



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Populist Radical Right Parties and the Welfare State: Explaining the Effects of Exogenous Shocks on Party Position in Austria, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands

Timmerman, Jasper

Citation

Timmerman, J. (2023). *Populist Radical Right Parties and the Welfare State: Explaining the Effects of Exogenous Shocks on Party Position in Austria, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master Thesis, 2023](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3621577>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Jasper Timmerman

s2216035

BAP Thesis

Bachelor Project: The Welfare State in International Perspective

BSc Political Science: International Relations and Organizations

26th of May 2023

Dr. Ir. A.A.H.E. van Reuler

Words: 7995



Universiteit Leiden

Populist Radical Right Parties and the Welfare State:

**Explaining the Effects of Exogenous Shocks on Party Position in Austria, the United
Kingdom, and the Netherlands**

Table of Contents

1: Introduction	3
2: Literature Review	4
3: Theoretical Framework	6
4: Conceptualization	9
5: Methodology	11
Research design	11
Case Selection	12
Data Collection	12
Operationalization	13
6: Analysis	15
The Netherlands	15
The UK	18
Austria	20
7: Discussion	22
8: Conclusion	24
9: References	26
10: Appendices	31
Appendix A: Welfare Policies	31
The Netherlands	31
The UK.....	45
Austria.....	62
Appendix B: Tables	73
The Netherlands	73
The UK.....	78
Austria.....	82
Appendix C: List of Indicators	86

1: Introduction

The welfare state is a complex system of social policies and programs designed to provide economic and social support to the poor, disabled, elderly, and other vulnerable populations (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2014, p. 2). But what if this system is faced with political and societal challenges? The world constantly deals exogenous shocks. This has transformed the political world. Political parties have come and gone, and their policies have shifted. The severity and duration of the crises caused by exogenous shocks to the political, economic, and social systems is increasing (Miklian & Hoelscher, 2022, pp. 178-179). Exogenous shocks like financial crises, natural disasters, armed conflicts, and emergencies relating to global health have all become frequent, leading to economic and political disruption (Miklian & Hoelscher, 2022, pp. 180-182).

Meanwhile, populist radical right parties (or PRRP), also referred to as far right or extreme right-wing parties, have become increasingly popular (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, p. 102). Various studies have researched the relationship between PRRPs rise in popularity and the welfare state (Mudde, 2015; Rathgeb & Busemeyer, 2022). These studies have consistently argued that the need for the welfare state changes as the world is affected by exogenous shocks. If the welfare state is invoked to protect the most vulnerable segments of society, then a change to the position of these segments of society will ultimately alter the need for the welfare state (Mudde, 2015, p. 299). The globalization theory, for example, posits that there are winners and losers of globalization, where the lower working classes constitute the losing classes (Mudde, 2015, p. 299), as well as the power resource theory, which posits political policy positions depend on where a party derives its power from, its electorate (Rathgeb & Busemeyer, 2022, pp. 3-5, 16). Hence, comparative welfare state research has primarily focused on this one-dimensional idea of politicization.

However, more recent research shows that party positions are not quite as 'fixed' and 'static' as some argue (Rathgeb & Busemeyer, 2022, p. 6). In fact, there appears to have been a shift in electorates, with left parties catering more to the middle classes and the far right parties catering to the lower classes now (p. 6). This, in turn, means that the welfare state is supported by parties across the political spectrum (Busemeyer, Rathgeb & Sahm, 2022, p. 6).

Therefore, to understand how PRRPs respond to exogenous shocks we must analyze how their positions have altered during and after exogenous shocks. Although the rise of PRRPs has been studied in detail, as well as the implications of this development, insufficient attention has been paid to how PRRPs have adapted themselves to the times and the desires

of voters in crises. This research aims to expand on topics that have previously been overlooked or understudied and build upon the existing research on party positioning. The focus of this thesis will be on PRRPs positions regarding the welfare state. Therefore, this thesis sets out to answer the following question: What effect do exogenous shocks have on party positions of the populist radical right on welfare state policy?

Following this introduction, the rest of the paper has been divided into nine parts. The thesis starts with a literature review on past research that led to the need for this research. What follows is a theoretical framework outlining the hypothesis, or expected outcome of this research bases upon past research, followed by a chapter on the conceptualization of all the relevant concepts. The next chapter covers the methodology of the thesis, including the research design, case selection, data collection, and operationalization. The analysis of the data comes next, followed by a discussion and a conclusion. The last two chapters are the references and appendices.

2: Literature Review

The conditions that explain the electoral outcomes of PRRPs, the make-up of their electorates, and the implications of their growth of right-wing politics have traditionally been the focus of research on the radical right. A widely debated and studied hypothesis is that radical right parties tend to support limiting the welfare state and reducing social spending. According to Betz and Johnson (2004), this is because the radical right perceives the welfare state as a tool of the traditional left elites to redistribute wealth from the majority or ‘native’ population to minorities, immigrants, and other ‘undeserving’ groups (pp. 314-322). This view is supported by a number of studies across various contexts.

For example, Busemeyer, Rathgeb and Sahm have researched how PRRPs adapt their position on the welfare state to their voters’ preference for a particularistic-authoritarian welfare state (p. 78). The particularistic-authoritarian voter preference relates to the idea that the welfare state should support ‘deserving’ groups like the elderly and the sick, whilst limiting access to the welfare state for ‘undeserving’ groups like immigrants and non-citizens (Diermeier & Niehues, 2022, p. 303).

Furthermore, research on voters has specified how different segments of society value different welfare policies. Garritzmann, Busemeyer and Neimanns (2018) explain how low-

income, low-educated, conservative people, tend to prefer consumption policies with a direct payoff. Higher educated people tend to prefer social investment policies, whereas conservative, high-income individuals prefer workfare policies (p. 857). Further research then found that PRRPs prefer consumption policies over social investment policies (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, p. 104). This tendency is in line with PRRPs authoritarian, nativist, and populist characteristics (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, p. 108).

Contrastingly, more recent research has argued that PRRPs have started to become more pro-welfare over the past 50 years (Busemeyer, Rathgeb & Sahm, 2022, p. 81). It is explained that PRRPs do so to improve their electoral position. For example, Rovny (2012; 2013) has argued that PRRPs increasingly resort to position blurring and bridge policies to obtain the largest possible voter base (p. 271; p. 20). Pinggera (2021) explains that with social policy PRRPs try to appeal to both partisan and median voters (p. 1975). PRRPs try to introduce policies in line with their partisan voters but which also enjoy support from the general voting base, potentially resulting in new voters (De Sio & Weber, 2014, pp. 883-884). These theories explain some of the motives and behaviors of PRRPs, arguing that PRRPs will become more pro-welfare as they increase in support.

At the same time, very little research has been done on the relationship between PRRPs welfare stance and exogenous shocks. The few studies that have looked at exogenous shocks concentrate on the economic effects of crises, not how PRRPs have dealt with them. For example, Miklian and Hoelscher (2022) research the effects of exogenous shocks on businesses. Savun and Tirone (2012) argue that exogenous shocks increase the chances of civil war, but also cause changes in identity (p. 367). Research more concerned with politics tends to be more general in scope. Calca and Gross (2019), for example, do research the effects of exogenous shocks on politics, but focus more on the effects on the political system. They discuss how exogenous shocks reinforce left-right cleavages and positioning, where electoral competition plays a significant role in shaping party responses to external shocks (Calca & Gross, 2019, pp. 560-562).

The abovementioned theories theorize on how PRRPs have adapted to their (desired) voter base. Their findings, however, are contradictory. One group argues PRRPs have become more pro-welfare state expansion, whilst the other group argues PRRPs have become more particularistic-authoritarian, in favor of a more restrictive welfare state. On top of this

contradiction, the research has focused primarily on the politicization of voter demands, not the effects of exogenous shocks. The research that does concern itself with exogenous shocks tends to focus more on businesses and politics altogether. What is missing is research on relationship between exogenous shocks and the welfare state, as well as research on the effects of exogenous shocks on PRRPs stance on the welfare state. Hence, the research question of this thesis will be: What effect do exogenous shocks have on party positions of the populist radical right on welfare state policy?

Moreover, existing research has neglected party manifestoes. Party manifestoes are how parties can formally express their ideological and political positions (Janda, Harmel, Edens & Goff, 1995, p. 172), and are thus relevant in investigating how party positions have changed due to exogenous shocks.

3: Theoretical Framework

Right-wing parties have moved more to the middle of the political spectrum, vying with the left-wing parties for the centre-middle class vote (Rathgeb & Busemeyer, 2022, p. 6). Additionally, growing income inequality has increased ‘economic anxiety’ amongst previously dominant sections of society, resulting in support for parties that aim to protect these groups, e.g., PRRPs (Rathgeb & Busemeyer, 2022, p. 8). Research has found that support for PRRPs is, in part, the result of a failure by the welfare state to protect people from social risks, e.g., financial crises and immigration crises (Rathgeb & Busemeyer, 2022, p. 12). Opposition parties use these failures by criticizing the current parties in power’s response to these exogenous shocks (Traber, Giger & Häusermann, 2018, p. 17). In representation, voters care not only about being represented but also about what issues parties talk about and prioritize, i.e., voter-party congruence on the salience of issues (Traber, Giger & Häusermann, 2018, p. 2).

In fact, PRRPs are inherently tied to the welfare state. PRRPs base themselves on the notions of ethno-nationalism, anti-establishment and traditional values first’ (Muis & Immerzeel, 2017, p. 910). In essence, PRRPs want politics to benefit the ‘regular’ people, rendering them independent from the influence of government, the pressures of immigration and a changing global economic climate. The welfare state can assist in achieving these goals, often causing PRRPs to strongly defend the welfare state (Chueri, 2022, p. 384).

PRRPs are also not statically right winged, existing more in a continuum of left-right (Muis & Immerzeel, 2017, p. 911).

Theory thus suggests that PRRPs may be expected to adapt their policy positions regarding the welfare state as exogenous shocks occur.

The Globalization Theory

Research on the globalization theory argues there are two groups in modern society: the 'losers' and the 'winners' of globalization. The 'losers' of globalization develop economic insecurities through socio-economic change, mainly due to an unstable labor market, resulting in lower incomes and often changing nature of jobs and industries due to high competition (Halikiopoulou & Vanda's, 2016, pp. 640-643; Mudder, 2015, pp. 298-299). The globalization theory hypothesizes that the 'losers' of globalization then revert to PRRPs to represent their needs. The argument is that in case of an exogenous shock, voters' demands change (Vlandas & Halikiopoulou, 2022, p. 28). This change is due to the risk assessment of voters trying to protect their welfare state from the influences of globalization and immigration. Additionally, due to exogenous shocks like economic crises, governments may be left less capable in providing the public services and social expenditure a populace is accustomed to, and demands from it (Savun & Tirone, 2012, p. 367). As social investment is what keeps citizens content with the political course, compliance to the established power may be affected negatively (p. 367). As a result, a window of opportunity opens for political opposition. PRRPs can be expected to capitalize on the economic insecurities experienced by these 'losers', resulting in a 'welfarist turn' for PRRPs, reflected in their party manifestoes (Traber, Giger & Häusermann, 2018, p. 17; Vlandas & Halikiopoulou, 2022, pp. 29-30). Recent research has also shown that the recession of 2008 resulted in a general rise in support for the welfare state and a rise in opposition to social policy retrenchment (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, p. 106).

In other words, as exogenous shocks occur, PRRPs will receive more support, resulting in PRRPs paying more attention to the welfare state in their party manifestoes.

Issue Ownership Theory and Salience Theory

Exogenous shocks can increase support for PRRPs. As PRRPs become more influential, they may adapt their policy position to become more appealing to a larger audience or to radicalize further to compete with other parties (Halikiopoulou & Vlandas, 2016, p. 639). Issue ownership theory and salience theory explain that parties try to

emphasize the issues that benefit them most, redirecting voters' focus on issues where a party has the best chance to yield positive results (Rovny, 2012, p. 271). This can be achieved through, for example, position blurring and bridge policies.

Even though their positioning may be ambiguous, PRRPs may very well be interested in welfare state expansion. PRRPs, however, prefer policies that directly benefit the voter, rather than investing in longer term developmental programs (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, pp. 104-108; Ennsner-Jedenastik, 2022, p. 159). Exogenous shocks cause uncertainty and instability (Halikiopoulou & Vanda's, 2016, pp. 640-643). PRRPs thus opt for policies with immediate payoffs and stabilizing effects (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, p. 109).

In sum, although the preferred type of welfare policy may be different for PRRPs, their manifestoes can be expected to favor welfare reform.

Welfare Chauvinism

Exogenous shocks can also cause changes in identity (Savun & Tirone, 2012, p. 367; Todd, 2017, p. 60). Crises that threaten national identity (e.g., the immigration crisis) result in higher support for PRRPs (Halikiopoulou & Vlandas, 2016, p. 645). Thus, PRRPs have a high interest in highlighting the effects of immigration on welfare (Ennsner-Jedenastik, 2022, pp. 159-160). PRRPs often consider the welfare state to be too generous, encouraging dependency on government support. PRRPs often criticize modern welfare states to be inefficient and unsustainable systems that benefits "undeserving" groups, such as immigrants and non-citizens (Diermeier & Niehues, 2022, p. 303)

This sometimes results in a call for reduced welfare spending, stricter eligibility criteria, and a more individualistic approach to social policy, where people are responsible for their own well-being. However, they may argue for a focus on "deserving" groups, such as elderly and disabled citizens, while condemning those who they view as abusing the welfare system (Chueri, 2022, p. 384).

