

The Reverse Backlash: How the Success of Populist Radical Right Parties Relates to More Positive Immigration Attitudes

James Dennison
European University Institute
james.dennison@eui.eu

Alexander Kustov
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
akustov@uncc.edu

Forthcoming in *Public Opinion Quarterly*

Abstract

What is the relationship between the electoral success of populist radical right parties (PRRPs) and public attitudes toward immigration? Previous research suggests that PRRP success can lead to more negative attitudes due to the breaking down of anti-prejudice norms and more prominent anti-immigration party cues. However, we argue that greater PRRP success could have a positive relationship with immigration attitudes, reflecting negative partisanship, polarisation, and a desire to re-emphasise anti-prejudice norms, which we call a “reverse backlash effect”. Using the best available electoral and public opinion data across the last thirty years in 24 European countries, our TSCS analyses show the predominance of such “reverse backlash effects” across several operationalisations of PRRP success. Our argument has important consequences for the understanding of possible PRRP effects on public opinion, as well as attitudinal formation via party cueing and social norms more generally.

Keywords: immigration attitudes, populism, voting, opinion change, social norms

Introduction

In recent decades, populist radical right parties (PRRPs) have secured increasing electoral strength across Europe and beyond. While there has been significant research on how such parties cue widespread anti-immigration sentiments to improve their electoral fortunes, it is still unclear whether they actually change these very sentiments. The so-called “immigration backlash” is usually conceptualized as a populist response to pro-immigration policy advancements or increasing immigration (Kustov 2022), but one can also imagine an analogous “reverse backlash” to populist electoral success in terms of improving public attitudes toward immigration, especially given the increasing polarization on the issue. The recent prominent examples of such a dynamic are the seeming pro-immigration reactions of the US public to the election of Donald Trump (Collingwood et al., 2018) or the UK public in the aftermath of Brexit (Schwartz et al., 2020). In this paper, we test whether these notable cases of “reverse backlash” can be generalized to a larger set of the populist radical right successes across countries.

What is the relationship between the electoral success of populist radical right parties (PRRPs) and public attitudes toward immigration? Intuitively, we might expect the increased success of populist radical right parties to have a negative effect on public attitudes to immigration via two related mechanisms: the increased ability of PRRPs to cue anti-immigration attitudes in the general population via greater resources, attention, and legitimacy (Zaller, 1992; Hartevelde et al., 2017; Hellwig & Kweon, 2016; Vrânceanu & Lachat, 2021) and the breaking of social stigmas related to open expression of anti-immigration sentiment (Rooduuijn et al., 2016). Moreover, Abou-Chadi and Krause (2020; Van Spanje, 2010) show that when radical right parties enter parliament it moves mainstream parties towards more anti-immigration positions (meaning that at the aggregate-level the growth of PRRPs may also lead to anti-immigration sentiment *via* other parties’ cueing efforts). At the same time, Valentim (2021) shows that PRRP entry to parliament erodes social norms so that *their voters* see their views as legitimised and are more willing to publicly express their intention to vote for such parties.

However, empirically, despite the rise of PRRPs over the last decades, attitudes to immigration have been shown to be stable over the long-term (Kustov et al., 2021). Moreover, as the electoral breakthroughs and successes of PRRPs became more widespread and acute across Europe in the aftermath of the 2015-16 so-called “migration crisis”, there was not and has still not been a correspondent negative turn in attitudes to immigration. Indeed, according to some sources of data and as measured by certain questions, attitudes to immigration have become more positive in several European countries (Banai et al, 2022; Dennison and Geddes, 2019).

