Institutionalization of party systems: test for resistance to immigration challenges.
Evidence from EU countries

Elena Sirotkina

LCSR Associate Researcher, Research Assistant

Introduction

- Immigration is an external challenge for EU political systems.

- Anti-immigration sentiments contribute to radical parties electoral support rise

- **Key Questions:** does the electoral success of anti-immigration parties (AIP) depend:
    - 1) on the level of trust in political institutions in a country
    - 2) on a party system institutionalization level

The logic

- The immigration situation in a country is the result of how political institutions manage the problem
- Political institutions perform well – people do not vote for AIP
- Political institutions perform poorly – people punish them by voting for AIP
- Satisfaction with political institutions performance = trust in political institutions
- Satisfaction with parties performance = trust in political parties + stable electoral support (no instant rise in voting for AIP)

Theory. Institutionalization. Parties and party systems institutionalization

- 4 dimensions (Huntington 1968):
  - adaptability/rigidity,
  - complexity/simplicity,
  - autonomy/subordination,
  - coherence/disunity

Janda (1970), Levitsky (1998), Selznick (1957) – values as a dimension of a party's external relations

Panebianco (1988) two criteria –
  1) a party's ability to remain autonomous from the environment
  2) a party's ability to maintain its internal structure

Randall and Sväsand (2002):
  1. systemness
  2. value infusion
  3. decisional autonomy
  4. reification

Problems with conceptualization and measuring

- a series of 'dimensions' rather than conceptualization notion (Bielasiak, 2002; Grzymała-Busse, 2002; Morlino, 1998)

- contain the idea of stability and persistence in the rules and nature of inter-party competition (Lindberg, 2007; Mainwaring and Scully,1995; Mair, 2001)

Why voting stability as an indicator of party system institutionalization?

1) shows:
   a) external stability = relative stability of electoral results
   b) stability of inter-party competition= relative stability of interparty electoral distance
   c) party systems predictability and stability over time (Bakke and Sitter, 2005; Mair, 2001)

2) if a party significantly gains or loses electoral support, it disrupts a stable relationship between parties within a party system
   1. rising share of volatility
   2. redistribution of electorate
   3. lower predictability of the outcome

Operationalization and measuring

Party system institutionalization (PSI) = overall stability + value infusion (routinization)

1. Overall stability = voting stability (stability of party preferences) -> *index*

2. Value infusion = trust in the parties + political institutions -> *surveys data*

Theory. Approaches to anti-immigration parties (AIP) studies

What are they? How they might be defined? (Fennema 1996)

- protest parties (opposite to government arguments)
- racist parties (one-issue party)
- extreme-right parties (ideologically articulate)

What influences ant-immigration parties success? Institutional factors

- institutional settings, such as electoral systems and parliamentary thresholds (Jackman and Volpert, 1996; Swank and Betz, 2003)

- responses from mainstream parties (Arzheimer, 2009; Arzheimer and Carter, 2006; Norris, 2005; van der Brug et al., 2005)

- the history and ideological origin of anti-immigrant parties (Carter, 2002; Ivarsflaten, 2006)

- local-level activity

What influences ant-immigration parties success? Non-institutional factors

- crime rate (Smith 2004, Bauer et ai 2000)
- level of education:
    1. Yes - Kitschelt 1995, 2007, Arzheimer and Carter 2006, Lubbers et al.2002;
    2. No effect- Knigge, 1998; Lubbers, Scheepers and Billiet, 2000
- level of unemployment (Minkenberg 2000, Gilljam and Holmberg 1993)
- number of immigrants or asylum seekers:
    1. Yes - Arzheimer, 2009, 269; Golder, 2003, 451; Lubbers et al., 2002
    2. No effect - Coffe´, Heyndels and Vermeir, 2007

Hypotheses

H1 The higher trust in political institutions the lower the level of anti-immigration sentiments.

H2 The more institutionalized a party system the less is possibility for an AIP to increase significantly its electoral support.

Methodology

I. Case studies (countries & parties)

- What AIP and in what countries exist? What is their background and electoral history(the level of support, the level of elections they participate, regional brunches, municipal activity etc.)?

II. PSI (party system institutionalization measurement)

III. Regression analysis

IV. QCA

Targeted Data Base

- European elections database (NSD)
- Countries:
    1) France 2) the Netherlands 3) Austria 4)Denmark 5)Germany 6)Belgium 7)Sweden 8) Luxemburg and 9)Italy
- National socio-economic statistics
- ZA4800: European Values Study 2008: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2008) (trust in political institutions + immigrants attitudes)
- ESS datasets, ESS6-2012, ed.2.0 (trust in parties + immigrants attitudes)
- Parties manifestos

Model 1. Voting stability measurement

- 10 years period (approximately 3-4 campaigns)

NATIONAL LEVEL:

Aver (Corr. party results $(t;t_1)$; $(t_1;t_2)$; $(t_2;t)$

REGIONAL LEVEL:

Diff. party results in a region (t_1-t); (t_2-t_1); (t_2-t)/aver. party result in a region

Model 2: Explaining causality between trust in political institutions and anti-immigration sentiments (individuals by country)

DV 'negative attitude to immigrants' (ESS)

    (additive index)
    1) Allow many/few immigrants of same race/ethnic group as majority
    2) Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority
    3) Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe
    4) Immigration bad or good for country's economy
    5) Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants
    6) Immigrants make country worse or better place to live
    7) Voted for AIP in last national election

IV Trust in political institutions:

    (additive index)
    1. Trust in political parties
    2. Trust in country's parliament
    3. Trust in the legal system
    4. Trust in the police
    5. Trust in politicians

Controls (SES)

Model 3: Integrative model. Does level of party system institutionalization influence AIP electoral success? (country level)

QCA

DV (AIP electoral success) – 1;0

IV   Voting stability level

     Trust in political institutions level

Additional variables:

1. type of electoral system
2. go through local elections (1,0)
3. is the position of the largest conservative party the same (1;0)
4. number of immigrants or asylum seekers
5. crime rate
6. level of education
7. level of unemployment

Stages of research

I.   Literature analysis (Introduction)

II. Building explanatory theory and hypothesizing

III. Collecting:

   1.   AIP qualitative data by countries
   2.   electoral data
   3.   surveys data

IV. Modelling and data analysis

V.   Discussion of results

Anticipated results

- Clarification of the hypotheses => correction of models and explanatory theories
- Preliminary results analysis

Thank you for your attention!