

**Political conflicts over European integration:
rejection or ambivalence?**

Kristel JACQUIER

2015.83



Political conflicts over European integration: rejection or ambivalence?

Kristel JACQUIER¹
October, 2015

Abstract:

We use survey data from ISSP 2013 to explore how conflicts over European integration interact with the dimensions of contestation that structure politics in five EU countries. Multinomial estimates allow the distinction between support, rejection and ambivalence vis-à-vis the EU. The empirical analysis shows that ambivalence and rejection of the European Union have the same determinants. We find that far-right political ideology is the only robust predictor of genuine anti-EU attitudes.

Keywords: European integration, political parties, survey analysis

JEL classification: D72, F02

¹ Paris School of Economics, University of Paris I (Panthéon Sorbonne), Paris, France.
email: kristel.jacquier@univ-paris1.fr

INTRODUCTION


In the context of the recent European debt crisis, anti-EU ideas are widespread. Euroscepticism has reached unprecedented levels and the European parliament elections in 2014 have seen the rise of eurosceptic parties. To our knowledge ISSP 2013_National identity III is the only survey that explicitly asks respondents whether they want their country to remain in the European Union. The survey question goes further the usual questions about the EU. People are not only asked to evaluate the EU, they are asked whether they would vote to remain a member state. Such a scenario is no longer fictional since David Cameron has pledged to hold an in-out referendum by 2017. We analyze the impact of the European integration process on 5 West European party systems: Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, and Great Britain.

The paper aims to contribute to the literature on how conflicts over European integration interact with the dimensions of contestation that structure politics within European societies. Multinomial estimates allow distinguishing between support, rejection and ambivalence vis-à-vis the EU. We argue that national politics play a major part in the polarization of public opinion. The empirical evidence in this paper shows that utilitarian variables hardly explain why citizens would rather be opposed to the European Union than ambivalent towards it. Votes however have a significant impact in France, Denmark and Finland.


THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Four models describe the association between a party left/right location and its support for EU policies. The "international relations model" argues that the political conflict over the EU is structured around a single dimension: more or less integration (i.e. national sovereignty vs supranational governance). The "regulation model" (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2000) show that party positioning on left/right and European integration coincide: leftwing parties defend more regulation while rightwing parties pushes for deregulation. In the Hix-Lord model, left/right conflicts emerge among "functional groups", whereas European integration (more vs less integration) concerns territorial groups. Hence, the position that a person takes on one dimension does not constrain her position on the other dimension. The two dimensions coexist and they are orthogonal. Finally, the Hooghe-Marks model predicts that the two dimensions partially overlap which creates an opposition between "regulated capitalism" and "neoliberalism" (see figure above).


MODELS OF POLITICAL CONFLICTS OVER EUROPEAN INTEGRATION




1A. International Relations Model



1B. Hix Model: Two Orthogonal Dimensions



1C. Regulation Model



1D. Hooghe-Marks Model

Source: Marks and Streenbergen, 2002

Hooghe, Marks, and Wilson (2002) examine seven issue areas and conclude that a party's position on the "new politics" dimension (Green/alternative/libertarian (GAL) tradition/authoritarian/nationalist (TAN)) has a stronger ability to predict its support for integration than its position on the left/right scale². Items that locate on the new politics dimension include protecting consumers, controlling immigration, increasing EU transparency, protecting human rights, and protecting national cultures. The Center-Left supports European integration in social and unemployment policies, environmental regulation, and upgrading the European parliament. Those on the right of this dimension oppose European integration because it threatens the national community. The new right is located on the TAN side of the new politics divide, which leads to a fierce opposition to the EU. The European orientations of market liberals are more nuanced. They support EU policies that can facilitate market integration but oppose European "reregulation". In summary, opposition to the integration process crystallizes around the loss of national autonomy. On the left there might be concerns that recommendation emanating from Brussels pushes towards deregulation while on the right the regulations might constrain national economies too much. Far-right parties are concerned with the loss of control over immigration, which might cause the national identity to dilute.