In this research note we argue and empirically demonstrate that PRRP electoral success is associated with greater positivity in overall public attitudes via what we dub a “reverse backlash effect.” If present, this relationship might reflect the desire amongst the majority of citizens to re-emphasise anti-xenophobic social norms and stigma towards PRRPs’ key policies (e.g. Mendes and Dennison, 2021), as well as express negative partisanship towards such parties (e.g. Meléndez and Kaltwasser, 2021). It may also reflect a reduction in ambivalence towards the topic of immigration via higher issue salience and polarisation more generally, with a majority of those who were ambivalent moving towards pro-immigration positions (Lindstam et al, 2021). Finally, this “reverse backlash effect” may also be conceptualised as a form of thermostatic public opinion. Rather than the thermostat measuring feeling towards particular policies (Wlezien, 1995), it would be towards the direction and state of the party system and societal norms regarding what constitutes an acceptable political opinion.

Findings related to similar albeit less generalisable events lend plausibility to our central proposition. Scholars (Schwartz et al, 2021; Solodoch, 2021) have shown that the UK’s vote to leave the EU (“Brexit”) lead to an increase in self-reported *positivity* towards immigrants, theorised as resulting from satisfaction that immigration “control” had been “restored” and a desire to distance oneself from accusations of xenophobia and racism following the controversial referendum campaign. The latter point is grounded in the Motivation to Control Prejudice theory, which posits that ‘individuals are averse to breaking anti-prejudice norms and will deliberately seek to control actions, expressions or thoughts that can be deemed to violate these norms’ (Schwartz et al, 2021: 1169; Blinder et al, 2013; Czopp and Monteith, 2003; Devine et al. 1991; Devine, 1989; Dovidio and Gaertner 2004; Fazio et al., 1986). Crucially, the Motivation to Control Prejudice theoretically requires continuous self-reflection about one’s own views to external events to control and check manifestations of prejudice to avoid social sanction (Blinder et al, 2013; Monteith et al, 2002). As such, the widely discussed and controversial rise in radical right support in Europe in the 2010s may plausibly have—like “Brexit”—triggered a psychological imperative for many individuals to redouble their support for immigration. Indeed, Blinder et al (2013: 845) argue that politicians or parties with ‘clear racist or fascist reputations’ can be expected to ‘activate the antiprejudice norm’ while the controversial leaders of PRRPs make individuals ‘*aware* that a norm is at stake, before they take the cognitive effort to control prejudice and adjust their response in accordance with it’ (Harteveld et al, 2017: 372).

Finally, we may also expect the increased success of PRRPs to have no effect on public attitudes to immigration. Such attitudes have been shown to be stable at the aggregate level (Kustov et al, 2021), theoretically the result of attitudes being formed in early life and reflecting deep-seated psychological predispositions and national and education socialising experiences (McLaren et al, 2020; García-Faroldi, 2017; Kauff et al., 2013; McLaren and Paterson, 2020; Dennison et al, 2020; Dinesen et al., 2016). Therefore, attitudinal changes that do occur happen gradually at the aggregate level due to generational replacement, as those socialised in more precipitous conditions for immigration sympathy (e.g., heterogenous societies, “universalist” tertiary education) enter adulthood.

We test these three possible alternatives regarding the possible relationship of PRRP success with anti-immigration attitudes (positive, negative, or null) using the standard fixed-effects TSCS specifications and the best available electoral and public opinion data across the last several decades in Europe. To capture PRRP success, we look at the vote and the seat shares won by the populist right as defined by the Popu-List or the Timbro Index data. To capture immigration attitudes, we aggregate the relevant public opinion items from major sources.

Data and Methods

Since the electoral success of PRRPs reflects the preferences and priorities of voters alongside other unobserved factors, any cross-sectional associations (or the lack thereof) are likely subject to endogeneity concerns, including reverse causality and omitted variable bias. The standard econometric solution to these problems is to produce plausible causal estimates by utilizing panel data with unit fixed effects regression models, which can account for unobserved country-specific time-invariant confounding factors— such as historic, “constant” PRRP success and other fixed structural, historic, and long-term factors—under a few

reasonable assumptions.¹ The main identifying assumption of such approach here is that immigration attitudes would have developed similarly in countries with and without the observed PRRP success had it not happened. As such, our approach cannot solve all potential sources of endogeneity such as omitted variables that account for both PRRP success and immigration attitudes or reverse causality—though theoretically we believe it is unlikely PRRPs can capitalize on pro-immigration attitudes.

