fascism and the English Defence League. *Social Identities* 20(1): 104–118.
- Allen C (2014) Britain First: The 'frontline resistance' to the Islamification of Britain. *The Political Quarterly* 85(3): 354–361.
- Allen TJ (2017) All in the party family? Comparing far right voters in Western and Post-Communist Europe. *Party Politics* 23(3): 274–285.
- Alonso S and Da Fonseca SC (2012) Immigration, left and right. *Party Politics* 18(6): 865–884.

- Andersen R and Evans JAJ (2003) Social-political context and authoritarian attitudes: Evidence from seven European countries. In: *EREPS Annual Meeting*, Ghent, 5–7 December.
- Art D (2007) Reacting to the radical right: Lessons from Germany and Austria. *Party Politics* 13(3): 331–349.
- Art D (2011) *Inside the Radical Right: The Development of Anti-Immigrant Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arzheimer K (2009) Contextual factors and the extreme right vote in Western Europe, 1980–2002. *American Journal of Political Science* 53(2): 259–275.
- Arzheimer K (2012) Electoral sociology: Who votes for the extreme right and why – and when? In: Backes U and Moreau P (eds) *The Extreme Right in Europe: Current Trends and Perspectives*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, pp. 35–50.
- Arzheimer K (2015) The AfD's Facebook wall: A new hub for far-right mobilisation in Germany? In: *APSA Annual Meeting*, San Francisco, 3–6 September.
- Arzheimer K and Carter E (2006) Political opportunity structures and right-wing extremist party success. *European Journal of Political Research* 45(3): 419–443.
- Backes U and Moreau P (eds) (2012) *The Extreme Right in Europe: Current Trends and Perspectives*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Bale T (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 T, Green-Pedersen C, Krouwel A et al. (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): 410–426.
- Berning CC and Schlueter E (2016) The dynamics of radical right-wing populist party preferences and perceived group threat: A comparative panel analysis of three competing hypotheses in the Netherlands and Germany. *Social Science Research* 55: 83–93.
- Betz H-G (1994) *Radical Right-Wing Populism in Western Europe*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Betz H-G (2004) Exclusionary populism in Western Europe in the 1990s and beyond: A threat to democracy and civil rights? Identities, Conflict and Cohesion Programme Paper No. 9, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Betz H-G and Johnson C (2004) Against the current – stemming the tide: The nostalgic ideology of the contemporary radical populist right. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 9(3): 311–327.
- Blee KM and Creasap KA (2010) Conservative and right-wing movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 269–286.
- Bohman A (2011) Articulated antipathies: Political influence on anti-immigrant attitudes. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 52(6): 457–477.
- Bohman A and Hjerm M (2016) In the wake of radical right electoral success: A cross-country comparative study of anti-immigration attitudes over time. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(11): 1729–1747.
- Boomgaarden HG and Vliethehart R (2007) Explaining the rise of anti-immigrant parties: The role of news media content. *Electoral Studies* 26(2): 404–417.
- Bos L, Van der Brug W and De Vreese C (2010) Media coverage of right-wing populist leaders. *Communications* 35(2): 141–163.
- Busher J (2013) Grassroots activism in the English Defence League: Discourse and public (dis) order. In: Taylor M, Currie PM and Holbrook D (eds) *Extreme Right-Wing Political Violence and Terrorism*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 65–84.
- Bustikova L and Kitschelt H (2009) The radical right in post-communist Europe: Comparative perspectives on legacies and party competition. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 42(4): 459–483.

