**Appendix for Heinisch, R, Saxonberg, S, Werner, A, and Habersack, F (2019) The Effect of Radical Right Fringe Parties on Main Parties in Central Eastern Europe: Empirical Evidence from Manifesto Data. Party Politics.**

**Appendix I: Additional information referenced in the main manuscript**

**Table A1**: Correlations between fringe party salience and main party movement in the same category.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Move main – fringe at t0** | **Move main – fringe at t1** | **Move main – move other** |
| All countries | -0.04 (p = .52), N = 308 | 0.08 (p = .17), N = 319 | 0.11 (p = .03), N = 396 |
| Bulgaria | -0.51 (p = .00), N = 33 | 0.51 (p = .00), N = 44 | 0.65 (p = .00), N = 44 |
| Czech Republic | 0.03 (p = .84), N = 55 | 0.19 (p = .11), N = 66 | 0.36 (p = .00), N = 77 |
| Hungary | -0.07 (p = .84), N = 11 | -0.04 (p = .85), N = 22 | 0.46 (p = .03), N = 22 |
| Poland | -0.05 (p = .74), N = 44 | -0.29 (p = .19), N = 22 | -0.13 (p = .39), N = 44 |
| Romania | -0.01 (p = .92), N = 143 | 0.09 (p = .33), N = 121 | 0.05 (p = .52), N = 165 |
| Slovakia | -0.19 (p = .39), N = 22 | -0.20 (p = .20), N = 44 | 0.35 (p = .02), N = 44 |

Note: Significant results highlighted in italics.

**Table A2:** OLS regression with 6 country clusters, se in parentheses.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Model 4** | **Model 5** | **Model 6** |
| Fringe at t0 |  |  | -0.142\*\* | -0.350 | -0.145 |
|  |  |  | (0.03) | (0.37) | (0.07) |
| Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.126 | 0.139 | -0.333 |
|  |  |  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.34) |
| Baseline category=502 | | | | | |
| category=601 |  |  | -0.586 | -1.042 | -0.858 |
|  |  |  | (1.63) | (2.08) | (1.93) |
| category=602 |  |  | -0.722 | -1.083 | -1.351 |
|  |  |  | (1.20) | (1.71) | (1.62) |
| category=603 |  |  | -1.023 | -1.143 | -1.404 |
|  |  |  | (1.13) | (1.64) | (1.72) |
| category=604 |  |  | -0.758 | -1.126 | -1.364 |
|  |  |  | (1.19) | (1.71) | (1.61) |
| category=605 |  |  | -0.724 | -0.749 | -1.350 |
|  |  |  | (2.26) | (3.27) | (3.95) |
| category=606 |  |  | -0.418 | -2.593 | -0.536 |
|  |  |  | (1.48) | (1.43) | (1.44) |
| category=607 |  |  | -0.750 | -1.056 | -1.408 |
|  |  |  | (1.21) | (1.72) | (1.60) |
| category=608 |  |  | -0.691 | -1.246 | -1.189 |
|  |  |  | (1.20) | (1.72) | (1.65) |
| category=705 |  |  | -0.793 | -1.366 | -1.312 |
|  |  |  | (1.17) | (1.67) | (1.68) |
| category=706 |  |  | -0.124 | -0.605 | -1.596 |
|  |  |  | (1.36) | (1.98) | (2.04) |
| Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| category=601 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.210 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.37) |  |
| category=602 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (.) |  |
| category=603 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.031 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.37) |  |
| category=604 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.633 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.40) |  |
| category=605 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.118 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.47) |  |
| category=606 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 2.210 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (1.71) |  |
| category=607 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | -0.134 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.72) |  |
| category=608 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.365 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.40) |  |
| category=705 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.377 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.35) |  |
| category=706 | \* | Fringe at t0 |  | 0.252 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.36) |  |
| category=601 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.404 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.35) |
| category=602 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (.) |
| category=603 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.227 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.51) |
| category=604 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.342 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.34) |
| category=605 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.461 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.60) |
| category=606 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | -0.268 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (1.45) |
| category=607 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 1.156\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.28) |
| category=608 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.332 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.35) |
| category=705 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.315 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.36) |
| category=706 | \* | Fringe at t1 |  |  | 0.779 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.47) |
| Constant |  |  | 0.698 | 1.059 | 1.327 |
|  |  |  | (1.20) | (1.72) | (1.63) |
| R2 |  |  | 0.040 | 0.098 | 0.081 |