To test for the potential reverse backlash, we have thus gathered a TSCS dataset linking the best available electoral and public opinion data at the country-year level across 24 European countries (1989-2017). As for our main dependent variable, we construct an aggregate country-year measure of public anti-immigration attitudes comprised from the two most comprehensive data sources on the topic. We primarily rely on the “immigration conservatism” index compiled by Caughey et al. (2019), which aggregates major cross-national public opinion survey questions on immigration using an item response theory model. We then standardize and average it with the similar “immigration mood” index created by Claassen and McLaren (2021) which uses a slightly different aggregation methodology and a range of country-year cases ($r = 0.81$). Our results are robust to the use of these indices separately (see Tables A2 and A3).

As for our independent variables, we primarily rely on the Popu-List project combined with ParlGov data which provides a comprehensive measure of the share of votes and seats won by the “far-right populist” parties in European national legislatures in each country-year since the last elections. These are exactly the parties that have been either explicitly anti-immigration or otherwise attractive to the anti-immigration electorate (Rooduijn et al, 2019). As a robustness check, we also look at the conceptually similar vote share of “right-wing populist” parties as coded by the Timbro Authoritarian Populism Index (Heinö, 2016; $r = 0.92$). Some specifications also include common (lagged) control variables, including the share of immigrant population, unemployment rate (log), and GDP per capita (log). All major dependent and independent variables have been standardized to vary from 0 to 1. All coefficient estimates are reported using heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors.² For the list of PRRPs and more details on variables and their construction, see Appendix.

Results and Analysis

First, we consider the general relationship between the PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes across countries and time. In line with the conventional wisdom, the naïve cross-sectional correlation between these variables in the pooled data is consistently positive and varies from 0.06 to 0.25 depending on the operationalization (see Figure A1).

We then plot the historical trajectories of PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes within each European country (see Figure 1). As can be seen, despite their positive cross-sectional correlation and their conflation in the popular discourse, these dependent and independent variables rarely go together across time regardless of their operationalization. If anything, there seems to be a negative correlation between these two phenomena within most of the countries.

¹ The common two-way fixed-effects models have been recently criticized in the literature for their unclear counterfactual interpretation (Kropko and Kubinec, 2020; Imai and Kim, 2021). We thus use the simpler unit FEs as our starting specification but also report two-way FEs as a robustness check.

² Given that the PRRP success is “assigned” at the level of countries, we also apply the more conservative country-clustered standard errors across all specification with no change in the substantive results (see Table A1).

We thus further take advantage of the time-series cross-sectional data to fit a set of fixed-effects linear regressions to answer the following question: “as PRR success changes within a certain country, how does it relate to the changes in aggregate immigration attitudes over time?”

Table 1 summarizes our main empirical results. As can be seen, the success of PRRPs has a consistent negative relationship with anti-immigration attitudes. This is true regardless of PRRP success operationalization or a particular model specification. In terms of substantive size of this relationship, a one standard deviation increase in the seat and vote share of PRRPs is associated with 0.16 and 0.2 standard deviation increase of pro-immigration sentiments within countries respectively. Overall, this evidence is consistent with the hypothesised reverse backlash effects of PRRP success, at least in the aggregate.

To further check the robustness of these results, we conduct several additional empirical tests with little change in the substantive finding. First, we replicate the specifications from Table 1/A2 using the “economic conservatism index” from Caughey et al. (2019) as a placebo test, which expectedly shows no relationship with the PRRP success (see Table A4). Second, given that populist voting is not observed every year, we replicate our specifications at the more empirically appropriate, but less statistically powered, country-election level (see Table A5).