- Caiani M and Della Porta D (2011) The elitist populism of the extreme right: A frame analysis of extreme right-wing discourses in Italy and Germany. *Acta Politica* 46(2): 180–202.
- Caiani M and Parenti L (2013) *European and American Extreme Right Groups and the Internet*. London: Routledge.
- Caiani M, Della Porta D and Wagemann C (2012) *Mobilizing on the Extreme Right: Germany, Italy, and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carter EL (2002) Proportional representation and the fortunes of right-wing extremist parties. *West European Politics* 25(3): 125–146.
- Carter E (2005) *The Extreme Right in Western Europe: Success or Failure?* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Castells M (1997) *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Vol. 2, The Power of Identity*. London: Blackwell.
- Clarke H, Whiteley P, Borges W et al. (2016) Modelling the dynamics of support for a right-wing populist party: The case of UKIP. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 26(2): 135–154.
- Coffé H (2005) Do individual factors explain the different success of the two Belgian extreme right parties. *Acta Politica* 40(1): 74–93.
- De Koster W, Achterberg P, Van der Waal J et al. (2014) Progressiveness and the new right: The electoral relevance of culturally progressive values in the Netherlands. *West European Politics* 37(3): 584–604.
- De Lange SL (2007) A new winning formula? The programmatic appeal of the radical right. *Party Politics* 13(4): 411–435.
- De Lange SL (2012) Radical right-wing populist parties in offices: A cross-national comparison. In: Backes U and Moreau P (eds) *The Extreme Right in Europe: Current Trends and Perspectives*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, pp. 171–194.
- De Lange SL and Art D (2011) Fortuyn versus Wilders: An agency-based approach to radical right party building. *West European Politics* 34(6): 1229–1249.
- De Witte H and Klandermans B (2000) Political racism in Flanders and the Netherlands: Explaining differences in the electoral success of extreme right-wing parties. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 26(4): 699–717.
- Dunn K (2015) Preference for radical right-wing populist parties among exclusive-nationalists and authoritarians. *Party Politics* 21(3): 367–380.
- Dunn KP and Singh SP (2011) The surprising non-impact of radical right-wing populist party representation on public tolerance of minorities. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 21(3): 313–331.
- Eatwell R (2000) The rebirth of the ‘extreme right’ in Western Europe? *Parliamentary Affairs* 53(3): 407–425.
- Eatwell R (2005) Charisma and the revival of the European extreme right. In: Rydgren J (ed.) *Movements of Exclusion: Radical Right-Wing Populism in the Western World*. New York: Nova Publishers, pp. 101–120.
- Eger MA and Valdez S (2015) Neo-nationalism in Western Europe. *European Sociological Review* 31(1): 115–130.
- Ellinas AA (2007) Phased out: Far right parties in Western Europe. *Comparative Politics* 39(3): 353–371.
- Ellinas AA (2009) Chaotic but popular? Extreme-right organisation and performance in the age of media communication. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 17(2): 209–221.
- Fallend F (2012) Populism in government: The case of Austria. In: Mudde C and Rovira Kaltwasser C (eds) *Populism in Europe and the Americas: Threat or Corrective for Democracy?* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 113–135.

- Fielitz M and Laloire LL (eds) (2016) *Trouble on the Far Right: Contemporary Right-Wing Strategies and Practices in Europe*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Ford R and Goodwin MJ (2014) *Revolt on the Right: Explaining Support for the Radical Right in Britain*. London: Routledge.
- Frölich-Steffen S and Rensmann L (2007) Conditions for failure and success of right-wing populist parties. In: Delwit P and Poirier P (eds) *Extreme droite et pouvoir en Europe*. Brussels: Université de Bruxelles, pp. 117–141.
- Geiges L, Marg S and Walter F (2015) *Pegida. Die schmutzige Seite der Zivilgesellschaft*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Givens TE (2005) *Voting Radical Right in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Golder M (2003) Explaining variation in the success of extreme right parties in Western Europe. *Comparative Political Studies* 36(4): 432–466.
- Golder M (2016) Far right parties in Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 477–497.
- Goodwin MJ (2006) The rise and faults of the internalist perspective in extreme right studies. *Representation* 42(4): 347–364.
- Greven T (2016) *The Rise of Right-Wing Populism in Europe and the United States: A Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Hakhverdian A and Koop C (2007) Consensus democracy and support for populist parties in Western Europe. *Acta Politica* 42(4): 401–420.
- Han KJ (2014) The impact of radical right-wing parties on the positions of mainstream parties regarding multiculturalism. *West European Politics* 38(3): 1–20.
- Heinisch R (2003) Success in opposition – failure in government: Explaining the performance of right-wing populist parties in public office. *West European Politics* 26(3): 91–130.
- Heinisch R and Mazzoleni O (eds) (2016) *Understanding Populist Party Organisation: The Radical Right in Western Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hirsch-Hoefler S and Mudde C (2013) Right-wing movements. In: Snow DA, Della Porta D, Klandermans B and McAdam D (eds) *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*. London: Blackwell, pp. 1–8.
- Hutter S (2014) *Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe: New Cleavages in Left and Right Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hutter S and Kriesi H (2013) Movements of the left, movements of the right reconsidered. In: Van Stekelenburg J, Roggeband C and Klandermans B (eds) *The Future of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 281–298.
- Ignazi P (2003) *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Immerzeel T (2015) *Voting for a change: The democratic lure of populist radical right parties in voting behavior*. PhD dissertation, Utrecht University, the Netherlands.
- Immerzeel T and Pickup M (2015) Populist radical right parties mobilizing ‘the people’? The role of populist radical right success in voter turnout. *Electoral Studies* 40: 347–360.
- Immerzeel T, Lubbers M and Coffé H (2016) Competing with the radical right: Distances between the European radical right and other parties on typical radical right issues. *Party Politics* 22(6): 823–834.
- Inglehart R and Norris P (2016) Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash. HKS Working Paper No. RWP16–026, Harvard University.
- Ivarsflaten E (2005) Threatened by diversity: Why restrictive asylum and immigration policies appeal to Western Europeans. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 15(1): 21–45.
- Ivarsflaten E (2008) What unites right-wing populists in Western Europe? Re-examining grievance mobilization models in seven successful cases. *Comparative Political Studies* 41(1): 3–23.