LITERATURE

The above mentioned models are useful tools to analyze the structure of party opposition to the European Union. However, the real issue in the literature is to match political demand with political offer in the context of European politics. The role of ideology in public support for the EU has been documented; the most uncontested result is that extreme political ideologies are associated with more eurosceptical opinions (De Vries and Edwards, 2009). Some scholars have argued that citizens' votes at EU elections do not express their preferences about representation at the European level (Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996). On the other hand, national elections fail to reveal the preferences of citizens on EU policy (Mair, 2001). Van der Eijk and Franklin (2004) introduced the notion of 'sleeping giant' explaining that by the end of the 1990s, the positions of parties and their voters concerning European integration began to diverge. The authors show that a large proportion of voters display meaningful variation in EU preferences. However, their views are not expressed in elections because EU issues are subsumed into the left/right dimension by political parties. Political entrepreneurs had not yet exploited conflict potential among voters on the issue of European integration. The French European Constitution referendum in 2005 for example has revealed that mainstream political parties are indeed divided regarding the EU. Far left and far right political entrepreneurs, have a strategic incentive to

² radical right, right-populist and conservative right parties drive the overall relationship

mobilize the EU issue in order to reap electoral gains (Van der Eijk and Franklin, 2004; Hix, 1999, Taggart, 1998). The opposite is true for mainstream parties: They have been part of governing coalitions and were therefore largely responsible for the course of integration. Thus they are generally supportive of the integration process.

Carrubba, (2001) demonstrates that public opinion helps shape elite preferences concerning the EU. The author tests for an electoral connection in EU politics. The author confronts the three theory of representations. The permissive consensus theory proposed by Lindberg and Scheingold in 1970 states that citizens in the EU have been generally positively predisposed toward integration. As long as European issues didn't impact individual citizens, the political elites were free to pursue unification. In 1991, Stimson introduced the policy mood theory which lays emphasis on information costs. A rational individual will only make that investment when policy choices are far enough away from its ideal point. Policy-makers are prompted to stay within this zone of public acceptance which creates an electoral connection. Cue-taking theories offer a competing explanation for why one might observe an electoral connection in EU politics. If citizens are uninformed they might have weakly held preferences which make it easy for political elites to influence their votes. The correlation between public preferences and elite positions is reversed compared to the policy mood theory. Two research questions are raised: Why European integration has proceeded? And why one might observe an electoral connection? Manifesto data between the years 1977 and 1992 are used to measure elite positions. Ordinary least squares and two-stage least squares models are implemented. The results in Carrubba (2001) suggest the existence of an electoral connection. In both model specifications, the positions of the electorates and their representatives go together. In order to establish a causal relationship, two approaches are used: selecting only individuals with no party affiliation and instrumental variables. Both tests give credit to the policy mood theory. Thus, the empirical study in Carrubba (2001) shows that before 1992, elite and voters' preferences go hand and hand. Steenbergen et al. (2007) use the same methodology using data from 1984–2002 and find that party elites both respond to and shape the views of their constituency.

Paul Taggart (1998) defines euroscepticism as « contingent and conditional opposition to European integration as well as total and unconditional opposition to it ». Taggart and Szczesniak (2002) distinguish between « hard euroscepticism » and « soft euroscepticism ». Hard eurosceptical agents want to withdraw from the European Union. Soft eurosceptical agents are dissatisfied with the course of European integration but remain supportive of the unification of the peoples of Europe. Stoeckel (2013) explores ambivalence towards the EU defined as the presence of both positive and negative thoughts. Using multinomial regression analysis, they compare ambivalent views to positive, and negative ones, as well as indifference. The author builds a theoretical framework based on affective and cognitive cues.