Table 1: Populist Right Electoral Success and Anti-Immigration Attitudes


	Anti-immigration attitudes								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Far-right populist (seat share)	-0.226*** (0.043)	-0.158*** (0.043)	-0.135** (0.046)						
Far-right populist (vote share)				-0.301*** (0.048)	-0.233*** (0.047)	-0.208*** (0.050)			
Right-wing populist (vote share)							-0.266*** (0.042)	-0.167*** (0.041)	-0.136** (0.042)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	681	660	660	681	660	660	666	660	660
Adjusted R ²	0.794	0.824	0.821	0.798	0.826	0.823	0.793	0.824	0.821

Notes: The table shows the relationship between PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes. For variable descriptions, see Appendix. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are given in parentheses: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Discussion

How does the success of populist parties relate to voters’ immigration views? Given that right-wing populists use anti-immigration rhetoric in their political campaigns, it is tempting to think that, if anything, they can only make the electorate more anti-immigration when they emerge, gain support, and come to power. After all, in theory the rise of PRRPs should give them greater capacity to cue supporters and the general public (Zaller, 1992; Hartevelde et al, 2017; Hellwig & Kweon, 2016; Vrânceanu & Lachat, 2021) as well as an already observed (Valentim, 2021; Rooduijn et al, 2016) reduction in stigma towards self-reporting support for such parties, which could theoretically also affect self-reporting antipathy or opposition towards immigration.

Figure 1: The Trajectories of PRRP Success and Anti-immigration Attitudes Across Europe (1989-2017)



Notes: Higher values on the y-axis correspond to higher PRRP success or anti-immigration attitudes. Dashed lines indicate various measures of PRRP success. Solid lines indicate various measures of anti-immigration attitudes. For variable descriptions, see Appendix.

However, populism is polarizing (Bischof and Wagner, 2019; Dai and Kustov, 2022). While radical right views and parties carry significant social stigma and evoke negative partisanship (Mendes and Dennison, 2021; Meléndez and Kaltwasser, 2021), it is also possible there may be a reverse backlash amongst voters who want to distance themselves personally from such parties and views. Indeed, voters may wish halt the progress of such parties, their views, and their increased acceptability, or—particularly amongst moderates—see the rise of such parties as a signal that enough has been done to voice concerns about (perhaps, selected aspects of) immigration policies or realities. Furthermore, the rise of such parties may lead to greater cognition about the issue of immigration and thus a reduction in attitudinal ambivalence (Lindstam et al, 2021), with a majority of those who were ambivalent leaning towards pro-immigration positions, particularly relative to the now higher profile PRRPs.

In this paper, we tried to use the best available data to examine which possibility is more likely. While it is possible that both effects can be happening at the same time, the evidence is more consistent with the “reverse backlash effect.” That is, when PRRPs becoming increasingly successful, a significant proportion of the electorate “thermostatically” react to these developments by adjusting their stated preferences toward immigration in a positive direction. Given the general stability of immigration attitudes, however, it is important not to overstate the magnitude of these possible effects. Still, the available evidence strongly suggests that the populist success does not make the electorate more anti-immigration in the aggregate.

Of course, our study is not without limitations. In terms of endogeneity, one can still reasonably worry about reverse causality and omitted variable bias. As such, our findings should be regarded as associational rather than causal. Although we cannot rule out other confounding factors, theoretically there are few reasons to believe that the relationship reflects more positive attitudes to immigration causing greater PRRP success. In fact, the extent to which PRRPs rely on negative immigration attitudes when they come to power would only bias the regression estimates *against* finding any contemporaneous “reverse backlash effects,” contrary to what we find. Furthermore, the PRRP success may have an impact only on some voters, and some of these impacts may even cancel each other out in the aggregate (e.g., when PRRP success increase or decrease anti-immigration attitudes among PRRP and non-PRRP voters). Notably, if the greater positivity towards immigration were equal amongst PRRP and non-PRRP voters it would undermine the stigma mechanism, and instead support the thermostatic interpretation. Future research may thus benefit from using individual-level longitudinal data to explore the potential heterogeneous effects on different types of voters and the related mechanisms in more detail, as well as exploring the more credible identification strategies to isolate the causal effects of PRRP success. Finally, our current dataset ends in 2017, after which the rise of PRRPs has, in many countries, stopped or even gone into reverse while public attitudes to immigration have tended to gradually become more positive (Banai et al, 2022). This suggest that, if tested again in the future with the use of more recent data, the stipulated relationship may be stronger or, at the very least, is unlikely to disappear.