Therefore, PRRPs can be expected to favor restricted access to the welfare state.

The expectation is, based on existing theory discussed above, that PRRPs have an interest in adapting their policy position as exogenous shocks occur, paying more attention to the welfare state, favoring reform of existing policies into a more restricted welfare state. However, existing theories leave too much room for a conclusive answer. Therefore, this topic deserves further research. As a result, this thesis will follow the following hypothesis:

Exogenous shocks cause PRRPs to change their social policy in favor of welfare state restriction.

4: Conceptualization

Exogenous Shocks

Exogenous shocks refer to unexpected events or developments that originate from outside a given system or economy, disrupting the normal functioning of operations, and leading to, often unfavorable, impacts on the system or economy (Miklian & Hoelscher, 2022, p. 180). Examples of exogenous shocks are terrorist attacks, natural disasters, pandemics, and financial crises, however many other shocks exist (Li & Tallman, 2011, p. 1119).

Exogenous shocks are beyond the control of a government. However, governments can influence the effects, or the impact of a shock, by their response to it (Miklian & Hoelscher, 2022, p. 180). Exogenous shocks can significantly affect demand, supply, prices, and output. These effects are linked directly to the realm of the welfare state, through the potential loss of jobs, money, and wealth as well as social and economic dislocations. The societal consequences of exogenous shocks can cause political and identity changes in a populace, providing possibilities for competing political forces to shift power (Savun & Tirone, 2012, p. 367; Todd, 2017, p. 60).

PRRPs

PRRPs, or populist radical right parties, traditionally have been right-wing extreme (Garritzmann, Busemeyer & Neimanns, 2018, p. 849). They share their focus on nativism, authoritarianism, and populism (Mudde, 2015, p. 296). Nativism relates to PRRPs' nationalistic tendencies, where an 'us' consisting of nationals may be favored to the alienated 'other', usually groups of immigrants, non-natives, and indigenous peoples (Fenger, 2018, p. 189; Mudde, 2015, p. 296). Authoritarianism relates to PRRPs' desire for a rigidly organized and systemized society to make systems more straightforward and less complex (Meardi & Guardiancich, 2022, p. 131). Populism relates to PRRPs' desire for the strict representation of 'the people' in politics, resulting in an anti-elitist stance on government (Mudde, 2015, p. 296).

Three distinct scholarly viewpoints can be identified when researching PRRPs' preferences on welfare state policy: the neoliberal position, the welfare chauvinism position, and the welfare nostalgia position (Fenger, 2018, p. 190). The neoliberal position claims that PRRPs aim for neo-liberal social policies, while the welfare chauvinism position explains why PRRPs tend to opt for welfare policies that benefit the 'natives' of a country, while restricting 'non-natives' (Fenger, 2018, p. 190; Mudde, 2015, p. 296). The welfare nostalgia perspective takes this latter statement further, to exclude other minorities like women and self-employed individuals. When it comes to family-related issues, the welfare nostalgic stance supports welfare policies that reinforce traditional values (Fenger, 2018, p. 190).

Policy Stances on the Welfare State

Policy proposals are in essence reform proposals. In the literature on welfare state reform types, we can identify retrenchment, adaptations, updates or recalibrations, and restructuring.

Retrenchment refers to the reduction or cutback in welfare state benefits. This involves reducing the overall size of the welfare system or narrowing eligibility requirements. The reform involves cutting spending on social programs or reducing benefits (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). *Adaptations* refer to changes that are made to the welfare system in response to changes in the economy, demographics, or societal needs. Adaptations are meant to enable the welfare state to function as it has (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). *Updates or recalibrations* refer to the updating or modernization of social programs or policies to keep pace with the changing needs and risks of society. This may involve changing the eligibility criteria, simplifying the application process, or improving the delivery of services (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). *Restructuring* refers to the fundamental, structural change in the way social programs are organized or delivered. Restructuring may involve combining programs or services, decentralizing programs to local governments, or privatizing government services (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). According to Van Kersbergen and Vis (2012) welfare state expansion can be part of adaptations, updates or recalibrations, as well as restructuring.

5: Methodology

Research design

This thesis is deductive in nature, testing whether the existing theories on the effects of exogenous shocks on PRRPs' stance on the welfare state can explain the behavior of PRRPs in practice.

Parties change over time, and so do their images (Janda, Harmel, Edens & Goff, 1995, p. 172). Parties try to control, as well as formulate their identities through party manifestoes (p. 172). Therefore, in researching PRRPs policy positions it is relevant to look at their election manifestoes. The focus of this thesis thus lies on party manifestoes instead of debates or other forms of political expression. While debates can be useful to see how candidates perform under pressure and to get a sense of their communication skills, manifestoes provide a more detailed and comprehensive understanding of a party's vision and values.

The objective of this research is to identify how PRRPs change their policies on the welfare state (DV) as they are confronted with exogenous shocks (IV). The thesis analyzes party manifestoes and identifies the general tendencies of PRRPs after being confronted with exogenous shocks. Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) will be the research method used, as it can reduce large amounts of information (Schreier, 2014, p. 181), such as party manifestoes.

The research uses a diverse case method, with four PRRPs across three cases, namely the Dutch case (LPF/PVV), the British case (UKIP), and the Austrian case (FPÖ). Each case is from a different category of welfare state regime (Esping-Andersen, 1990), making the research as diverse as possible (Seawright & Gerring, 2008, p. 301). Identifying internal homogeneity in otherwise diverse cases allows for 'stronger claims to representativeness than any other small-N research' (Seawright & Gerring, 2008, p. 301).

The thesis will look at the election manifestoes of each PRRP from 2002-2021. These years are chosen because they cover three major exogenous shocks, namely the financial crisis of 2008, and the migrant crisis of 2015, and the housing crisis. The manifestoes are of interest, as they cover PRRPs' policy stances before, during, and after the three exogenous shocks. A comparative case study on the three cases determines whether there are significant shifts in policy positions for PRRPs. Thus, this research design allows to test the hypothesis, that exogenous shocks cause PRRPs to change their social policy in favor of welfare state restriction.

Case Selection

For this research three cases are covered, the Netherlands, the UK, and Austria. Based on the categorization of Esping-Andersen (1990), each case belongs to a different welfare regime. The Netherlands has a hybrid welfare state of social-democratic and conservative, the UK has a liberal welfare state, and Austria has a conservative welfare state (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, pp. 68-71). This allows for a diverse case method, which is argued to lead to the most representative results in small-N research' (Seawright & Gerring, 2008, p. 301).

Additionally, each case has dealt with a rise of right-wing populism (Deacon & Wring, 2016, pp. 169-170; Heinisch, 2008, p. 67; Vossen, 2012, p. 28). The UKIP has enjoyed electoral successes during some of the elections of 2001-2021 (Deacon & Wring, 2016, p. 169). The PVV has established itself as a major party in the Netherlands and even been part of government coalition (Afonso, 2015, p. 282). The Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) is considered as one of the oldest and most successful right-wing populist parties in Europe. The FPÖ has been part of the government multiple times.

For the Dutch case, two parties are included: Lijst Pim Fortuyn (LPF) and the Party for Freedom (PVV). To analyze the trajectory of policy stances for Dutch PRRPs we need to look at both. The LPF came to be in 2002, experienced electoral success in 2003, followed by a collapse following the death of party leader Pim Fortuyn (Plach, 2015, p. 2). The LPF is argued to have set the stage for the PVV, which was created in 2006 (Plach, 2015, p. 2). The PVV can thus be seen as the ideological continuation of the LPF. Therefore, this thesis will look at both parties for the Dutch case.

Data Collection

The research covers the elections of 2002-2021 in all three countries. The length of the period is important, as it allows for a longitudinal analysis to identify the shifts in policy stance over time. Research covering a longer period would not be possible, since the Netherlands did not have a radical right party before 2002 (Silva, 2018, p. 223). To maintain comparability of the three cases the research thus starts with the 2002 election manifesto of the LPF.

The party manifestoes included are for national elections. Although PRRPs do have election manifestoes for other elections, for example local and European Parliamentary elections, national election party manifestoes best reflect PRRPs stance on welfare policy. Van Kersbergen and Vis (2013) explain that the welfare state is the collection of social

policies instated to bolster welfare and offer protection within a nation (pp. 2-3). The welfare state is thus generally a national project. Therefore, this thesis will focus on the national election party manifestoes of PRRPs.

It is worth noting that international welfare does exist. The International Labor Organization, for example, has been shown to affect the welfare state (Strang & Chang, 1993, p. 257). Similarly, EU elections have been shown to affect party policies at the national level (Sommer-Topcu & Zar, 2014, p. 893). Therefore, elections other than national general elections, as well as the party manifestoes made for these elections, are not irrelevant to this thesis' topic. Future research could expand on this.

This thesis will look at the LPF election manifestoes from 2002 and 2003, as well as the PVV election manifestoes from 2006, 2010, 2012, 2017, and 2021. For the UKIP, the election manifestoes from 2005, 2010, 2015, 2017, and 2019 are included. The included manifestoes of the FPÖ cover the elections of 2006, 2008, 2013, 2017, and 2019.

Operationalization

To be able to analyze the 17 political manifestoes listed above, their contents need to be reduced. Therefore, this research has created a coding frame. The research is concept-driven, meaning the codes are a derivative of existing work.

The work used for the coding frame is Van Kersbergen and Vis (2013). They describe four main categories of welfare state reform: Retrenchment, Adaptations, Updates or Recalibrations, and Restructuring. This research is interested in how exogenous shocks affect PRRPs' preferred welfare reform, whether that constitutes reducing, maintaining, or expanding the welfare state. Therefore, these prescribed categories by Van Kersbergen and Vis (2013) are the perfect fit.

The research starts with isolating the welfare policies included in the manifestoes, since this research is only interested in the welfare state policies.

What follows is the sorting of these welfare policies into six common welfare domains: healthcare policies, education policies, social policies, economic policies, emancipation and integration policies, and immigration policies. Sorting the welfare policies into these groups allows for inferences across the groups. It will enable the recognition of certain patterns that apply to a specific type of welfare policy. For example, recognizing a phenomenon in all social policies in one manifesto, allows the comparison of similar phenomena in other manifestoes. What results is the identification of a pattern.

The individual welfare policies will then be coded as being part of two main categories: reform or residual. The residual category is used to allow for welfare policies that do not fit into any of the other categories. It will ensure mutual exclusiveness and exhaustiveness.

Next, the policies will be coded into the four categories by Van Kersbergen and Vis (2013). Appendix C shows a list of all indicators used.

Retrenchment relates to those welfare reforms that propose a roll-back (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). These policies are the policies that leave (some) people more unprotected than they did previously, by reducing the extensiveness of a benefit, or introducing stricter eligibility criteria. An example of an indicator would be: 'restrict' or 'criteria' or similar alternatives to these words (including translations).

Adaptations are those welfare reforms aimed at maintaining the welfare policy's effectiveness (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). It might do so by increasing funds or rules to enable the policy to still work, even though there may be contextual changes that influence the policy (inflation, higher demand). This reform also includes the introduction of- and investment into new programs, as these are meant to help people that are struggling, which constitutes a contextual change influencing existing policies. An example of an indicator would be: 'more money' or 'provide' or similar alternatives to these words (including translations).

Update or recalibrations are those welfare reforms aimed at changing existing policies to better fit the changing demands of society (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). An example would be the provision of after-school care, allowing mothers to work instead of staying at home, as well as quality criteria. This category also includes the lowering of taxes, if implemented with the aim to alleviate poverty and improving the welfare of the poorest. Taxation is a form of 'deadweight losses' of welfare (Vedder & Gallaway, 1999). Increasing poverty is a rising social problem, a changing demand of society. Therefore, tax falls under update/recalibration. An example of an indicator would be: 'quality' or 'taxes' or similar alternatives to these words (including translations).

Restructuring is the last category of welfare reform. These policies are aimed at the reorganization of (the delivery of) benefits (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2013, p. 3). Examples include devolution of government programs, reducing bureaucracy, privatization, and marketization. An example of an indicator would be: 'bureaucracy' or 'fewer-rules' or similar alternatives to these words (including translations).

6: Analysis

To ensure understanding of how welfare policies for each of the PRRPs has developed over time, the cases (The Netherlands, the UK, and Austria) are first examined independently, for each election manifesto/election year. In Appendix A, tables can be found, outlining the policy proposals of each PRRP on welfare state related topics, divided into categories. In Appendix B, the results are summarized in tables, totals, and percentages. In Appendix C, a list with all the indicators used for the research is compiled.

The Netherlands

2002-2003 (LPF)

In the 2002 election manifesto, the LPF policy proposals on welfare state reform are mostly concerned with adaptation and restructuring (See Table 1). Six of the adaptation proposals are on healthcare policies (See Appendix B). These policies mainly include increased spending on healthcare, through higher budgets, but also recruitment and (re-)training of healthcare workers. The restructure proposals are mainly aimed at the deregulation of education, removing bureaucracy and rules that undermine the freedom of teachers to decide on their own curriculum.