Stoeckel uses EU knowledge, news media consumption, and elite division to proxy cognitive cues, and trust in European institutions to proxy affective cue. In the multinomial model presented in Stoeckel (2013) the effect of elite division shows that in countries in which political parties are more divided over the EU, the probability for respondents to express indifference and positive views of European integration significantly decreases while greater party differentiation on European integration leads to higher levels of ambivalence. Affective cue makes univalent views about the EU more likely because it overrides competing cognitive cues. Overall the results provide insights on politicization of EU politics. Party politicization appears to increase the involvement of citizens but it might also spread ambivalence. Duchesne et al (2013) use focus group methods to analyze the nature of the relations linking European citizens to the EU. They challenge previous findings in the literature by showing that dominant feelings among citizens in the EU are indifference and ambivalence (as opposed to euroscepticism). They conclude that a European identity has not emerged yet, on the contrary national and social differences are wide. Additionally, national, European and global politics seem intermingled.

Individual-level attitudes towards the EU are well documented (Gabel 2009; McLaren 2002; Hooghe & Marks 2005). Much of the research concludes that socio-economic background explains attitudes towards European integration. Privileged social classes are more likely to benefit from integration and consequently they strongly support the EU. Variables such as occupation, income level and education are robust predictors of public support for the EU.

HYPOTHESIS

In their seminal work 'Cleavage Systems. Party Systems, and Voter Alignments', Lipset and Rokkan (1967) describe how European party systems are shaped by a series of conflicts that took place from the Protestant Reformation to the Industrial Revolution. These conflicts created highly durable identities. Marks and Wilson (2000) propose a cleavage theory of party response to European integration arguing that although political parties now operate in a more competitive electoral environment, the stance they adopt still cannot be predicted as an efficient response to electoral incentives. As a consequence, political responses to the EU depend on pre-existing ideologies, as well as constituency ties. Following Marks and Wilson (2000) we formulate hypothesis on how political parties position on European integration. The classic left opposes economic integration because it threatens social achievements. A modernized left has emerged in most European countries inspired by the "third way" of the British Labour Party. This modern left adopts a positive attitude towards globalization (Giddens, 1998). Christian democratic parties have been closely associated with the

founding of the EU and thus remain strong supporters of the European process. Liberal radical parties are also traditional supporters of the EU. Conservative and liberal conservative parties traditionally defend national traditions and national sovereignty. Thus they will be more or less supportive on the EU depending on the cultural threat perceived from the EU. Finally, the new populist right opposes European integration, because it fits into its more general opposition to globalization. They propose simple solutions that attract voters; economic issues are mostly left aside.

Socioeconomic determinants include occupation, income and trade union membership. Gabel and Palmer (1995) make the hypothesis that high income citizens are best able to grasp the opportunities associated with market liberalization (investment opportunities and low inflation) and find empirical evidence supporting this assumption. Anderson and Reichert (1995) draw similar conclusion. Thus citizens belonging to high income families are expected to be more supportive of the EU than lower incomes. Gabel (2009) assumes that labor market liberalization benefits high-skilled workers because they are in a better position to compete on an international labor market. High-skilled positions such as managers and professionals are expected to be the most supportive occupational categories and low-skilled occupations (plant and machine operators, and elementary workers) to be more eurosceptical. Until the end of the 1980s, trade unions have been supportive of European integration (Leconte, 2010). Along with mainstream political parties, most European trade unions had adopted a pro-European position. However the prospect of a "social Europe" has been challenged by the completion of the internal market, the enlargements and EU legislation such as the Posted Worker Directive (1996)³. Koopmans (2007) explains that although trade unions are supportive of the process of integration; they are very critical towards the direction that the EU has been taking. The economic crisis has intensified this trend. See Leconte (2010) for details on trade Unions' position on European integration. As a result, trade union membership is expected to be correlated with soft eurosceptical views on Europe.