These limitations notwithstanding, it is important to know that the relationship between PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes is in fact negative across the broadest sample of electoral contexts. This descriptive finding has several implications. First, social stigmas may mediate the effects of PRRP cueing on attitudes, not only precluding immigration backlash but also potentially reversing it. Second, just because the key determinants of attitudes to immigration—notably early life socialisation and psychological predispositions—are “deep-seated” and have a constant component, that does not mean that they are not dynamic and

subject to mediating exogenous factors. Third, the policy preferences of political supply (i.e. parties) has repeatedly been shown to be primarily affected by the policy preferences of political demand (i.e. voters), rather than *vice versa*. We offer a case whereby political demand seems to be related to political supply, albeit not in the manner that the political supply might prefer. Finally, although the electoral breakthroughs of PRRPs was for many countries a radical change from post-war or post-transition party systems that was distressing or even traumatic for many individuals, it does not seem that social norms and stigmas around xenophobic attitudes and radical right parties were entirely “broken” by these events. Instead, it seems that they survived and found new forms of expression in most citizens who reject such norms.

References

- Abou-Chadi, T., & Krause, W. (2020) The Causal Effect of Radical Right Success on Mainstream Parties’ Policy Positions: A Regression Discontinuity Approach. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 829-847.
- Banai, A., Votta, F., & Seitz, R. (2022) The Polls—Trends: Trends in Public Opinion toward Immigration among EU Member States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 86(1), 191-215.
- Bischof, D., & Wagner, M. (2019). Do voters polarize when radical parties enter parliament?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 63(4), 888-904.
- Blinder, S, Ford, R and Ivarsflaten, E (2013) The better angels of our nature: how the antiprejudice norm affects policy and party preferences in Great Britain and Germany. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(4), 841–857.
- Caughey, D., O’Grady, T., and Warshaw, C. (2019) Policy Ideology in European Mass Publics, 1981–2016. *American Political Science Review* 113:674–93.
- Claassen, C., and McLaren, L. (2021) Does Immigration Produce a Public Backlash or Public Acceptance? Time-Series, Cross-Sectional Evidence from Thirty European Democracies. *British Journal of Political Science*, 1–19.
- Czopp, AM and Monteith, MJ (2003) Confronting prejudice (literally): reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29(4), 532–544
- Dai, Y., & Kustov, A. (2022) When Do Politicians Use Populist Rhetoric? Populism as a Campaign Gamble. *Political Communication*.
- Dennison, J., Davidov, E., and Seddig, D. (2020) ‘Explaining Voting in the UK’s 2016 EU Referendum: Basic Human Values, Attitudes to Immigration, European Identity and Trust in Politicians’ in *Social Science Research*
- Dennison, J. and Geddes, A. (2019) A Rising Tide? The Salience of Immigration and the Rise of Anti-Immigration Political Parties in Western Europe. *Political Quarterly*, 90(1): 107-116.
- Devine, PG (1989) Stereotypes and prejudices: their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56(1), 5–18.
- Devine, PG et al. (1991) Prejudice with and without compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60(6), 817–830.
- Dinas, E., Riera, P., & Roussias, N. (2015) Staying in the First League: Parliamentary Representation and the Electoral Success of Small Parties. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 3(2), 187-204. doi:10.1017/psrm.2014.38
- Dinesen PT, Klemmensen R and Nørgaard AS (2016) Personality and Immigration Attitudes. *Political Psychology* 37: 55-72.
- Dovidio JF and Gaertner SL (2004) Aversive racism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 36, 4–56.
- Fazio RH et al. (1986) On the automatic activation of attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50(2), 229.
- García-Faroldi L (2017) Determinants of Attitudes towards Immigration: Testing the Influence of Interculturalism, Group Threat Theory and National Contexts in Time of Crisis. *International Migration* 55: 10-22.