2003-2006 (LPF)

The 2003 LPF manifesto shows an increase in restructuring proposals for the welfare state, which again represents the category of welfare state reform with the highest number of proposals (See Table 1). The LPF has 19 policy proposals in this category, with six of them being on education and eight of them on social policy (See Appendix B). The proposals echo the 2002 manifesto in its desire to deregulate education but expand on policies regarding minimizing subsidies and benefits.

2006-2010 (PVV)

After the dissolution of the LPF the PVV has now entered the political space. During the 2006 elections the PVV shows interest mainly in retrenchment and adaptation reforms of the welfare state (See Table 1). Adaption has doubled in the number of policies proposed compared to the 2003 LPF manifesto, where retrenchment has enjoyed an increase as well. PVV's retrenchment policies represent mainly in social policies, mainly restricting accessibility of benefits for immigrants and criminals. The PVV appears to be much more

outspoken on their desire to limit immigrants' access to the welfare state than the LPF in previous years. The adaptation proposals are mainly on healthcare and educational policies, mainly advocating for more personnel and budget for both sectors. This reflects more of a continuation in principles compared to the LPF manifesto of 2002.

2010-2012 (PVV)

In the 2010 election we notice a strong increase in retrenchment policies, representing 44.2% of all proposed welfare state policies (See Table 1). The proposed policies are split mainly between social policies and immigration policies.

The PVV expands on their 2006 policies, by limiting the access of immigrants to the country and its welfare state. There is generally an increase in social policies limiting the generosity of the welfare state. Benefits are still available, but new restrictions apply. For example, the PVV proposes to only cover two children in child allowances and coupling benefits with mandatory acceptance of labor.

2012-2017 (PVV)

In the 2012 election, the PVV is still focused on the retrenchment and adaptation of the welfare state (See Table 1). Both are reflected mainly in social policies. The retrenchment policies are near identical to the 2010 policies, but the adaptation policies, however, are quite different from 2010. Nearly all the adaptation policies are on maintaining certain rights and benefits, as well as reversing budget cuts made by the previous government. None of these adaptation policies were part of the 2010 manifesto. These are the response to cuts made by the government in the years prior.

2017-2021 (PVV)

The 2017 PVV manifesto is quite infamous for its shortness. In fact, the program only covered one A4, with nine welfare policies included. These policies were split quite evenly across the welfare reform types (See Table 1), with its focus mainly on combatting immigration, lowering costs for citizens, and reversing past budget cuts on healthcare. No increase of anti-immigrant sentiment, resulting from the migrant crisis, can be observed.

2021-2025 (PVV)

For the 2021 manifesto, the PVV returns to adaptation proposals. Most of which show an increase in interest in healthcare and economic policies. The healthcare proposals restate

previous goals of increasing care capacity and investing in the sector. The increase in interest for economic policies, however, appear to be the result of the housing crisis, with policies aiming at providing more housing.

Table 1.

Percentages of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year in the Netherlands

	2002	2003	2006	2010	2012	2017	2021
Retrenchment	11.5%	22.5%	29.6%	44.2%	31.8%	22.2%	22.5%
Adaptation	34.6%	16.3%	33.3%	20.9%	38.6%	22.2%	37.5%
Update/Recalibration	23.1%	18.4%	18.5%	9.3%	6.8%	33.3%	20.0%
Restructure	30.8%	38.8%	11.1%	14.0%	15.9%	0%	17.5%
Residual	0%	4.1%	7.4%	11.6%	4.5%	22.2%	2.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The UK

2005-2010 (UKIP)

During the 2005 elections the UKIP favored updating/recalibrating and restructuring the welfare state (See Table 2), with 10 and 12 policies respectively. The update/recalibration proposals mainly included quality control of education, a raise of pensions, and decrease in taxes. Meanwhile, an increase in healthcare and educational autonomy, decentralization of healthcare, and the streamlining of the benefits and tax system were the goals of the restructure proposals. Adaptation was not a priority of the UKIP in 2005, with only three policy proposal in education.

2010-2015 (UKIP)

2010 resulted in a rise in restructuring proposals (see Table 2 & Appendix B). Mainly the number of social policies increased, with policies on the simplification of the pension and benefits system, reduction in pension provision, and the removal of means testing as a requirement for access to welfare benefits. Healthcare and education also received attention, with restructuring proposals relating to the autonomy of the NHS and educational sector. Besides a continued call for tax reduction, remarkably few policies are published on the economy this election.

2015-2017 (UKIP)

In 2015 there is a significant shift in welfare reform for the UKIP. Restructuring proposals are largely replaced with proposals for the adaptation of the welfare state (See Table 2). Nearly all of which are proposals in the increase in funds, or investment into education, healthcare, and social provisions for the elderly. The manifesto also sees the introduction of multiple policies regarding housing. Restructuring now receives the least amount of attention by the UKIP.

Social retrenchment has increased, with restrictions being placed on the access to the benefits system and NHS for immigrants and international students, as well as decreasing the intensity of benefits in general (See Appendix B). Although access to the welfare state for immigrants was minimal before, these policies have increased the restrictiveness and generosity of the welfare state more than the previous two elections.

2017-2019 (UKIP)

The 2017 UKIP manifesto sees a further increase in adaptation proposals, as well as a further drop in restructuring proposals (See Table 2). The proposals mainly echo the 2015 manifesto, adding provision of mental healthcare, and the adjustment of pensions according to inflation, minimum wage, or increase of 2.5%. There is a continued call for tax reduction.

2019-2024 (UKIP)

The manifesto sees the continuation of policy proposals from previous elections. However, the call for tax reduction continues and grows (See Appendix B).

Table 2.

Percentages of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year by UKIP

	2005	2010	2015	2017	2019
Retrenchment	16.7%	15.0%	17.4%	15.2%	25.7%
Adaptation	10.0%	15.0%	39.1%	54.3%	40.0%
Update/Recalibration	33.3%	22.5%	23.9%	21.7%	25.7%
Restructure	40.0%	42.5%	17.4%	4.3%	5.7%
Residual	0%	5.0%	2.2%	4.3%	2.9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Austria

2006-2008 (FPÖ)

The 2006 manifesto for the FPÖ has comparable numbers of policy proposals for retrenchment, adaptation, and update/recalibration. Only policies on the restructuring of the welfare state are of a considerably smaller amount. Retrenchment focuses on social and immigration policies, limiting access for immigrants to the welfare state, restricting benefits to natives, and opposing immigration. Adaptation focuses on healthcare, investing into the training of more staff, and increase benefits of healthcare for natives. Update/recalibration focuses on the economy with a clear objective to reduce taxes.

2008-2013 (FPÖ)

The division of welfare proposal across the reform types remained stable during the 2008 election, meaning a continuation from previous manifestoes. Retrenchment lessened during this election, but social and immigration policies were maintained. Adaptation policies shifted from healthcare policies to social policies, with adjustments for inflation of allowances and pensions. Update/recalibration remains focused on the economy, with a desire to reduce taxes.

2013-2017 (FPÖ)

The policies remain similar to the election before, except for a small increase in adaptation policies. More retrenchment policies are introduced, mainly limiting immigration as it did before. Adaptation policies remain focused on social policies with the adjustments for inflation of allowances and pensions. Maintaining of retirement age is also a priority. Update/recalibration policies focus on social policies and economy policies. The FPÖ introduces plans for minimum pensions and wage, easing access to benefits, increase financial aid, increasing tax relief, and rent reduction.

2017-2019 (FPÖ)

The division of policies remains similar to the year before, except for an increase in adaptations. Retrenchment focuses more on education and social, limiting access to education for non-natives. Furthermore, strict requirements for benefits for immigrants are introduced, like a policy limiting benefits for immigrant to physical benefits, instead of financial benefits. Adaptation policies remain focused on inflation adjustment and retirement age. Update/recalibration policies focuses on adding support for young and new mothers.

2019-2024 (FPÖ)

This election there is a strong shift in numbers across the welfare reform categories, resulting in more policies for the update/recalibration and restructure categories. This manifesto, however, looks more like a propaganda pamphlet. The FPÖ was in coalition from 2017-2019, and the manifesto focuses mainly on advertising its achievements of the past political term. There is, however, a continued push for tax reduction and the removal of bureaucracy.

Table 3.

Percentages of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year by the FPÖ

	2006	2008	2013	2017	2019
Retrenchment	34.2%	20.6%	29.6%	28.1%	20%
Adaptation	28.9%	29.4%	25.9%	31.3%	10%
Update/Recalibration	26.3%	35.3%	40.7%	28.1%	30%
Restructure	10.5%	11.8%	3.7%	6.3%	30%
Residual	0%	2.9%	0%	6.3%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

7: Discussion

In comparing the progression of welfare policies in the three countries, a few patterns come to the fore.

All four PRRPs share an interest in educational and healthcare policies. Although its priority comes and goes, it is always an item of importance for the parties. This is in line with theory on PRRPs' preference of policies that directly benefit the voter, with immediate payoffs and stabilizing effects (Enggist & Pinggera, 2022, pp. 104-109; Ennsner-Jedenastik, 2022, p. 159). Unlike benefits, educational and healthcare improvements directly benefit citizens, and are thus preferred by PRRPs.

Based on the researched manifestoes, the two welfare domains of education and healthcare policies do not appear to be sensitive to external shocks. Their presence is relatively constant in the manifestoes, regardless of societal changes. All the manifestoes contain similar policies on the increase of funds for education and healthcare, reforms for improvement, allowances on healthcare, childcare, and eldercare, as well as other similar policies. The only recurrent exception to this rule is the desire of the FPÖ and the PVV to limit access to the healthcare and educational systems for foreigners (See Appendix A: FPÖ 2006; 2008; 2013; 2017; PVV 2010 – Healthcare Policies; Education Policies).

Contrastingly, based on the researched manifestoes, social policies do appear to fluctuate in relevance or content depending on exogenous shocks. For example, at the time of the 2008 financial crisis, there appears to be austerity of the welfare state. In the Netherlands, in the 2010 election manifesto of the PVV, child allowances are limited to a maximum of two children. Furthermore, debt counseling, or 'schuldhulpsanering', is only allowed to be used once per person (See Appendix A: PVV 2010 - Social Policies).

Similarly, in 2008, the FPÖ retrenches employment benefits to only those in need. However, the FPÖ, also introduced inflation adjustment of pensions, allowances, and benefits, throughout their 2008 and the 2013 manifesto (See Appendix A: FPÖ 2008; 2013 - Social Policies). Considering the rising costs and inflation following the financial crisis, policies like this could be regarded as tools to combat the loss in welfare resulting from the crisis.

Interestingly, the UKIP does not appear to introduce austerity measures following the financial crisis, nor does it introduce protective policies for those who have been hit by the

financial crisis. In their 2010 manifesto, UKIP does promise to invest in jobs and streamline the pension and benefit systems. However, this is not new to the 2010 manifesto, as it was part of the 2005 manifesto as well, as well as the subsequent manifestoes (See Appendix A: UKIP - Social Policies). The possibility exists, that the UK did not respond similarly to the financial crisis, resulting in a different approach to welfare policies. How and why these differences exist could be the topic of future research.

For economic policies, all four PRRPs appear to be in favor of tax reduction and reforms. Although the push for tax reduction does appear to get stronger in the UKIP manifestoes, policies covering tax reduction are consistent throughout all manifestoes of all years. Therefore, tax reduction, appears to be more of an intrinsic characteristic of PRRPs, rather than a common PRRP reaction to exogenous shocks.

However, housing does appear to be a topic influenced by exogenous shocks based on the researched manifestoes. None of the four parties propose policies on housing before 2013. When the housing crisis takes off in 2013 (Edwards, 2016, pp. 228-230), this is directly reflected in the election manifestoes of the PVV, UKIP, and FPÖ. As early as 2013, the FPÖ already proposes rent reductions and investments in social housing (See Appendix A: FPÖ 2013 – Economic Policies). The 2015 UKIP manifesto mentions the intention to build more rent homes, as well a loosening of duties on low-range housing (See Appendix A: UKIP 2015 – Economic Policies). The UKIP expands their policy proposal in 2017 and 2019, with the proposed construction of modular homes, using brownfield sites (previously occupied land) to construct houses on, the construction of veteran hostels, and the construction of one million more homes (See Appendix A: UKIP 2017; 2019 – Economic Policies). The PVV is a little late on housing policies, however, in 2019 the PVV also introduces policies on more housing for the elderly, more social housing, and mortgage protection (See Appendix A: PVV 2019 – Economic Policies).

Alternatively, immigration policies do not appear to interact with exogenous shocks very much based on the researched manifestoes. All four PRRPs have a strong anti-immigration stance throughout their manifestoes of each election year. The UKIP, for example, proposes in their 2005 manifesto to introduce a point system for immigration, making immigration more difficult (See Appendix A: UKIP 2005 – Immigration Policies). Similarly, the LPF already opposes immigration in 2002, as well as the restrictive labor immigration policies introduced by the FPÖ in 2006 (See Appendix A: LPF 2002; FPÖ 2006

– Immigration Policies). Each PRRP continues its anti-immigration stance over the next manifestoes, without a notable increase in number or degree of anti-immigration policies around the 2015 mark, which is when the migrant crisis hit Europe (De Genova, 2018, p. 1771).