- Jäckle S and König PD (2017) The dark side of the German 'welcome culture': Investigating the causes behind attacks on refugees in 2015. *West European Politics* 40(2): 223–251.
- Jackman RW and Volpert K (1996) Conditions favouring parties of the extreme right in Western Europe. *British Journal of Political Science* 26(4): 501–521.
- Jansen RS (2011) Populist mobilization: A new theoretical approach to populism. *Sociological Theory* 29(2): 75–96.
- John P and Margetts H (2009) The latent support for the extreme right in British politics. *West European Politics* 32(3): 496–513.
- Kitschelt H (2004) *Diversification and Reconfiguration of Party Systems in Postindustrial Democracies*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Kitschelt H (2007) Growth and persistence of the radical right in postindustrial democracies: Advances and challenges in comparative research. *West European Politics* 30(5): 1176–1206.
- Kitschelt H and McGann AJ (1995) *The Radical Right in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Klandermans B and Mayer N (eds) (2006) *Extreme Right Activists in Europe: Through the Magnifying Glass*. London: Routledge.
- Koopmans R (1996) Explaining the rise of racist and extreme right violence in Western Europe: Grievances or opportunities? *European Journal of Political Research* 30(2): 185–216.
- Koopmans R and Muis J (2009) The rise of right-wing populist Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands: A discursive opportunity approach. *European Journal of Political Research* 48(5): 642–664.
- Koopmans R and Olzak S (2004) Discursive opportunities and the evolution of right-wing violence in Germany. *American Journal of Sociology* 110(1): 198–230.
- Koopmans R, Statham P, Giugni M and Passy F (2005) *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kovács A (2013) The post-communist extreme right. The Jobbik Party in Hungary. In: Wodak R, Khosravi-Nik M and Mral B (eds) *Right-Wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 223–234.
- Kriesi H, Grande E, Dolezal M et al. (2012) *Political Conflict in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kriesi H, Grande E, Lachat R et al. (2008) *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lubbers M and Scheepers P (2001) Explaining the trend in extreme right-wing voting: Germany 1989–1998. *European Sociological Review* 17(4): 431–449.
- Lubbers M, Gijsberts M and Scheepers P (2002) Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research* 41(3): 345–378.
- Luther KR (2011) Of goals and own goals: A case study of right-wing populist party strategy for and during incumbency. *Party Politics* 17(4): 453–470.
- Mazzoleni G (2008) Populism and the media. In: Albertazzi D and McDonnell (eds) *Twenty-First Century Populism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 49–64.
- Meguid BM (2008) *Party Competition Between Unequals: Strategies and Electoral Fortunes in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Minkenberg M (2011) The radical right in Europe today: Trends and patterns in East and West. In: Langenbacher N and Schellenberg B (eds) *Is Europe on the 'Right' Path?* Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, pp. 37–55.
- Minkenberg M (ed.) (2015) *Transforming the Transformation? The East European Radical Right in the Political Process*. New York: Routledge.
- Minkenberg M (2017) *The Radical Right in Eastern Europe: Democracy under Siege?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Mouffe C (2005) The 'end of politics' and the challenge of right-wing populism. In: Panizza F (ed.) *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. London: Verso, pp. 50–71.
- Mudde C (2007) *Populist Radical Right Parties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde C (2013) The 2012 Stein Rokkan Lecture: Three decades of populist radical right parties in Western Europe: So what? *European Journal of Political Research* 52(1): 1–19.
- Mudde C (2014) Fighting the system? Populist radical right parties and party system change. *Party Politics* 20(2): 217–226.
- Mudde C (2016) The study of populist radical right parties: Towards a fourth wave. C-REX Working Paper Series No. 1, Centre for Research on Extremism, the Extreme Right, Hate Crime, and Political Violence, University of Oslo.
- Mudde C and Rovira Kaltwasser C (eds) (2012) *Populism in Europe and the Americas: Threat or Corrective for Democracy?* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Muis J (2015) The rise and demise of the Dutch extreme right: Discursive opportunities and support for the Center Democrats in the 1990s. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 20(1): 41–60.
- Muis J and Scholte M (2013) How to find the 'winning formula'? Conducting simulation experiments to grasp the tactical moves and fortunes of populist radical right parties. *Acta Politica* 48(1): 22–46.
- Norris P (2005) *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oesch D (2008) Explaining workers' support for right-wing populist parties in Western Europe: Evidence from Austria, Belgium, France, Norway, and Switzerland. *International Political Science Review* 29(3): 349–373.
- Patzelt WJ and Klose J (eds) (2016) *PEGIDA. Warnsignale aus Dresden*. Dresden: Thelem Universitätsverlag.
- Pauwels T (2011a) Measuring populism: A quantitative text analysis of party literature in Belgium. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 21(1): 97–119.
- Pauwels T (2011b) Explaining the strange decline of the populist radical right Vlaams Belang in Belgium: The impact of permanent opposition. *Acta Politica* 46(1): 60–82.
- Pelinka A (2013) Right-wing populism: Concept and typology. In: Wodak R, Khosravnik M and Mral B (eds) *Right-Wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 3–22.
- Pirro A (2015) *The Populist Radical Right in Central and Eastern Europe: Ideology, Impact, and Electoral Performance*. London: Routledge.
- Plasser F and Ulram PA (2003) Striking a responsive chord: Mass media and right-wing populism in Austria. In: Mazzoleni G, Stewart J and Horsfield B (eds) *The Media and Neo-Populism: A Comparative Analysis*. Westport, CT: Praeger, pp. 21–43.
- Pytlas B (2016) *Radical Right Parties in Central and Eastern Europe: Mainstream Party Competition and Electoral Fortune*. London: Routledge.
- Ravndal JA (2016) Right-wing terrorism and violence in Western Europe: Introducing the RTV dataset. *Perspectives on Terrorism* 10(3). Available at: www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/508/html (accessed 27 November 2016).
- Reuband KH (2015) Wer demonstriert in Dresden für Pegida? Ergebnisse empirischer Studien, methodische Grundlagen und offene Fragen. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Parteienrecht und Parteienforschung* 21: 133–143.
- Rooduijn M (2014) The mesmerising message: The diffusion of populism in public debates in Western European media. *Political Studies* 62(4): 726–744.
- Rooduijn M and Pauwels T (2011) Measuring populism: Comparing two methods of content analysis. *West European Politics* 34(6): 1272–1283.