- Hartevelde E, Kokkonen A and Dahlberg S (2017) Adapting to party lines: the effect of party affiliation on attitudes to immigration. *West European Politics* 40(6), 1177–1197.
- Heinö, A. J. (2016) *Timbro authoritarian populism index*. Timbro. <https://timbro.se/allmant/timbro-authoritarian-populism-index>.
- Hellwig T and Kweon Y (2016) Taking Cues on Multidimensional Issues: The Case of Attitudes toward Immigration. *West European Politics* 39 (4): 710–30.
- Imai, K., & Kim, I. S. (2021) On the use of two-way fixed effects regression models for causal inference with panel data. *Political Analysis*, 29(3), 405-415.
- Kauff M, Asbrock F, Thörner S and Wagner U (2013) Side effects of multiculturalism: the interaction effect of a multicultural ideology and authoritarianism on prejudice and diversity beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin* 39: 305-320.
- Kropko, J., & Kubinec, R. (2020) Interpretation and identification of within-unit and cross-sectional variation in panel data models. *PloS one*, 15(4).
- Kustov, A, Laaker D, Reller C. (2021) The Stability of Immigration Attitudes: Evidence and Implications. *The Journal of Politics*, 83 (4): 1478-1494.
- Kustov, A. 2022. Testing the backlash argument: voter responses to (pro-) immigration reforms. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1-21.
- Lindstam, E., Mader, M. and Schoen, H. (2021) Conceptions of National Identity and Ambivalence towards Immigration. *British Journal of Political Science* 51:93–114.
- McLaren L and Paterson I (2020) Generational change and attitudes to immigration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46(3): 665-682.
- McLaren L, Neundorf A and Paterson I (2020) Diversity and Perceptions of Immigration: How the Past Influences the Present. *Political Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720922774>
- Meléndez, Carlos & Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser (2021) Negative partisanship towards the populist radical right and democratic resilience in Western Europe, *Democratization*, 28:5, 949-969, DOI: [10.1080/13510347.2021.1883002](https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2021.1883002)
- Mariana M.S. & Dennison J. (2021) Explaining the emergence of the radical right in Spain and Portugal: salience, stigma and supply, *West European Politics*, 44:4, 752-775, DOI: [10.1080/01402382.2020.1777504](https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2020.1777504).
- Monteith MJ et al. (2002) Putting the brakes on prejudice: on the development and operation of cues for control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83(5), 1029–1050.
- 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
- Rooduijn, M., Van Kessel, S., Froio, C., Pirro, A., De Lange, S., Halikiopoulou, D., Lewis, P., Mudde, C. & Taggart, P. (2019) *The PopuList: An Overview of Populist, Far Right, Far Left and Eurosceptic Parties in Europe*. www.popu-list.org.
- Schwartz, C., Simon, M., Hudson, D., & Van-Heerde-Hudson, J. (2021) A Populist Paradox? How Brexit Softened Anti-Immigrant Attitudes. *British Journal of Political Science*, 51(3), 1160-1180.
- Solodoch, O. (2021) Regaining control? The political impact of policy responses to refugee crises. *International Organization*, 75(3), 735-768.
- Valentim, V. (2021) Parliamentary Representation and the Normalization of Radical Right Support. *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(14), 2475–2511.
- Van Spanje J (2010) Contagious parties: Anti-immigration parties and their impact on other parties' immigration stances in contemporary Europe. *Party Politics* 16(5): 563-586.
- Vrânceanu A and Lachat R (2021) Do Parties Influence Public Opinion on Immigration? Evidence from Europe. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 31(1): 1–21.
- Wlezien, C. (1995) The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39(4), 981–1000. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111666>.
- Zaller JR (1992) *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Online Appendix

Variable descriptions:

PRRP success

- *Far-right populist (seat share, 0-1)* indicates the share of seats won by “far-right populist” parties in each country-year since the last elections in a national legislature as coded by Popu-List (Rooduijn et al, 2019).
- *Far-right populist (vote share, 0-1)* indicates the share of votes cast for “far-right populist” parties in each country-year since the last elections in a national legislature as coded by Popu-List (Rooduijn et al, 2019).
- *Right-wing populist (vote share, 0-1)* measures the share of votes cast for “right-wing populist” parties in each country-year since the last elections in a national legislature as coded by the Timbro Authoritarian Populism Index (Heino, 2016).