8: Conclusion

In answering the research question on the effects of exogenous shocks on party positions of the populist radical right on welfare state policy, this research has relied on previous research and theory, as well as an analysis of 17 party manifestoes. The answer is not straightforward, one-size-fits-all. Theory suggested that PRRPs have an interest in adapting their policy position as exogenous shocks occur, paying more attention to the welfare state, favoring reform of existing policies into a more restricted welfare state. Therefore, the hypothesis was: *Exogenous shocks cause PRRPs to change their social policy in favor of welfare state restriction.*

The thesis has proven that PRRPs are interested in the welfare state. Populism lends itself very well to the welfare state. Populist parties aim to represent regular people (Mudde, 2015, p. 296). Being that the welfare state are policies to protect the welfare of regular people, it comes as no surprise that the PRRPs and the welfare state are so interconnected.

Research had previously investigated the relationship between PRRPs and the welfare state, but very little research existed on the effects of exogenous shocks on the position of PRRPs. Exogenous shocks are out of our control (Miklian & Hoelscher, 2022, p. 180), and are thus bound to confront us in the future. Therefore, researching how these exogenous shocks affect politics is relevant to the future of politics. PRRPs are merely a part of it.

However, this thesis has found that exogenous shocks affect PRRPs stance on the welfare state differently, depending on the type of exogenous shock. Therefore, the hypothesis could not fully account for all the possibilities in which a PRRP might respond to an exogenous shock. The financial crisis of 2008, for example, generally resulted in austerity measures at first, including the retrenchment of some welfare provisions. However, this thesis also showed that education and healthcare generally did not face any retrenchment, but expansion of the welfare state. This thesis also showed that the UKIP did not resort to austerity measures in their welfare proposals around the financial crisis. A reason for this could be a differing degree as to which a nation is faced with a particular exogenous shock.

Accounting for this deviation was not part of this research, which is where future research could expand on the findings of this thesis.

In addition, this thesis concluded that no noteworthy change in the anti-immigration attitudes of PRRPs could be detected in their manifestoes. Therefore, a conclusion could be that PRRPs are inherently anti-immigration regardless of an immigration-related exogenous shock.

Lastly, housing is one of the key domains in which PRRPs' stance on the welfare state is affected by exogenous shocks. As a result of the housing crisis of the 2010's, all three of the active PRRPs in that decade showed a surge in interest in welfare on housing. As housing directly affects the welfare of people, and PRRPs are interested in policies that directly benefit people, this is a logical consequence.

Reflections:

The research in this thesis could not account for all divergence of PRRP behavior. A reason for this could be the relatively limited scope of the research. As mentioned, the UKIP had a different approach to the financial crisis of 2008 than the PVV and the FPÖ. It could not be concluded for certain that this is truly a deviation of PRRP behavior. Had the research cover multiple decades, and multiple PRRPs from countries all over the world, the results of this research would be much more reliable and generalizable.

It is also important to note that this research has relied on a personal interpretation of what constitutes a welfare policy, and what does not. Similarly, each welfare policy being divided into welfare domains also relied on personal interpretation. As a researcher can be biased, other researchers might have made different decisions.

Lastly, it is also important to take notice of the fact that two of the 17 manifestoes were very limited in content. These manifestoes were the PVV manifesto from 2017, and the FPÖ manifesto of 2013. Additionally, the FPÖ manifesto of 2019 lacked in future policies. As the FPÖ had just been part of the coalition, most of the manifesto from 2019 reflected on their achievement whilst in office. As a result, fewer policies were useable for the research.

Implications:

Future research could rely on the findings in this thesis to expand research on the role PRRPs in the welfare state. People tend to have a very unilinear idea of what a PRRP is and how they behave. This research has shown that some of the preconceived notions about

PRRPs do not always apply. Therefore, research into PRRPs allows for many similar discoveries in political science.

Societally, this thesis might affect the position of PRRPs in political thought for people. Where some voters might dismiss PRRPs, this thesis has been able to show a different side to these parties. PRRPs' continued commitment to the welfare of people in the domain of healthcare, education, and taxation, might sway people to reconsider their political conviction.

9: References

- Adler, D., & Ansell, B. (2020). Housing and populism. *West European Politics*, 43(2), 344-365.
- Afonso, A. (2015). Choosing whom to betray: populist right-wing parties, welfare state reforms and the trade-off between office and votes. *European Political Science Review*, 7(2), 271-292.
- Betz, H. G. (1993). The new politics of resentment: radical right-wing populist parties in Western Europe. *Comparative politics*, 25(4), 413-427.
- Betz, H. G., & 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.
- Busemeyer, M., Rathgeb, P., & Sahm, A. (2022). Authoritarian values and the welfare state: the social policy preferences of radical right voters, *West European Politics*, 45(1), 77-101. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2021.1886497
- Calca, P., & Gross, M. (2019). To adapt or to disregard? Parties' reactions to external shocks. *West European Politics*, 42(3), 545-572.
- Chueri, J. (2022). An emerging populist welfare paradigm? How populist radical right-wing parties are reshaping the welfare state. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 45(4), 383-409.
- Deacon, D., & Wring, D. (2016). The UK Independence Party, populism and the British news media: Competition, collaboration or containment?. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(2), 169-184.

- De Genova, N. (2018). The “migrant crisis” as racial crisis: Do Black Lives Matter in Europe?. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 41(10), 1765-1782.
- De Sio, L., & Weber, T. (2014). Issue yield: A model of party strategy in multidimensional space. *American Political Science Review*, 108(4), 870–885. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055414000379>
- Diermeier, M., & Niehues, J. (2022). Towards a nuanced understanding of anti-immigration sentiment in the welfare state—a program specific analysis of welfare preferences. *Rationality and Society*, 34(3), 302-333.
- Dwyer, P. (2004). Creeping conditionality in the UK: From welfare rights to conditional entitlements?. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 29(2), 265-287.
- Edwards, M. (2016). The housing crisis and London. *City*, 20(2), 222–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2016.1145947>
- Enggist, M., & Pinggera, M. (2022). Radical right parties and their welfare state stances – not so blurry after all? *West European Politics*, 45(1), 102-128. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2021.1902115
- Ennsner-Jedenastik, L. (2018). Welfare chauvinism in populist radical right platforms: The role of redistributive justice principles. *Social Policy & Administration*, 52(1), 293-314.
- Ennsner-Jedenastik, L. (2022). The impact of radical right parties on family benefits. *West European Politics*, 45(1), 154-176. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2021.1936944
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). The three political economies of the welfare state. In *The three worlds of welfare capitalism* (pp. 9-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenger, M. (2018). The social policy agendas of populist radical right parties in comparative perspective. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 34(3), 188-209.
- Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs. (2006). Wahlprogramm der Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs – FPÖ. Nationalratswahl 2006
- Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs. (2008). Österreich im Wort. Nationalratswahl 2008
- Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs. (2013). Liebe deine Nächsten. Nationalratswahl 2006
- Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs. (2017). Freiheitliches Wahlprogramm zur Nationalratswahl 2017. Nationalratswahl 2017
- Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs. (2019). Mit Sicherheit für Österreich. Nationalratswahl 2019

- Garritzmann, J. L., Busemeyer, M. R., & Neimanns, E. (2018). Public demand for social investment: New supporting coalitions for welfare state reform in Western Europe? *Journal of European public policy*, 25(6), 844-861.
- Grubel, H. G. (1998). Economic freedom and human welfare: Some empirical findings. *Cato Journal*, 18(2), 287-304.
- Halikiopoulou, D., & Vlandas, T. (2016). Risks, costs and labour markets: Explaining cross-national patterns of far right party success in European parliament elections. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(3), 636-655.
- Heinisch, R. (2008). Austria: The structure and agency of Austrian populism. *Twenty-first century populism: The spectre of Western European democracy*, 67-83.
- Janda, K., Harmel, R., Edens, C., & Goff, P. (1995). Changes in party identity: Evidence from party manifestos. *Party politics*, 1(2), 171-196.
- Jennissen, R. P. W. (2013). De instroom van buitenlandse arbeiders en de migratiegeschiedenis van Nederland na 1945. *Justitiële verkenningen*, 39(6), 9-31
- Lalor, K. (2021). Queer Legacies of Colonialism. In: S. Raj and P. Dunne (Eds), *The Queer Outside in Law. Palgrave Socio-Legal Studies* (pp. 23-47). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Li, S., & Tallman, S. (2011). MNC strategies, exogenous shocks, and performance outcomes. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(10), 1119-1127.
- Lijst Pim Fortuyn. (2002). Zakelijk met een Hart. Verkiezingsprogramma 2002.
- Lijst Pim Fortuyn. (2003). Politiek is Passie. Verkiezingsprogramma 2003.
- Meardi, G., & Guardiancich, I. (2022). Back to the familialist future: The rise of social policy for ruling populist radical right parties in Italy and Poland. *West European Politics*, 45(1), 129-153. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2021.1916720
- Miklian, J., & Hoelscher, K. (2022). SMEs and exogenous shocks: A conceptual literature review and forward research agenda. *International Small Business Journal*, 40(2), 178-204.
- Mudde, C. (2015). Populist radical right parties in Europe today. In J. Abromeit, Y. Norman, G. Marotta, and B. M. Chesterton (Eds.), *Transformations of populism in Europe and the Americas: History and recent trends* (pp. 295–307). London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury.
- Muis, J., & Immerzeel, T. (2017). Causes and consequences of the rise of populist radical right parties and movements in Europe. *Current Sociology*, 65(6), 909-930.
- Nieveen, N., & Kuiper, W. (2012). Balancing curriculum freedom and regulation in the Netherlands. *European Educational Research Journal*, 11(3), 357-368.

- Otjes, S., Ivaldi, G., Jupskås, A. R., & Mazzoleni, O. (2018). It's not economic interventionism, stupid! Reassessing the political economy of radical right-wing populist parties. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 24(3), 270-290.
- Partij voor de Vrijheid. (2006). Verkiezingspamflet. Verkiezingsprogramma 2006.
- Partij voor de Vrijheid. (2010). De agenda van hoop en optimisme. Verkiezingsprogramma 2010.
- Partij voor de Vrijheid. (2012). Hún Brussel, óns Nederland. Verkiezingsprogramma 2012.
- Partij voor de Vrijheid. (2017). Nederland weer van ons!. Verkiezingsprogramma 2017.
- Partij voor de Vrijheid. (2021). Het gaat om u. Verkiezingsprogramma 2021.
- Pinggera, M. (2021). Congruent with whom? Parties' issue emphases and voter preferences in welfare politics. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(12), 1973-1992. doi: 10.1080/13501763.2020.1815825
- Plach, C. (2015). Radical right populist parties in Britain and the Netherlands: Explaining electoral success. *Res Publica-Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 19(1), 1-11
- Rathgeb, P., & Busemeyer, M. (2022). How to study the populist radical right and the welfare state? *West European Politics*, 45(1), 1-23. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2021.1925421
- Busemeyer, M. R., Rathgeb, P., & Sahm, A. H. (2022). Authoritarian values and the welfare state: the social policy preferences of radical right voters. *West European Politics*, 45(1), 77-101.
- Rovny, J. (2013). Where do radical right parties stand? Position blurring in multidimensional competition. *European Political Science Review*, 5(1), 1-26.
- Rovny, J. (2012). Who emphasizes and who blurs? Party strategies in multidimensional competition. *European Union Politics*, 13(2), 269-292.
- Savun, B., & Tirone, D. C. (2012). Exogenous shocks, foreign aid, and civil war. *International Organization*, 66(3), 363-393.
- Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 170-183). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political research quarterly*, 61(2), 294-308.
- Somer-Topcu, Z., & Zar, M. E. (2014). European parliamentary elections and national party policy change. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(6), 878-902.
- Stefan, G. M. (2015). European welfare state in a historical perspective. A critical review. *European Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(1), 25-38.

- Strang, D., & Chang, P. M. Y. (1993). The International Labor Organization and the welfare state: Institutional effects on national welfare spending, 1960–80. *International Organization*, 47(2), 235-262.
- Silva, B. C. (2018). Populist radical right parties and mass polarization in the Netherlands. *European Political Science Review*, 10(2), 219-244.
- Todd, J. (2017). From identity politics to identity change: Exogenous shocks, constitutional moments and the impact of Brexit on the Island of Ireland. *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, 28(2017), 57-72.
- Traber, D., Giger, N., & Häusermann, S. (2018). How economic crises affect political representation: Declining party–voter congruence in times of constrained government. *West European Politics*, 41(5), 1100-1124. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2017.1378984
- UK Independence Party. (2005). We want our country back. Manifesto 2005.
- UK Independence Party. (2010). Empowering the people. Manifesto 2010.
- UK Independence Party. (2015). Believe in Britain. Manifesto 2015.
- UK Independence Party. (2017). Britain together. Manifesto 2017.
- UK Independence Party. (2019). Manifesto for Brexit and beyond. Manifesto 2019.
- Van der Veer, P. (2006). Pim Fortuyn, Theo van Gogh, and the politics of tolerance in the Netherlands. *Public Culture*, 18(1), 111-124.
- Van Kersbergen, K., & Vis, B. (2014). *Comparative welfare state politics: Development, opportunities, and reform*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vedder, R. K., & Gallaway, L. E. (1999). *Tax reduction and economic welfare*. US Government Printing Office.
- Vlandas, T., & Halikiopoulou, D. (2022). Welfare state policies and far right party support: Moderating 'insecurity effects' among different social groups. *West European Politics*, 45(1), 24-49.
- Vossen, K. (2012). Van marginaal naar mainstream? Populisme in de Nederlandse geschiedenis. *BMGN-Low Countries Historical Review*, 127(2), 28-54.