- Rooduijn M, De Lange SL and Van Der Brug W (2014) A populist Zeitgeist? Programmatic contagion by populist parties in Western Europe. *Party Politics* 20(4): 563–575.
- Rooduijn M, Van der Brug W and De Lange SL (2016) Expressing or fuelling discontent? The relationship between populist voting and political discontent. *Electoral Studies* 43: 32–40.
- Rosanvallon P (2008) *Counter-Democracy: Politics in an Age of Distrust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rydgren J (ed.) (2005a) *Movements of Exclusion: Radical Right-Wing Populism in the Western World*. New York: Nova Publishers.
- Rydgren J (2005b) Is extreme rightwing populism contagious? Explaining the emergence of a new party family. *European Journal of Political Research* 44(3): 413–437.
- Rydgren J (2007) The sociology of the radical right. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 241–262.
- Rydgren J (2011) A legacy of ‘unciviness’? Social capital and radical right-wing populist voting in Eastern Europe. *Acta Politica* 46(2): 132–157.
- Rydgren J (2013) Introduction: Class politics and the radical right. In: Rydgren J (ed.) *Class Politics and the Radical Right*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–9.
- Schain MA (2006) The extreme-right and immigration policy-making: Measuring direct and indirect effects. *West European Politics* 29(2): 270–289.
- Semyonov M, Raijman R and Gorodzeisky A (2006) The rise of anti-foreigner sentiment in European societies, 1988–2000. *American Sociological Review* 71(3): 426–449.
- Sprague-Jones J (2011) Extreme right-wing vote and support for multiculturalism in Europe. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(4): 535–555.
- Stewart J, Mazzoleni G and Horsfield B (2003) Conclusion: Power to the media managers. In: Mazzoleni G, Stewart J and Horsfield B (eds) *The Media and Neo-Populism: A Comparative Analysis*. Westport, CT: Praeger, pp. 217–237.
- Swank D and Betz H-G (2003) Globalization, the welfare state and right-wing populism in Western Europe. *Socio-Economic Review* 1(2): 215–245.
- Swyngedouw M (2001) The subjective cognitive and affective map of extreme right voters: Using open-ended questions in exit polls. *Electoral Studies* 20(2): 217–241.
- Tavits M (2006) Party system change testing a model of new party entry. *Party Politics* 12(1): 99–119.
- Van der Brug W and Fennema M (2007) Causes of voting for the radical right. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 19(4): 474–487.
- Van der Brug W and Mughan A (2007) Charisma, leader effects and support for right-wing populist parties. *Party Politics* 13(1): 29–51.
- Van der Brug W, Fennema M and Tillie J (2000) Anti-immigrant parties in Europe: Ideological or protest vote? *European Journal of Political Research* 37(1): 77–102.
- Van der Brug W, Fennema M and Tillie J (2005) Why some anti-immigrant parties fail and others succeed. *Comparative Political Studies* 38(5): 537–573.
- Van Kessel S (2015) *Populist Parties in Europe: Agents of Discontent?* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Spanje J (2010) Contagious parties: Anti-immigration parties and their impact on other parties’ immigration stances in contemporary Western Europe. *Party Politics* 16(5): 563–586.
- Van Spanje J (2011a) The wrong and the right: A comparative analysis of ‘anti-immigration’ and ‘far right’ parties. *Government and Opposition* 46(3): 293–320.
- Van Spanje J (2011b) Keeping the rascals in: Anti-political-establishment parties and their cost of governing in established democracies. *European Journal of Political Research* 50(5): 609–635.
- Van Spanje J and De Vreese C (2015) The good, the bad and the voter: The impact of hate speech prosecution of a politician on electoral support for his party. *Party Politics* 21(1): 115–130.