Immigration attitudes

- *Anti-immigration attitudes (0-1)* indicate the immigration-related restrictiveness of the electorate in a given country/year based on a combination (average) of “immigration conservatism” index compiled by Caughey et al. (2019) and the “immigration mood” index compiled by Claassen and McLaren (2021). Both indices use slightly different methodologies to aggregate major public opinion questions on immigration. The Caughey et al. index uses an ordinal group-level item response theory model and the Claassen and McLaren index uses a slightly different dynamic latent variable model to summarize most of the available survey questions about immigration from the European Social Survey (ESS), International Social Survey Program (ISSP), World Values Survey (WVS), the Pew Global Attitudes Survey, and Eurobarometer.
- For the election-level analysis, the measure is aggregated over the entire between-election periods (2-5 years depending on the country/period).

Other variables

- *Economic attitudes (0-1)* indicate the (absolute) voter preferences on economic policies as based on the “economic conservatism” index compiled by Caughey et al. (2019).
- Control variables include *immigration stocks*, *unemployment rate (log)*, and *GDP per capita (PPP, log)* derived from the publicly available OECD and the World Bank data.

List of Right-Wing Populist Parties (Timbro)

Austria

- Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs
- Freie Partei Salzburg
- Bündnis Zukunft Österreich

Belgium

- Vlaams Belang
- Front National

Czechia

- Úsvit přímé demokracie
- Realisté
- Svoboda a Přímá Demokracie
- Āád národa

Denmark

- Dansk Folkeparti
- Nye Borgerlige
- Fremskridtspartiet

Spain

- Vox

Estonia

- Eesti Konservatiivne Rahvaerakond

Finland

- Samfinländarna
- Förändring 2011
- Blå reform

France

- Front National
- Mouvement National Républicain

Germany

- Alternative für Deutschland

Greece

- Laikos Orthodoxos Synagermos
- Elliniki Lisi

Estonia

- Eesti Konservatiivne Rahvaerakond

Iceland

- Miðflokkurinn
- Íslenska Þjóðfylkingin

Ireland

- National Party
- Irish Freedom Party

Italy

- Lega (Lega Nord)
- Fratelli d'Italia - Alleanza Nazionale

Luxembourg

- Alternativ Demokratesch Reformpartei
- Fräi Partei Lëtzebuerg

Netherlands

- Partij voor de Vrijheid
- Forum voor Democratie
- Lijst Pim Fortuyn

Norway

- Fremskrittspartiet

Poland

- Prawo i Sprawiedliwość
- Konfederacja Wolność i Niepodległość

Portugal

- Chega

Slovakia

- Slovenska Narodna Strana

Slovenia

- Slovenska demokratska stranka
- Slovenska nacionalna stranka
- Lista novinarja Bojana Požarja

Sweden

- Sverigedemokraterna

Switzerland

- Schweizerische Volkspartei
- Lega dei Ticinesi
- Mouvement Citoyens Genevois

United Kingdom

- UK Independence Party
- Brexit Party

- La Destra
- Die Freiheitlichen

- Biergerlëscht

- Een NL
- Partij voor Nederland
- Centrum Democraten

- Demokratene i Norge

- Kukiz 15
- Kongres Nowej Prawicy

- Sme Rodina

- Zedinjena Slovenija

- Lipa


- Ny Demokrati

- Freiheits-Partei der Schweiz

- Eidgenössisch-Demokratische Union

- The English Democrats

Figure A1: Populist Right Electoral Success and Anti-Immigration Attitudes



Notes: The figure depicts bivariate relationships between the various measures of PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes at the country-year level. All points are shaded by country. For variable descriptions, see Appendix.