10: Appendices

Appendix A: Welfare Policies

- Light Blue** = indicator of retrenchment
Red = indicator of adaptation
Yellow = indicator of updates/recalibration
Green = indicator of restructuring
Pink = indicator of maintaining status quo

The Netherlands

LPF 2002:

Healthcare Policies	Reform of welfare state				Residual
	Retrenchment	Adaptation	Update/Recalibration	Restructure	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria kwaliteit en kwantiteit van de zorg 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zorgsector autonoom – minder regels organisatie en management 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meer geld, meer personeel ouderenzorg 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private zorginstellingen dezelfde rechten als reguliere ziekenhuizen 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medische specialist meer budget voor extra ingrepen (uurtarief) 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meer praktijkverpleegkundigen om huisartsen te ontlasten 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herintreders en deeltijders stimuleren bij het opzetten van huisartsenposten 		X			

• Huisartsenposten bij ziekenhuizen om druk op spoedeisende hulp te verminderen		X			
• Stimuleren opleidingen verpleegkundigen en OK-assistenten		X			

Education Policies					
• Marktconforme salaris onderwijsgeveden				X	
• Dereguleren van het onderwijssysteem				X	
• De administratieve lasten en de bureaucratie terugdringen				X	
• Vrijheid van onderwijs				X	
• Kleinere scholen (extra geld)		X			

Social Policies					
• Inkomensafhankelijke subsidies afschaffen				X	
• Instroom WAO verminderen	X				
• WAO uitsluitend toegankelijk voor arbeidsongeschiktheid ontstaan in of door werksituaties.	X				
• andere oorzaken → een particuliere verzekering af te sluiten → verlaging van de WAO-premie.				X	
• Armoedevalslachtoffers ontzien			X		
• Gepensioneerden financieel ondersteunen		X			

Economic Policies					
• Verlaging BTW			X		
• Afschaffing meerdere belastingen			X		
• Woningbezitters steunen		X			

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Extra zorg voor huisvesting, scholing en culturele vorming van immigranten			X		

Immigration Policies					
• Immigratie tegengaan.	X				
• Financieel bijdragen aan de opvang van vluchtelingen in de regio			X		

LPF 2003:

Healthcare Policies					
• Basispakket voor zorg het gehele jaar door		X			
• Nieuwe zorgaanbieders toelaten				X	
• Bureaucratie en vergadercultuur verminderen				X	
• Aantal opleidingsplaatsen sterk vergroten		X			
• Afschaffen belemmeringen voor Zelfstandige Behandel Centra				X	
• De nominale premie ziektekostenverzekering dekt de integrale kosten		X			
• Toelaten buitenlandse verzekeringsmaatschappijen	X				
• Zorgsubsidie aan de burger en fiscale korting		X			
• De ziektekostenverzekeraar dekt de kosten uit premie-inkomsten (niet de staat)	X				

Education Policies					
• Actief spreidingsbeleid van allochtone en autochtone leerlingen			X		
• Een marktconform salaris leraren				X	
• Meer begeleiding en ondersteuning lerarenopleiding		X			
• Opheffen beperkingen inzetten zij-instromers				X	
• Onnodige wetten onderwijs schrappen				X	
• Scholen vrijheid voor eigen beleid				X	
• Universiteiten en hogescholen op termijn geheel financieel zelfstandig				X	
• Subsidie van student, niet de universiteit				X	
• Meer gerichte seksuele voorlichting		X			

Social Policies					
• Werkloosheid- of arbeidsongeschiktheidregelingen richten op spoedige werkhervatting				X	
• Flexibiliseren van werktijd, werkduur en werkplek			X		
• Aanbieden van gezinstherapie		X			
• Opvoedingsondersteuning voor probleemgezinnen			X		
• Opvang en hulpverlening slachtoffers verbeteren			X		
• Gratis OV in de regio, buiten de spitsuren, voor bejaarden		X			

• Opheffen van de leeftijdsdiscriminatie (bv. Pensioenheffing bij doorwerken)				X	
• Gerichte lastenverlichting i.p.v. subsidies				X	
• Inkomensafhankelijke subsidies verminderen				X	
• De WAO herzien of zelfs afschaffen ten behoeve van een Arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen				X	
• Algemene Nabestaanden Wet herzien (pensioenrechten)				X	
• Gesubsidieerd arbeid omzetten in regulier arbeid				X	
• Zwart werk wit maken				X	
• Alleen permanente verblijfsvergunning geeft recht op volledige bijstand	X				
• Succesvol afronden inburgeringsexamen noodzakelijke voorwaarde voor uitkering	X				

Economic Policies					
• Verhoging van de arbeidskorting.			X		
• Daar waar geen concurrentie mogelijk is, niet privatiseren					X
• Meer woningbouw (Eenvoudigere regelgeving bouw, minder bureaucratie en het tegengaan van misbruik van inspraakmogelijkheden bij bouwplannen)				X	
• Woningdoorstroming van goedkope naar duurdere woningen bevorderen			X		
• Sociale segregatie steden tegengaan			X		
• Gemengde woonvormen voor gezinnen en grootouders laten ontwikkelen					X
• Wetgeving ten behoeve van betaalbare studentenhuisvesting				X	
• Verlaging BTW			X		
• Afschaffing meerdere belastingen			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Nederlands verplicht, geen overheidsfolders meer in vreemde talen	X				
• Gezinsvorming gepaard met voorportaal voor de inburgeringcursus in land van herkomst	X				
• Succesvol afronden inburgeringsexamen noodzakelijke voorwaarde voor permanente verblijfsvergunning	X				

Immigration Policies					
• Streng toelatingsbeleid asielzoekers (Enkel vluchtelingen, immigratie vanuit niet-westerse culturen beperken)	X				
• Minimumleeftijd gezinsvorming verhogen van 18 naar 24 jaar	X				
• Alleen vluchtelingen die niet in eigen regio kunnen worden opgevangen mogen naar NL komen	X				
• Gratis rechtsbijstand beperken tot enkel de beroepsfase van een procedure	X				

PVV 2006:

Healthcare Policies					
• Meer verplegers verpleeghuizen		X			
• Wegsnijden bureaucratie en management				X	
• Meer begroting voor deze sector		X			
• Extra geld voor verpleeghuiszorg		X			
• Verbetering zorg en nazorg thuisfront uitgezonden en teruggekeerde militairen			X		
• Geen medische zorg voor illegalen behoudens spoedeisende hulp	X				

Education Policies					
• Meer docenten voor de klas		X			
• Wegsnijden bureaucratie en management				X	
• Meer begroting voor deze sector		X			
• Kwaliteitsverbetering lerarenopleiding			X		
• Kleinere scholen		X			
• Vrijheid van onderwijs				X	

Social Policies					
• Miljard extra voor AOW'ers		X			
• 10 jaar geen recht op uitkering bij uitkeringsfraude	X				
• Nette eenpersoonskamers voor ouderen in verpleeghuizen			X		
• Belastingvrij loon voor vrijwillig werkende 65-plussers			X		
• Werken verplicht voor een uitkering	X				
• Geen export van uitkeringen buiten de EU	X				
• Eerste tien jaar verblijf vreemdelingen in Nederland: geen recht op uitkering	X				

Economic Policies					
• Belastingverlaging			X		
• Onverkort handhaven hypotheekrenteaftrek		X			
• Geen stijging gemeentelijke lasten		X			

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Overheidsfolders uitsluitend in het Nederlands	X				
• Burqaverbod in openbare ruimte					X

• Verbod hoofddoekjes in publieke functies					X
--	--	--	--	--	----------

Immigration Policies					
• Immigratiestop niet-westerse allochtonen voor 5 jaar	X				
• Quotum asielzoekers van maximaal 5.000 per jaar, opvang in eigen regio	X				

PVV 2010:

Healthcare Policies					
• Geen verhoging van het eigen risico		X			
• Kleinere zorginstellingen		X			
• Kleinschalige buurtzorg in plaats van grootschalige thuiszorg				X	
• Minder management				X	
• Geen centra Jeugd en Gezin	X				
• Efficiëntere jeugdzorg			X		
• Programma's tegen ondervoeding, uitdroging en doorligwonden in alle zorginstellingen		X			
• Versoberen geestelijke gezondheidszorg	X				
• Extra zorgmedewerkers		X			

Education Policies					
• Kleine scholen		X			
• School laten leiden door (ex-)professional met afgeronde schoolleidersopleiding			X		
• Speciaal onderwijs		X			
• Minder management				X	
• Meer aandacht voor sport en bewegen				X	
• Onderwijsvrijheid				X	
• Geen verplichte spreiding van leerlingen	X				
• Buitenlandse studenten hun eigen studiekosten laten betalen					
• Handhaving studiefinanciering en ov-jaarkaart		X			
• Nederlands onderwijs in het Nederlands	X				

Social Policies					
• Bij fraude vervalt het recht op een uitkering	X				
• Ontslagrecht niet versoepelen					X
• Geen 'positieve' discriminatie					X
• Kinderbijslag en kindgebonden budget maximaal voor 2 kinderen	X				
• Acceptatieplicht arbeid koppelen aan ontvangen bijstand	X				
• Stopzetten alle kinderbijslag naar het buitenland	X				
• Geen enkele uitkering naar het buitenland – uitzondering: AOW	X				
• Verblijfsvergunning geeft geen recht meer op bijstand	X				

• Eén keer gebruik maken van schuldhulpverlening is het maximum	X				
• Verplichte budgetcursus voor personen in de schuldhulpverlening, op eigen kosten					X
• de AOW blijft op 65 jaar		X			
• Geen uitkeringen voor boerkadraagsters of mensen die slecht Nederlands spreken	X				
• Eerst tien jaar wonen en werken in Nederland, dan pas recht op een uitkering	X				

Economic Policies					
• Versnellen en versimpelen vergunningsprocedures			X		
• Lagere belastingen voor burgers en ondernemers			X		
• De hypotheekrenteaftrek en huursubsidie handhaven		X			
• Weg met de welstandcommissies (uiterlijke bouwrestricties en vereisten)				X	

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Geen hoofddoekjes in de zorg, het onderwijs, het gemeentehuis of waar dan ook bij de overheid, en evenmin bij welke gesubsidieerde organisatie dan ook					X
• Verbied de boerka en de koran, belast hoofddoekjes					X
• Geen folders of andere overheidscommunicatie in een taal anders dan Nederlands (of Fries)	X				

Immigration Policies					
• Inburgeringsexamen in land van herkomst	X				
• inburgeringscursus in Nederland niet gehaald, dan het land weer uit	X				
• Zelf taalcursussen en inburgeringscursussen betalen	X				
• Invoering van een asielzoekersquotum van maximaal 1.000 personen per jaar, opvang bij voorkeur in de regio	X				
• volledige immigratiestop voor mensen uit islamitische landen	X				

PVV 2012:

Healthcare Policies					
• Kleinere zorginstellingen		X			
• 12.000 extra zorgmedewerkers		X			
• Alle zorginstellingen regelarm of regelvrij				X	
• Minder management				X	
• Buurtzorg in plaats van grootschalige thuiszorg				X	
• Geen verhoging eigen risico		X			
• Geen extra zorggeld voor alloctonenbuurten	X				
• Geen Centra voor Jeugd en Gezin	X				
• Verzorgingshuizen behouden		X			

Education Policies					
• Kleine scholen		X			
• Minder management				X	
• Handhaving studiefinanciering voor de bachelorfase		X			
• Geen bezuiniging op het passend onderwijs		X			
• Elke school een anti-pest-beleid					X
• Onderwijsvrijheid				X	

Social Policies					
• Hoogte en duur WW ongewijzigd		X			
• Kinderbijslag en kindgebonden budget voor maximaal 2 kinderen	X				
• Geen verdere bezuinigingen op kinderopvang		X			
• Ontslagbescherming niet veranderen		X			
• Ontslagvergoeding ongewijzigd		X			
• Bij uitkeringsfraude nooit meer recht op een uitkering	X				
• Maximaal één keer schuldhulp-sanering	X				
• Geen bezuinigingen op de sociale werkplaatsen (WSW)		X			
• Korten op ineffektieve reïntegratiesubsidies, behoudens voor de WSW-ers	X				
• De Wajong blijft toegankelijk voor volledig duurzaam arbeidsongeschikten.		X			
• Partneralimentatie hooguit vijf jaar	X				
• AOW-leeftijd blijft op 65 jaar (eerder of later met korting of opslag)		X			

• Hanteren van vaste rekenrente van 4 procent bij pensioenen.		X			
• Geen 'positieve' discriminatie	X				
• Stopzetten uitkeringen naar het buitenland, uitgezonderd AOW	X				
• Geen kinderbijslag meer naar het buitenland	X				
• Na tien jaar geen Nederlander, dan geen recht op uitkering	X				
• Pas recht op een uitkering als een immigrant Nederlands is, goed Nederlands spreekt en geen boerka draagt.	X				