- Van Spanje J and Van der Brug W (2009) Being intolerant of the intolerant: The exclusion of Western European anti-immigration parties and its consequences for party choice. *Acta Politica* 44(4): 353–384.
- Veugelers J and Magnan A (2005) Conditions of far right strength in contemporary Western Europe: An application of Kitschelt's theory. *European Journal of Political Research* 44(6): 837–860.
- Vliegthart R, Boomgaarden HG and Van Spanje J (2012) Anti-immigrant party support and media visibility: A cross-party, over-time perspective. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 22(3): 315–358.
- Walgrave S and De Swert K (2004) The making of the (issues of the) Vlaams Blok. *Political Communication* 21(4): 479–500.
- Weber M (1947 [1921]) *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. T Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Werts H, Scheepers P and Lubbers M (2013) Euro-scepticism and radical right-wing voting in Europe, 2002–2008: Social cleavages, socio-political attitudes and contextual characteristics determining voting for the radical right. *European Union Politics* 14(2): 183–205.
- Wilkes R, Guppy N and Farris L (2007) Right-wing parties and anti-foreigner sentiment in Europe. *American Sociological Review* 72(5): 831–840.
- Williams MH (2006) *The Impact of Radical Right-Wing Parties in West European Democracies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williams MH (2010) Can leopards change their spots? Between xenophobia and trans-ethnic populism among West European far right parties. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 16(1): 111–134.
- Zaslave A (2004) Closing the door? The ideology and impact of radical right populism on immigration policy in Austria and Italy. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 9(1): 99–118.
- Zaslave A (2008) Here to stay? Populism as a new party type. *European Review* 16(3): 319–336.
- Zhirkov K (2014) Nativist but not alienated: A comparative perspective on the radical right vote in Western Europe. *Party Politics* 20(2): 286–296.