Table A2: Populist Right Electoral Success and Anti-Immigration Attitudes (Robustness Check I)

	Anti-immigration attitudes								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Far-right populist (seat share)	-0.226**	-0.158*	-0.135						
	(0.074)	(0.066)	(0.069)						
Far-right populist (vote share)				-0.301**	-0.233*	-0.208*			
				(0.096)	(0.091)	(0.092)			
Right-wing populist (vote share)							-0.266**	-0.167*	-0.136*
							(0.102)	(0.078)	(0.067)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	681	660	660	681	660	660	666	660	660
Adjusted R ²	0.794	0.824	0.821	0.798	0.826	0.823	0.793	0.824	0.821

Notes: The table shows the relationship between PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes. For variable descriptions, see Appendix. Robust standard errors clustered by country are given in parentheses: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Table A2: Populist Right Electoral Success and Anti-Immigration Attitudes (Robustness Check II)

	Anti-immigration attitudes (Caughey et al.)								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Far-right populist (seat share)	-0.283*** (0.054)	-0.231*** (0.057)	-0.235*** (0.062)						
Far-right populist (vote share)				-0.363*** (0.060)	-0.323*** (0.063)	-0.325*** (0.068)			
Right-wing populist (vote share)							-0.271*** (0.054)	-0.179** (0.055)	-0.186** (0.057)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	616	595	595	616	595	595	601	595	595
Adjusted R ²	0.766	0.783	0.776	0.771	0.786	0.779	0.762	0.779	0.773

Notes: The table shows the relationship between PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes (as measured by Caughey et al. index). For variable descriptions, see Appendix. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are given in parentheses: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Table A3: Populist Right Electoral Success and Anti-Immigration Attitudes (Robustness Check III)

	Anti-immigration attitudes (Claassen and McLaren)								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Far-right populist (seat share)	-0.201*** (0.048)	-0.139** (0.049)	-0.042 (0.049)						
Far-right populist (vote share)				-0.289*** (0.055)	-0.216*** (0.056)	-0.108 (0.056)			
Right-wing populist (vote share)							-0.249*** (0.042)	-0.199*** (0.044)	-0.097* (0.044)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	618	615	615	618	615	615	618	615	615
Adjusted R ²	0.772	0.803	0.820	0.775	0.805	0.821	0.776	0.806	0.821

Notes: The table shows the relationship between PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes (as measured by Claassen and McLaren index). For variable descriptions, see Appendix. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are given in parentheses: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Table A4: Populist Right Electoral Success and Economic Attitudes (Placebo Test)

	Economic Conservatism (Caughey et al.)								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Far-right populist (seat share)	-0.005 (0.043)	-0.047 (0.048)	-0.006 (0.046)						
Far-right populist (vote share)				-0.025 (0.048)	-0.081 (0.056)	-0.041 (0.056)			
Right-wing populist (vote share)							-0.043 (0.049)	-0.139* (0.054)	-0.103 (0.052)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	532	511	511	532	511	511	517	511	511
Adjusted R ²	0.667	0.676	0.696	0.667	0.677	0.696	0.667	0.680	0.698

Notes: The table shows the relationship between PRRP success and economic attitudes (as measured by Caughey et al. index). For variable descriptions, see Appendix. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are given in parentheses: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.

Table A5: Populist Right Electoral Success and Anti-Immigration Attitudes (Election-level Analysis)

	Anti-immigration attitudes								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Far-right populist (seat share)	-0.224*** (0.065)	-0.199** (0.069)	-0.207+ (0.125)						
Far-right populist (vote share)				-0.272*** (0.082)	-0.255** (0.096)	-0.238 (0.152)			
Right-wing populist (vote share)							-0.198** (0.077)	-0.146* (0.074)	-0.114 (0.102)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	180	173	173	180	173	173	177	173	173
Adjusted R ²	0.801	0.838	0.839	0.802	0.839	0.838	0.794	0.835	0.834

Notes: The table shows the relationship between PRRP success and anti-immigration attitudes at the between-election level. For variable descriptions, see Appendix. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are given in parentheses: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.