Economic Policies					
• BTW lager			X		
• Meerdere belastingen lager			X		
• Vereenvoudiging en versnelling vergunningprocedures			X		
• De hypotheekrenteaftrek en de huurtoeslag handhaven		X			
• Geen extra huurverhogingen		X			
• Weg met de welstandcommissies (uiterlijke bouwrestricties en vereisten)				X	
• Minder regels in de bouw				X	

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Algeheel hoofddoekverbod					X
• Verbied de boerka en de koran, belast hoofddoekjes					X

Immigration Policies					
• Immigratiestop voor mensen uit islamitische landen	X				
• Niet meer dan duizend asielzoekers per jaar	X				

PVV 2017:

Healthcare Policies					
• Eigen risico zorg geheel afschaffen		X			
• Terugdraaien bezuinigingen thuiszorg en ouderenzorg			X		

Social Policies					
• AOW-leeftijd op 65 jaar		X			

Economic Policies					
• Huren omlaag			X		
• Lagere inkomstenbelasting			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Hoofddoek niet in publieke functies					X
• Verbod koran					X

Immigration Policies					
• Asielzoeker-stop	X				
• Geen immigranten meer uit islamitische landen	X				

PVV 2021:

Healthcare Policies					
• Salaris verhoging zorg		X			
• Tienduizenden extra zorgmedewerkers		X			
• Administratie automatiseren, standaardiseren of afschaffen				X	
• Voltijd bonus voor zorgmedewerkers		X			
• Geen concurrentie streekziekenhuizen en gespecialiseerde ziekenhuizen				X	
• Wegnemen obstakels specialisten die een kliniek beginnen				X	
• Tienduizenden nieuwe verpleeghuis plekken		X			
• Vereenvoudigen regelen van zorg. (één wet)			X		
• Afschaffen eigen risico voor iedereen		X			
• Behoud zorgtoeslag voor lagere inkomens		X			

Education Policies					
• Klein schalig onderwijs		X			
• Geen onbevoegde leraren meer voor de klas			X		
• Stoppen met het leenstelsel, terug naar de basisbeurs					
• Onderwijs vrijheid				X	

Social Policies					
• Geen subsidies meer voor multiculturele entiteiten	X				
• Geen 'positieve discriminatie' en diversiteitsbeleid meer	X				
• Verhogen minimumloon			X		
• Geen aantasting WW en ontslagvergoeding		X			
• AOW-leeftijd op 65		X			
• Zware beroepen mogelijkheid na 40 jaar werk met pensioen			X		
• Behoud huidig pensioenstelsel		X			
• Zzp'ers betaalbaar vrijwillig verzekeren (arbeidsongeschiktheid en pensioen)				X	
• Sociaal en beschut werk voor mensen met een arbeidsbeperking beschermen			X		
• Invoering tewerkstellingsvergunningen (vergunning voor buitenlanders om in NL te mogen werken)	X				
• Geen uitkeringen voor statushouders (tijdelijke verblijfsvergunning – 5 jaar)	X				

Economic Policies					
• Verlagen btw op boodschappen				X	
• Verlagen energierekening				X	
• Verlagen huren				X	
• Géén woningen voor statushouders	X				
• Méér sociale huurwoningen bouwen			X		
• Tienduizenden nieuwe ouderenwoningen			X		
• Méér middenhuur-woningen bouwen; de huurprijs reguleren			X		
• Méér koopwoningen bouwen			X		
• Minder regels in de bouw					X
• Hypotheekrenteaftrek onaangetast laten			X		
• Permanente bewoning van vakantiehuizen mogelijk maken					X

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Verbod op het dragen van hoofddoekjes in overheidsgebouwen inclusief de Staten-Generaal					X
• Geen overheidsinformatie in het Arabisch of Turks (talen nu gespecificeerd)	X				

Immigration Policies					
• Restrictief immigratiebeleid	X				
• Geen islamitische immigranten	X				
• Volledige asielstop en dus sluiting asielzoekerscentra	X				

The UK

UKIP 2005:

Healthcare Policies	Reform of welfare state				Residual
	Retrenchment	Adaptation	Update/Recalibration	Restructure	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the government from day to day management of NHS facilities. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return to the 'matron' system with a single manager responsible for all care and accommodation. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More freedom for consultants and family doctors to select treatments patients 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GP surgeries to re-open in the evenings and at weekends when working people can visit. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrap Strategic Health Authorities and return hospital control to local boards 				X	

Education Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give more autonomy state schools and teachers on curriculum 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools to organize their own intermediate testing: Standard Aptitude Tests must go 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow headteachers to exclude unruly pupils, without allowing governors, parents, or bureaucrats to compromise this authority. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide sufficient specialised facilities for excluded pupils 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce a new assisted-places scheme in which the state helps to fund private 		X			

education for children from poorer backgrounds					
• Review quality of all undergraduate university courses and withdraw funding from those that are of insufficient standard. Fully fund those courses that remain.			X		
• Review the standards for grading all courses and ensure that students who do not pass the university's annual examinations are not permitted to continue.			X		
• Cancel top-up fees, give maintenance grants as necessary, and scrap the student loan scheme.		X			

Social Policies					
• Raise state pensions by £25 per week, funded by the contribution to the EU budget (12 billion)			X		
• Reinstate tax credits on dividends paid to pension funds (people pay less tax when investing in pension fund)			X		
• Reduce benefits	X				
• Simplify benefit system				X	
• Remove means-testing for receiving benefits (disincentivizes work)				X	
• Restore full pension rights to expatriate pensioners whose pensions were frozen when they left the UK			X		
• Higher pension age.	X				

Economic Policies					
• Cut council taxes by a half for all householders, not just pensioners.			X		
• Scrap the 10% income tax bracket, removing another 2.5 million people from tax altogether.			X		
• Raise the threshold for inheritance tax to £500,000.			X		
• Drastic simplification of taxes.				X	
• Replace VAT with a sales tax payable at the wholesale point.				X	
• Since national insurance contributions are just income tax under a different name, we would combine these into income tax.				X	
• 'flat tax' (a uniform rate)			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Britishness’ tests (language and culture) for assimilation. 	X				

Immigration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a ‘points’ system for evaluating applications for work permits based on an identified need for specific skills and other tests of suitability. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All those entering Britain with the intention of staying to be subject to health checks for certain communicable diseases. 	X				

UKIP 2010:

Healthcare Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make no cuts in NHS frontline health services but substantially reduce NHS waste and bureaucracy. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Franchising key services (run on a fixed budget) to charitable associations, not-for-profit and profit-making private companies, partnerships and individuals. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introducing 'Health Credit Vouchers', which will enable people to opt out of the NHS public healthcare system entirely if they so wish. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-the-job nurse training and hospital-based colleges will replace most university courses. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return to the 'matron' system with a single manager responsible for all care and accommodation. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restore free eye tests and dental check-ups for all UK citizens 		X			

Education Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denationalize universities and further education (FE) colleges by replacing the present complex systems of grants and loans with 'Student Vouchers' and 'Training Vouchers' to be issued to every citizen at the age of 18. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain all existing grammar schools and encourage the creation of new grammar schools and specialist schools, which will be called 'professional schools'. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace current teacher training with more on-the-job training 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher qualifications for aspiring teachers. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return to a student grant system, as opposed to student loans 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace the current school funding policy - which favors specialist schools - with a policy where funds are shared equally regardless of the degree of specialization. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow teachers to do their jobs with minimal government interference. 				X	

Social Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the public sector by cutting many public sector jobs for one million new skilled jobs in manufacturing and related services. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop the tax and welfare system penalizing married and unmarried couples. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate approximately one million new skilled jobs through private and public investment. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lengthen and enhance Entry to Employment programs for those not in education, employment, or training, to overcome anti-work attitudes. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplify pensions and remove unnecessary and degrading means testing for our senior citizens. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freeze public sector pensions, replace with private pension provision. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll the mass of existing benefits into simpler categories, while ensuring every UK citizen receives a simple, non-means tested 'Basic Cash Benefit' (BCB). 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow part-time and temporary workers to continue claiming BCB until their wages reach UKIP's proposed £11,500 personal allowance so they can take jobs without being heavily penalized by the system. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merge Child Benefit, the Child Trust Fund, Child Tax Credits and the Education Maintenance Allowance into an enhanced Child Benefit, payable for each of the first three children in a family. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce flat-rate, non-means tested 'Nursery Voucher' to cover approximately half the cost of a full-time nursery place. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure British benefits are only available to UK citizens or those who have lived here for at least five years. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require those on benefits to take part in council-run local community projects called 'Workfare' schemes. 	X				

Economic Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take all minimum wage earners out of tax by raising the tax threshold to £11,500. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a flat tax. 			X		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase out Employers' National Insurance (the 'tax on jobs') over a five-year period. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut government spending on services. Eliminate waste and inefficiency. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut council tax 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abolish Inheritance Tax 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target pension contributions' tax relief at low and average earners, reducing the annual limit for tax-relievable pension contributions to £10,000 gross from the current £255,000 (compensating for higher earners' flat tax advantages). 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrap hidden development taxes and requirements for social housing in bigger developments. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentivize the use of approximately 800,000 empty homes. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage local councils to build more social housing by designating areas for such housing and allowing bond issues to fund construction. 		X			

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New citizens should pass a citizenship test and sign a 'Declaration of British Citizenship' promising to uphold Britain's democratic and tolerant way of life. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Banning the burqa or veiled niqab in public buildings and certain private buildings. 					X

Immigration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immediate five-year freeze on immigration for permanent settlement. Future immigration must not exceed 50,000 people p.a. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future immigration for permanent settlement will be on a strictly controlled, points-based system. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reintroduce The 'Primary Purpose Rule' (abolished by the Labour Government), whereby those marrying or seeking to marry a British citizen will have to convince the admitting officer that marriage, not residence, is their primary purpose in seeking to enter the UK. 					X

UKIP 2015:

Healthcare Policies					
• Invest an extra £12 billion into the NHS		X			
• Invest £1.5 billion into mental health and dementia services.		X			
• Pay carers an extra £572 a year.		X			
• Fund the cost of re-training for GPs who wish to return to practice.		X			
• Reduce the burden of data collection, target chasing, revalidation and appraisal work that interferes with the care GPs can give to patients.				X	
• Training of nurses and midwives , we will also fund return to practice training for those who have taken career breaks.		X			
• Improve working conditions for medical consultants, by increasing funds .		X			
• We will invest £200 million to make parking at English hospitals free for patients and their visitors.		X			
• Introduce a ' Licence to Manage ' for hospital managers.			X		
• Abolish Monitor and the Care Quality Commission and place their inspectorate functions into the hands of county health boards.				X	
• Introduce a legally-binding 'Dignity Code' to improve standards of professional care.			X		
• Provide direct access to specialist mental health treatment for all pregnant women and mothers of children under 12 months of age		X			

Education Policies					
• Waive tuition fees for students taking a degree in science; technology; engineering; maths or medicine.		X			
• Decrease the amount of paperwork teachers deal with.				X	
• Linking vocational schools and colleges with industry, we will introduce an option for students to take an apprenticeship qualification instead of four non-core GCSEs.				X	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund all secondary schools according to a single formula, taking into account Special Educational Needs. 				X	
---	--	--	--	---	--

Social Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build 500 affordable rent homes every year and eight halfway house hostels for homeless veterans. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove stamp duty on the first £250,000 for new homes built on brownfield sites. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits like the NHS not available to immigrants (they are required to have private insurance during their first 5 years). 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits like the NHS not available to students on student-visas (they are required to have private insurance) 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a Sovereign Wealth Fund from the tax profits of fracking, and ring-fencing the income it generates for a social care fund, will potentially release older people from the distress of having to sell their homes to pay for care and give them and their families peace of mind. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep free bus passes, winter fuel allowances, free TV licenses for the over 75s and free prescriptions and eye tests for the over-60s, without means testing. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pledge to protect services such as day care, home care and Meals on Wheels. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a flexible state pension window, which will widen over time, so even when the state pension age increases to 69, pensioners will still be able to take a slightly lower weekly state pension from the age of 65. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund a higher standard of independent advice available to all pensioners. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give all war widows and widowers a war pension, regardless of when they may have remarried. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting a lower cap on benefits 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five-year ban on benefits for migrants 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stopping child benefit being paid to children who don't live in the UK 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting child benefit to two children for new claimants 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to pay Housing Benefit to young people under the age of 25 		X			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End unfair ATOS-style Work Capability Assessments and return assessments to GPs or appropriate specialist consultants, who have full access to patients' medical records and are likely to know the patient. We believe this makes them the best person to undertake assessments and we will ensure they are adequately funded and resourced to take on this task. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UKIP will train and fund the cost of 800 advisers to work in 800 foodbanks. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers on zero-hours contracts must either be given a full or part-time secure contract after one year, if the workers involved request it. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fund a pro-active co-ordinating service for older and disabled people in every county to combat loneliness, combining resources from across the NHS, social services and the voluntary sector. 		X			