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

**Table A3**: Correlations between fringe party salience and main party movement in the opposite category.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Move main – fringe at t0** | **Move main – fringe at t1** |
| All countries | 0.04 (p = .62), N = 168 | 0.05 (p = .53), N = 174 |
| Bulgaria | 0.05 (p = .82), N = 18 | 0.06 (p = .77), N = 24 |
| Czech Republic | 0.03 (p = .86), N = 30 | -0.02 (p = .92), N = 36 |
| Hungary | -0.22 (p = .68), N = 6 | 0.11 (p = .74), N = 12 |
| Poland | 0.15 (p = .50), N = 24 | 0.19 (p = .56), N = 12 |
| Romania | 0.03 (p = .79), N = 78 | 0.08 (p = .50), N = 66 |
| Slovakia | 0.04 (p = .90), N = 12 | -0.09 (p = .68), N = 24 |

**Figure A3:** Relationship between fringe salience at t0 and main movement in opposite category from t0 to t1, per country



**Figure A4:** Relationship between fringe salience at t1 and main movement in opposite category from t0 to t1, per country



**Figure A5:** Relationship between fringe salience at t0 and main movement in opposite category from t0 to t1, per category



**Figure A6:** Relationship between fringe salience at t1 and main movement in opposite category from t0 to t1, per category



**Appendix II: Relationship between fringe party salience and main salience**

The following shows the relationship between the saliences of the socio-cultural categories of fringe and main parties. While the relationship between the saliences at the same election is mainly a confirmation of party profiles, the following lagged relationship is a further indication for possible reactions.

**Relationship between saliences at the same election**

**Table A4:** Correlations between salience of fringe and main party saliences

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | r | p | N | Category | r | p | N |
| All | .35 | .00 | 374 | Culture | -.07 | .71 | 34 |
| Bulgaria | .65 | .00 | 44 | Nationalism positive | .33 | .06 | 34 |
| Czech R | .69 | .00 | 77 | Nationalism negative | -.06 | .75 | 34 |
| Hungary | .28 | .21 | 22 | Traditional Moral positive | .25 | .16 | 34 |
| Poland | .09 | .56 | 44 | Traditional Moral negative | -.06 | .74 | 34 |
| Romania | .23 | .01 | 143 | Law & Order | .26 | .14 | 34 |
| Slovakia | .60 | .00 | 44 | Civic Mindedness | .05 | .79 | 34 |
|  |  |  |  | Multiculturalism positive | .31 | .08 | 34 |
|  |  |  |  | Multiculturalism negative | -.08 | .65 | 34 |
|  |  |  |  | Minority groups | .02 | .93 | 34 |
|  |  |  |  | Non-economic groups | .44 | .01 | 34 |

**Figure A7:** Relationship between fringe and main saliences, per country



**Figure A8:** Relationship between fringe and main saliences, per category



**Relationship between lagged saliences (fringe at t0, main at t1)**

This analysis is another way of investigating whether there might be an effect of fringe on main parties. It investigates whether the salience by fringe parties is related to the saliences by main parties at the next elections. The results show that there does not seem to be such a relationship, the effects that can be found seem to be driven by two outliers (see figures).

**Table A5:** Correlations between salience of fringe and lagged main party saliences

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | r | p | N | Category | r | p | N |
| All | .25 | .00 | 319 | Culture | -.22 | .25 | 29 |
| Bulgaria | .25 | .11 | 44 | Nationalism positive | .14 | .45 | 29 |
| Czech R | .67 | .00 | 55 | Nationalism negative | . | . | 29 |
| Hungary | .21 | .53 | 11 | Traditional Moral positive | -.27 | .15 | 29 |
| Poland | .05 | .76 | 44 | Traditional Moral negative | -.05 | .81 | 29 |
| Romania | .21 | .02 | 132 | Law & Order | .26 | .18 | 29 |
| Slovakia | .20 | .25 | 33 | Civic Mindedness | .42 | .02 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  | Multiculturalism positive | -.11 | .56 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  | Multiculturalism negative | .10 | .60 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  | Minority groups | -.18 | .34 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  | Non-economic groups | .35 | .06 | 29 |

**Figure A9:** Relationship between fringe at t0 and main at t1 saliences, per country



**Figure A10:** Relationship between fringe at t0 and main at t1 saliences, per category