Author biographies

Jasper Muis is Assistant Professor at the Sociology Department of the VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands. His research interests include right-wing populism, protest behaviour, political communication and complex adaptive systems. His dissertation, titled *Pim Fortuyn: The evolution of a media phenomenon* about the breakthrough of right-wing populism in the Netherlands, received the Dutch Research Prize of the Praemium Erasmianum Foundation.

Tim Immerzeel is a teacher in social studies in the city of Rotterdam – the stronghold of Pim Fortuyn's party. He was postdoctoral research fellow at the Department of Sociology at VU University Amsterdam and member of the international PolPart project team that investigates why people participate in politics. He finished his dissertation at the Department of Sociology/ICS at Utrecht University, the Netherlands. It investigates the relationship between political participation and radical right-wing voting, and examines the mobilization success of radical right parties.

Résumé

Cet article examine trois tendances qui coexistent au sein des travaux de recherche sur la droite radicale et populiste. Il se penche sur les partis politiques et la mobilisation extraparlamentaire dans les démocraties européennes contemporaines. Après avoir passé en revue les questions de définition et sélectionné plusieurs cas d'études, nous examinons les différentes approches de la demande qui expliquent les succès et les échecs de la droite populiste et radicale. Nous analysons ensuite les perspectives du côté de l'offre afin de souligner l'importance des opportunités politiques et des stratégies internes du côté de l'offre, c'est-à-dire le rôle de l'équipe dirigeante, de l'organisation et du positionnement idéologique. En troisième lieu, nous examinons les travaux de recherche sur l'émergence et la montée de ces partis et de ces mouvements en nous demandant s'ils représentent une remédiation ou une menace pour la démocratie. Nous analysons les travaux abondants consacrés aux conséquences de ce phénomène sur les politiques des partis, l'action publique et les comportements des citoyens et des appareils politiques. En conclusion, cette étude propose de nouvelles pistes pour les travaux de théorisation et de recherche.

Mots-clés

Partis anti-immigration, populisme, droite radicale, extrême droite, mouvements sociaux

Resumen

Este artículo revisa tres aspectos de los estudios sobre la derecha radical populista (PRR), abarcando tanto los partidos políticos como la movilización extraparlamentaria en las democracias europeas contemporáneas. Luego de presentar los temas de definición y la selección de casos, primero debatimos los enfoques del lado de la demanda para las fortunas del PRR. Posteriormente, evaluamos los enfoques de la oferta. Estos consisten en explicaciones de oportunidad política y enfoques internos de oferta, refiriéndose al liderazgo, la organización y el posicionamiento ideológico. En tercer lugar, se examina la investigación sobre las consecuencias de la aparición y el surgimiento de estos partidos y movimientos: ¿constituyen una corrección o una amenaza para la democracia? Discutimos la creciente literatura sobre el impacto en las políticas de los partidos establecidos, las políticas, ellos mismos y el comportamiento de los ciudadanos. La revisión concluye con las orientaciones futuras para la teorización y la investigación.

Palabras clave

Partidos anti-inmigración, populismo, derecha radical, extrema derecha, movimientos sociales