Economic Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut income taxes for middle earners by reshuffling thresholds for income tax (tax brackets) 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrap inheritance tax 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the transferable tax allowance for married couples and civil partners to £1,500. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove income tax for incomes of below 13,000, effectively ending income tax on minimum wage. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants of up to £10,000 per unit will be available to developers to carry out essential remediation work of derelict, potentially contaminated, land (brownfield sites) 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties built on registered brownfield sites will be exempt from stamp duty on first sale, up to the £250,000 threshold. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relax planning regulations for the conversion of off-high road commercial and office space and other existing buildings to affordable residential use. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace the current National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and introduce fresh national planning guidelines that will prioritise brownfield sites for new housing and genuinely protect the green belt. 				X	

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End the use of multilingual formatting on official documents. These will be published only in English and, where appropriate, Welsh and Gaelic. 	X				

Immigration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points based system for labour immigrants. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolish the EEA family permit scheme and reinstate the primary purpose rule, meaning foreign nationals marrying British citizens will have to prove that the primary purpose of their marriage is not to obtain British residency. 					X

UKIP 2017:

Healthcare Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide NHS England with an additional £9 billion a year by 2021/22. An additional £2 billion for social care. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lift cap on medical school training places from 7,500 to 10,000, and cover all tuition for those who commit to working within the NHS for at least ten out of the fifteen years after they qualify. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage retired GPs or GPs with small children to work part-time or in job-share schemes. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund additional support staff such as physician associates, clinical pharmacists and health visitors in GP surgeries, and allow practices to operate a wider range of clinics, including minor surgery, where feasible. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of nurse training placements, reinstate funding for bursaries to cover nursing, midwifery and allied health professions' tuition and accommodation costs, and cover the cost of re-training for nurses who have taken career breaks. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train more emergency medicine consultants and improve their working conditions. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrap hospital car parking charges in England. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase planned spending on mental health services by at least £500 million every year. This sum could fund 6,000 clinical psychologists to see 500,000 more adults and young people every year. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide direct access to specialist mental health treatment for all pregnant women and mothers of children under 12 months of age 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reverse the cuts to eldercare budgets 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disallow NHS, or third parties under contract to local authorities, to employ home care workers on zero hours contracts. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £400 million each year on dementia research 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give carers an extra five days' paid holiday each year, and increasing Carer's Allowance. 		X			

Education Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open a grammar school in every town . 		X			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a scheme similar to Germany's Dual Vocational Training system, in which students attend classes at a vocational school and receive on-the-job training at a company. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop paying tuition fees for courses which do not lead at least two thirds of students into a graduate level job, or a job corresponding to their degree, within five years after graduation. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolish tuition fees entirely as soon as economic conditions allow. Meanwhile restore maintenance grants for poorest students. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reverse the policy of closing special schools, and ensure all other schools are accessible to disabled learners and that individual support is in place for each child. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund all secondary schools according to a single formula. 				X	

Social Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow women to retire at 60 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly tighten up rules on zero hours contracts and severely limit their use. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce the minimum and living wage and reverse government cuts to the number of minimum wage inspectors in England and Wales 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the primary school day by offering wrap-around childcare from 8am to 6pm during term time 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a fund worth £80 million a year to help childminders and smaller childcare providers employing five people or fewer, to open their doors to more children with special needs. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep the winter fuel allowance, free bus passes, prescriptions, and eye tests for all over-60s, without means testing. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund a pro-active co-ordinating service for older and disabled people in every county to combat loneliness, combining resources from across the NHS, social services and the voluntary sector. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKIP will not cut disability benefits 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new migrants to Britain will be expected to make tax and national insurance contributions for at least five consecutive years before they 	X				

become eligible to claim UK benefits or NHS care.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to increase state pension payments according to inflation, minimum wage, or 2.5% (triple lock). 		X			

Economic Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove VAT from domestic energy bills. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will remove VAT from hot takeaway food such as fish and chips, and from women's sanitary products. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove income tax for incomes of below 13,500, effectively ending income tax on minimum wage. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut income taxes for middle earners by reshuffling thresholds for income tax (tax brackets) 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raise the inheritance tax threshold to £500,000 per individual, eventually scrap inheritance tax. 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy to roll out high quality, low cost factory-built modular (FBM) homes, affordable on the national average wage of £26,000. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boost capacity in UK-based modular homes manufacturing. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a Housing Development Corporation (HDC) to acquire primarily brownfield sites and build homes. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrap the bedroom tax 			X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build eight halfway house veterans' hostels, each with 200 rooms and modelled on similar hostels already in operation. We will also assign 500 affordable rent homes every year to ex-forces personnel. 		X			

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce test on the social attitudes of migration applicants to foster community cohesion and protect core British values 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ban wearing of the niqab and the burqa in public places 					X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End the use of multilingual formatting on official documents. These will be published only in English and, where appropriate, Welsh and Gaelic. 	X				

Immigration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a Migration Control Commission and set a target to reduce net migration to zero, over a five-year period. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place a moratorium on unskilled and low-skilled immigration for five years after we leave the EU. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abolish the European Economic Area (EEA) family permit scheme and reinstate the primary purpose rule 					X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points-based immigration system. 	X				

UKIP 2019:

Healthcare Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dramatically increase the number of training places for British doctors, nurses and paramedics. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the recruitment of hospital doctors and GPs by waiving repayment of tuition fees while they work in the NHS, and we will reintroduce student bursaries for nursing and midwifery students. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take on more nurse associates and assistant practitioners via the existing apprenticeship scheme to help fill existing vacancies. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abolish prescription charges in England. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrap hospital car parking charges wherever possible, these are a tax on patients and visitors. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase social care funding in England by £5 billion to remove the threat of people losing their homes if they need social care. 		X			

Education Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cutting down on bureaucratic assessments and appraisals by teachers. 				X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UKIP will increase the Dedicated Schools Grant by £4 billion per year to help employ an extra 30,000 teachers and cut teacher workloads to increase retention. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of new grammar schools. 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restore the Assisted Places Program (grants for poorer children to go to private schools). 		X			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waive the repayment of tuition fees for further and higher education in subjects vital to our national life: science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine subjects (STEMM) at university, dependent on graduates working in their fields in the UK during their student loan repayment period. 		X			

Social Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to increase state pension payments according to inflation, minimum wage, or 2.5% (triple lock) 		X			

• Seek to minimise the use of Zero Hour Contracts.				X	
• Scrap the 'bedroom tax'.			X		
• Child benefit will be limited to three children and paid only to children of UK citizens who are living in the UK.	X				
• UKIP would not pay benefits to foreign nationals resident in the UK until they have paid tax and National Insurance for five years.	X				
• Young people aged 16 – 24 not in education, employment or training (NEETs) should start jobs or training, or they lose their entitlement to benefits if they refuse.	X				
• Migrants will not be able to claim public housing or benefits until they have been a tax-paying resident in the UK for a continuous five years.	X				
• Workers on permits and students will be expected to possess private health insurance.	X				
• Abolish universal 'free' childcare, and target childcare subsidies towards disadvantaged families who need it.	X				
• Public spaces should be made accessible wherever possible to maximise access and usability for disabled people.		X			
• Public toilet provision increased with more disabled access and more changing facilities for both children and adults.		X			

Economic Policies					
• Build one million new houses on brownfield sites, through grants.		X			
• We will end densification and specify a maximum housing density.			X		
• Homes should have a minimum size.			X		
• All new homes should have a high minimum soundproofing standard.			X		
• Lower income tax, corporation tax and payroll taxes.			X		
• Freeze Insurance Premium Tax			X		
• Raise the personal Income Tax allowance from £12,500 to £15,000.			X		
• Abolish Inheritance Tax			X		
• Cut VAT rates to zero on certain goods, such as domestic fuel, sanitary products, and repairs to commercial, residential buildings and historic and listed buildings.			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
Citizenship will not be obtainable for migrants until they have worked in the UK for 10 continuous years and fully assimilated into the country, with fluent spoken and written English.	X				

Immigration Policies					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce net migration to below 10,000 per annum. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary immigration for workers on work permits and students will be both strictly controlled and time-limited. 	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chain migration and sham marriages must be stopped. UKIP will bring back the Primary Purpose Rule. 					X

Austria

FPÖ 2006:

(Unofficial translations from German into English provided by author of this thesis)

Healthcare Policies	Reform of welfare state				Residual
	Retrenchment	Adaptation	Update/Recalibration	Restructure	
• Invest in training nurses		X			
• 100% reimbursement of costs for artificial insemination.			X		
• Creation of a voluntary civil service system to alleviate pressures on care facilities		X			
• A tuition fee exemption for further social or medical education.		X			
• Universal right of healthcare for all Austrians.		X			
• Carer allowances should be adjusted annually .		X			
• Health insurance should also cover natural remedies and naturopathic treatments.			X		

Education Policies					
• Instate standardized tests for sufficient command of the German language before being allowed to partake in regular education.	X				
• In the field of research and development, expenditure on education should be increased .		X			
• Foreigners have no legal entitlement education in Austria.	X				

Social Policies					

• A separate social security system must be created for guest workers, which is specially designed for a temporary stay in Austria.	X				
• FPÖ demands uniform labor law regulations for all employees.				X	
• The public sector covers costs of apprenticeships working at companies.			X		
• People should only have to work for 45 years, the FPÖ rejects a further increase in the retirement age.		X			
• Restrict childcare allowance to Austrian citizens.	X				
• All family benefits should be increased yearly		X			
• Depending on the number of children, women should be entitled to a basic pension, which must be expanded to become a mother's pension.			X		
• During the first three years of residence, non-EU citizens are not entitled to social assistance or unemployment assistance.	X				
• Jobs are not assigned to asylum seekers.	X				
• Voluntary unemployment insurance should be made available for the self-employed.				X	
• Harmonization of public pension schemes				X	
• Private compulsory health insurance for foreigners, separated from general social security.	X				

Economic Policies					
• Expenditure on household-related should be tax-deductible at 60%.			X		
• Wage and income tax should be dependent on family size.			X		
• Divorced people who fulfill their obligations as parents are also entitled to tax relief.			X		
• Compensation for working overtime.		X			
• The tax burden on labor should be lowered by 4%.			X		
• Individual taxation should be replaced by family splitting (adjusting taxable income for the number of dependents)				X	
• Inheritance- and gift tax should be abolished up to limit of 500,000 Euros.			X		
• The levels of the average tax rates must be adjusted annually for inflation.		X			
• Means-adjusted taxes.		X			

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Instate preparation courses and support programs for (re)training mothers.			X		
• Translations of official documents and interpreters should be financed by foreigners.	X				
• Citizenship granted after 15 years of permanent and legal residence in Austria, as well as sufficient knowledge of the German language and regional studies are essential prerequisites for the granting of citizenship.	X				

Immigration Policies					
• Employment permits for foreigners are only temporary and only granted if there is an acute shortage of labor in the relevant profession that cannot be remedied in the medium term.	X				
• Repeatedly unemployed guest workers lose their residence permit as they endanger the welfare state.	X				
• A stop to immigration.	X				
• There is no legal entitlement to family reunification.	X				

FPÖ 2008:

(Unofficial translations from German into English provided by author of this thesis)

Healthcare Policies					
• The Austrian healthcare system needs structural reforms and not cutbacks (savings of up to 3 billion euros)				X	
• Invest in preventative healthcare.		X			
• Health insurance should also cover natural remedies and naturopathic treatments.			X		
• The state bears the costs of care for childless people when their own assets have been used up.			X		

Education Policies					
• Children of people without Austrian citizenship and without German mother tongue must pass a German language test one year before they are allowed to start school.	X				
• Promoting targeted retraining and further education measures.		X			
• Qualified unskilled workers should be given the opportunity to advance as skilled workers.					X
• Maintain free access to higher education.		X			

Social Policies					
• People should only have to work for 45 years, the FPÖ rejects a further increase in the retirement age.		X			
• No universal insurance	X				
• Social protection and employment benefits must be targeted at those in need.	X				
• An insurance system for temporary labor immigrants should be created, without compensation by the public sector, paid for by taxpayment of labour immigrants themselves.	X				
• Invest in targeted training courses for the unemployed.		X			
• Maintain current pension systems, but harmonize them.				X	
• Pensions must be adjusted for the price of necessary goods.		X			
• A pension bonus should be made available for those who have raised children			X		

• Better compensation for care-providing relatives			X		
• Adjust care allowance for inflation.		X			
• The public sector covers costs of apprenticeships working at companies.			X		
• Childcare allowance must be increased.		X			
• During the period following a birth the state must provide a childcare specialist to assist young mothers.			X		
• Emergency service volunteers should be able to retire earlier without deductions.		X			

Economic Policies					
• Reduction VAT on basic foods, prescription medicine, medical aids, prostheses, and wheelchairs.			X		
• Tax rates should be adjusted for inflation and yearly income.		X			
• Abolishing trivial taxes.			X		
• We need structural tax reforms				X	
• Reduce the tax burden on labor.			X		
• Non-taxation of overtime.			X		
• Expenditures for certain household-related should be tax-deductible, capped at a limit of 3,000 euros per person in the common household.			X		
• Individual taxation should be replaced by family splitting (adjusting taxable income for the number of dependents)				X	
• VAT refund for the purchase of equipment required for use by fire brigades and rescue organizations.			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Citizenship granted after 15 years of permanent and legal residence in Austria, as well as sufficient knowledge of the German language and regional studies are essential prerequisites for the granting of citizenship.	X				

Immigration Policies					
• To avoid economic refugees labor immigrants are granted temporary, time limited, residence permit.	X				

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Foreigners lose their employment permit and residence permit if they are unemployed for a long period of time or repeatedly.	X				
--	----------	--	--	--	--

FPÖ 2013:

(Unofficial translations from German into English provided by author of this thesis)

Education Policies					
• Without knowledge of German, no participation in normal lessons and limitation of foreigners per class.	X				
• High-quality childcare and training in kindergartens and schools			X		
• All-day options childcare at no additional cost for parents.			X		

Social Policies					
• Increase in family allowance and annual value adjustment of child benefits.		X			
• No exporting of family benefits.	X				
• Removing the difficulties in accessing care allowance			X		
• Annual inflation adjustment of care allowance.		X			
• Improvement of the commuter allowance for those who are dependent on the care.			X		
• Full social benefits for citizens only.		X			
• Minimum wage of 1,600 Euros per month.			X		
• Full social benefits only with citizenship and social housing only for Austrians.	X				
• After 45 years of working, people should be guaranteed full pension entitlement.		X			
• Fixation of the statutory retirement age at 65 for men and no increase in the retirement age for women.		X			
• Real value adjustment (of necessities rather than general inflation) of the pensions.		X			
• Child-rearing results in bonus in pension.			X		
• Increase in minimum pensions and no adjusting for income of partners.			X		
• Possibility of parental allowance.			X		

Economic Policies					
• Establishment of an upper limit for taxes and duties in the constitution.			X		
• Rent reduction.			X		
• Investing in construction of social housing.		X			
• Tax relief for Austrian families with multiple children thanks to a new family tax model			X		

• Restructuring of tax system, lowering taxes for the poorest.				X	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Commitment to our language and values as a prerequisite for acquiring citizenship.	X				

Immigration Policies					
• No further opening of the Austrian labor market for workers from the East.	X				
• Introduction of the temporary guest worker model, including the possibility of repatriation in the event of permanent unemployment or high unemployment figures.	X				
• Asylum is only temporary protection as long as there is danger or persecution.	X				
• Stop immigration from outside Europe.	X				

FPÖ 2017:

(Unofficial translations from German into English provided by author of this thesis)

Healthcare Policies					
• Sustain health and nursing care for seniors.		X			
• Better pay and upgrading of all professions in the medical and nursing sector.		X			
• Annual valorization of the care allowance and expansion of the inpatient care facilities.		X			

Education Policies					
• Expanding the number of childcare places.		X			
• Expansion of the daily gymnastics lessons, to increase health of children and young people.					X
• Guaranteed apprenticeship places and creation of additional in-company apprenticeship places through incentive systems (Blum-Bonus Neu → financial bonus for companies that successfully train apprentices).			X		
• Performance-based pay for interns.			X		
• Upgrade the training of teachers.		X			
• Sufficient knowledge of the language of instruction before entering school.	X				
• Maintaining special needs schools.		X			
• Free university admission for Austrians with the right admission requirements.	X				
• Tuition fees and "country of origin principle" for non-Austrians.	X				
• Increase in research funding and creation of a research funding law.		X			

Social Policies					
• Only physical benefits available to immigrants, no cash or insurance benefits.	X				
• Annual adjustment of family allowance, child tax credit and childcare allowance to the inflation rate.		X			
• Young mothers also need care after the birth.			X		
• Medical and social advice before planned abortions and support for pregnant women in difficult life situations.			X		
• A minimum old-age pension of 1,200 euros per month after a minimum of 40 years of insurance, allowing for child-rearing periods.			X		
• Harmonization of pension systems.				X	

• No increase in the statutory retirement age and implementation of a fair regulation of heavy workers.		X			
• Introduction of a minimum wage of 1,500 euros gross per month.			X		
• Access to social benefits for non-citizens only after at least five years of contribution payments.	X				
• No subsidized housing without knowledge of the German language.	X				

Economic Policies					
• Financial and tax support for voluntary fire brigade, rescue organizations, sports clubs and youth organizations.			X		
• Revitalization of social housing.		X			
• Tax reduction.			X		
• Simplification and clearing out of all tax laws				X	
• Tax relief for families , depending on number of children.			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• We do not accept compulsory headscarves.					X

Immigration Policies					
• Stop to immigration.	X				
• Asylum for those persecuted abroad for a limited period of time.	X				
• Closure of the Austrian labor market for EU foreigners and third-country nationals.	X				

FPÖ 2019:*(Unofficial translations from German into English provided by author of this thesis)*

Healthcare Policies					
• More money for home care.		X			

Social Policies					
• Invest in the standard of living of the elderly.			X		
• Reform of the housing subsidy system.				X	

Economic Policies					
• Tax exemption for Austrian workers.			X		
• Implement modern tenancy law.				X	
• Removal of excessive bureaucracy.				X	
• Further reductions in taxes and duties.			X		

Emancipation & Integration Policies					
• Headscarves or burqas have no place in public offices.					X

Immigration Policies					
• Those entitled to asylum must contribute to the costs of their asylum procedure.	X				
• Asylum is only temporary protection.	X				

Appendix B: Tables

The Netherlands

Table A.

Number of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year in the Netherlands

	2002	2003	2006	2010	2012	2017	2021
Retrenchment	3	11	8	19	14	2	9
Adaptation	9	8	9	9	17	2	15
Update/Recalibration	6	9	5	4	3	3	8
Restructure	8	19	3	6	7	0	7
Residual	0	2	2	5	3	2	1
Total	26	49	27	43	44	9	40

Table 1.

Percentages of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year in the Netherlands

	2002	2003	2006	2010	2012	2017	2021
Retrenchment	11.5%	22.5%	29.6%	44.2%	31.8%	22.2%	22.5%
Adaptation	34.6%	16.3%	33.3%	20.9%	38.6%	22.2%	37.5%
Update/Recalibration	23.1%	18.4%	18.5%	9.3%	6.8%	33.3%	20.0%
Restructure	30.8%	38.8%	11.1%	14.0%	15.9%	0%	17.5%
Residual	0%	4.1%	7.4%	11.6%	4.5%	22.2%	2.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table B.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2002 LPF

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	6	1	2	2
Education	0	1	0	4	0
Social	2	1	1	2	0
Economy	0	1	2	0	0
Emancipation & Integration	0	0	1	0	0
Immigration	1	0	1	0	0

Table C.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2003 LPF

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	2	4	0	3	0
Education	0	2	1	6	0
Social	2	2	3	8	0
Economy	0	0	5	2	2
Emancipation & Integration	3	0	0	0	0
Immigration	4	0	0	0	0

Table D.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2006 PVV

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	1	3	1	1	0
Education	0	3	1	2	0
Social	4	1	2	0	0
Economy	0	2	1	0	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	2
Immigration	2	0	0	0	0

Table E.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2010 PVV

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	2	4	1	2	0
Education	2	3	1	3	0
Social	9	1	0	0	3
Economy	0	1	2	1	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	2
Immigration	5	0	0	0	0

Table F.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2012 PVV

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	2	4	0	3	0
Education	0	3	0	2	1
Social	10	8	0	0	0
Economy	0	2	3	2	0
Emancipation & Integration	0	0	0	0	2
Immigration	2	0	0	0	0

Table G.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2017 PVV

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	1	1	0	0
Education	0	0	0	0	0
Social	0	1	0	0	0
Economy	0	0	2	0	0
Emancipation & Integration	0	0	0	0	2
Immigration	2	0	0	0	0

Table H.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2021 PVV

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	6	1	3	0
Education	0	1	1	1	0
Social	4	3	3	1	0
Economy	1	5	3	2	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	1
Immigration	3	0	0	0	0

Table I.

Number of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year by UKIP

	2005	2010	2015	2017	2019
Retrenchment	5	6	8	7	9
Adaptation	3	6	18	25	14
Update/Recalibration	10	9	11	10	9
Restructure	12	17	8	2	2
Residual	0	2	1	2	1
Total	30	40	46	46	35

Table 2.

Percentages of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year by UKIP

	2005	2010	2015	2017	2019
Retrenchment	16.7%	15.0%	17.4%	15.2%	25.7%
Adaptation	10.0%	15.0%	39.1%	54.3%	40.0%
Update/Recalibration	33.3%	22.5%	23.9%	21.7%	25.7%
Restructure	40.0%	42.5%	17.4%	4.3%	5.7%
Residual	0%	5.0%	2.2%	4.3%	2.9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table J.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2005 by UKIP

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	0	1	4	0
Education	0	3	2	3	0
Social	2	0	3	2	0
Economy	0	0	4	3	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	0
Immigration	2	0	0	0	0

Table K.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2010 by UKIP

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	1	0	5	0
Education	0	1	1	5	0
Social	2	2	2	6	0
Economy	1	2	6	1	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	1
Immigration	2	0	0	0	1

Table L.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2015 by UKIP

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	8	2	2	0
Education	0	1	0	3	0
Social	6	8	4	1	0
Economy	0	1	5	2	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	2	0
Immigration	1	0	0	0	1

Table M.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2017 by UKIP

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	11	2	0	0
Education	1	4	0	1	0
Social	1	6	2	1	0
Economy	0	4	6	0	0
Emancipation & Integration	2	0	0	0	1
Immigration	3	0	0	0	1

Table N.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2019 by UKIP

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	6	0	0	0
Education	0	4	0	1	0
Social	6	3	1	1	0
Economy	0	1	8	0	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	0
Immigration	2	0	0	0	1

Austria

Table O.

Number of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year by the FPÖ

	2006	2008	2013	2017	2019
Retrenchment	13	7	8	9	2
Adaptation	11	10	7	10	1
Update/Recalibration	10	12	11	9	3
Restructure	4	4	1	2	3
Residual	0	1	0	2	1
Total	38	34	27	32	10

Table 3.

Percentages of Proposed Welfare State Reform Policies Per Year by the FPÖ

	2006	2008	2013	2017	2019
Retrenchment	34.2%	20.6%	29.6%	28.1%	20%
Adaptation	28.9%	29.4%	25.9%	31.3%	10%
Update/Recalibration	26.3%	35.3%	40.7%	28.1%	30%
Restructure	10.5%	11.8%	3.7%	6.3%	30%
Residual	0%	2.9%	0%	6.3%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table P.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2006 by the FPÖ

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	5	2	0	0
Education	2	1	0	0	0
Social	5	2	2	3	0
Economy	0	3	5	1	0
Emancipation & Integration	2	0	1	0	0
Immigration	4	0	0	0	0

Table Q.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2008 by the FPÖ

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	1	2	1	0
Education	1	2	0	0	1
Social	3	6	4	1	0
Economy	0	1	6	2	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	0
Immigration	2	0	0	0	0

Table R.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2013 by the FPÖ

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	0	0	0	0
Education	1	0	2	0	0
Social	2	6	6	0	0
Economy	0	1	3	1	0
Emancipation & Integration	1	0	0	0	0
Immigration	4	0	0	0	0

Table S.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2017 by the FPÖ

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	3	0	0	0
Education	3	4	2	0	0
Social	3	2	4	0	0
Economy	0	1	3	1	0
Emancipation & Integration	0	0	0	0	0
Immigration	3	0	0	0	0

Table T.

Number of Welfare state Policies Per Policy Domain 2019 by the FPÖ

	Retrench- ment	Adap- tation	Update/ Recalibration	Restructure	Residual
Healthcare	0	1	0	0	0
Education	0	0	0	0	0
Social	0	0	1	1	0
Economy	0	0	2	2	0
Emancipation & Integration	0	0	0	0	1
Immigration	2	0	0	0	0

Appendix C: List of Indicators

- Retrenchment:
 - More restrictive
 - Eligibility criteria/voorwaarde
 - Alleen X heeft recht op Y, enkel, alleen, geen recht, verplichtingen; at least, only
 - Immigration stop
 - Stop to accomdating diversity
 - Terugschalen, versoberen
 - All policies that restrict access for certain group: tests of culture, language barriers
 - Targeting benefits to the poorest instead of all
- Adaptation:
 - Modify
 - Continue
 - Adaptations
 - More money
 - Meer subsidie
 - Introduction
 - Dekking
 - Aanbieden
 - Gratis
 - Provide
 - Invest in subsidies or programs; introduce.
 - Stimuleren herintreden, opleiden
 - Kleinere (extra geld)
 - Handhaving
 - Geen bezuinigingen; Cuts
 - Behouden
 - Adjust for inflation and means.
- Updates or recalibrations:
 - Family policies

- Introducing quality criteria
- Lower taxes
- Personal allowance (how much you are allowed to earn, before having to pay a tax) + pension.
- Extra kosten voor immigranten (new social risk)
- Simplify application
- Discriminatie tegengaan, diversiteit
- Public sector pays for apprenticeships
- Minimum wage → rising costs
- Women have extra support
- Restructuring:
 - Service delivery
 - Redefine
 - Amend the rights and duties.
 - Terminate a policy entirely.
 - Privatization: voluntary, private insurance
 - Marketization: Marktconform; toelaten markt; financieel zelfstandig
 - Fewer Rules
 - bureaucracy
 - Autonomy: not everything centralized (E.g. curriculum)
 - Means-testing, inkomensafhankelijk
 - Herzien, omzetten,
 - Particuliere verzekering
 - Opheffen belemmerende regels
 - In plaats van: restructuring