EUROSCEPTISM AND POLITICAL PARTIES

France is among the six original members. The general evaluation of European integration is good in France (61.47% membership supporters in the sample). However, the process of European integration was not smooth and remains a salient issue in the political sphere. The European Constitution was

³ The directive states that firms seconding workers in another member state have to abide by the host country's conditions in terms of the minimum legal wage and working time limits. It led to several controversial decisions from the European Court of Justice (ECJ). Trade Unions accused the ECJ of prioritizing market integration over workers' rights.

rejected by 55% of voters in the referendum held in 2005 and was interpreted as more than just a movement of humor (Cautrès, 2005). Left-wing eurosceptic parties are critical towards the political agenda of the EU, but they support the unification of European countries. Indeed, the major left-wing party (the Left Front or 'Front de Gauche') considers a withdrawal as a last resort and defends a complete recasting of the EMU. The National Front (Front National) (which falls into the new populist right category) is the major anti-EU party in France. The FN is gaining momentum and became the first French party at the 2014 European elections with 25% of the votes (see the appendix).

Irish people traditionally display high support for European integration; this is supported by the ISSP data with 77% of positive attitudes towards the EU in the sample (see appendix). The party most critical of the EU in Ireland is Sinn Féin. Sinn Féin urged a "No" vote in the referendum held in Ireland in 2008 on the Lisbon Treaty. However, in the context of the referendum in the UK (Sinn Féin is also active in Northern Ireland) the party announced that the party will campaign to stay within the EU because a withdrawal would have disastrous economic consequences, especially in Northern Ireland. It aligns itself with the European United Left–Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) parliamentary group (see details of European Parliamentary elections in the appendix). The United Left Alliance (ULA) was also skeptical towards the EU. ULA was an electoral alliance in the 2011 general election. They consisted of the Socialist Party, the People Before Profit Alliance (PBPA), and the Workers and Unemployed Action Group (WUAG). They campaigned for a "no" vote in the 2012 European Fiscal Compact referendum.

The UK has nowadays reasons to mobilize against EU membership. Their cultural heritage is based on isolation and the economic benefits from a closer union are expected to be limited. Kriesi (2007) concludes that Euroscepticism "has been able to stimulate a restructuring of the party system – with the conservative right becoming the decisive restructuring force". Thus mainstream parties are openly eurosceptical. David Cameron- Leader of the Conservative Party and newly reelected- has pledged to hold an in-out referendum by 2017.

In Denmark issue salience and partisan conflict regarding European integration are high (De Vries, 2007). During the negotiations of the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 the Denmark notified the Council of the European Communities of their decision to opt out of the euro. All member states, other than Denmark and the United Kingdom, have either adopted the euro or are legally bound to adopt it eventually. In September 2000 the adoption of the euro was rejected by 53.2% of the Danish electorate (with an electoral turnout of 87.6%). The Danish People's Party (Dansk Folkeparti) is the main eurosceptical party in Denmark (along with People's Movement against the EU). The electoral success of Dansk Folkeparti in the 2014 EP elections might encourage less eurosceptical parties to become more critical to certain EU policies in the future. A central theme in the campaign for EP elections in

Denmark was the claim of benefit tourism as a threat to the Danish welfare state, a view mainly defended by the Danish People's Party and partially taken up by Venstre, the Conservatives and the Social Democrats. Eurosceptic parties received about one third of the votes (34.7%). The good result for the Danish People's Party is explained both by national issues (Kristian Thulesen Dahl DF party leader since 2012 has become more nuanced and places more emphasis on welfare issues, while Lars Røkke Rasmussen's Venstre leader was in the heart of a scandal) and EU specific protest (such as benefit tourism).

The Finns are among the least Europhile citizens in the EU, as reflected in the ISSP data (only 45% approval rate for Finland to remain an EU member state). The European sovereign debt crisis was a crucial issue in the Finnish parliamentary election, 2011. Portugal applied for an EU bailout the very month elections were held. The governing coalition supported Finland's participation in the bailout and all four opposition parties (Social Democrats, Left Alliance, Christian Democrats and the True Finns) opposed it. Such context helped Soini become the main opposition figure. In the next elections, in 2015, a right-wing coalition is formed, including The Finns Party. Timo Soini becomes Deputy Prime Minister of Finland and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

THE DATA

ISSP 2013_National identity III includes the following question:

If there were a referendum today to decide whether [COUNTRY] does or does not remain a member of the European Union, would you vote in favor or would you vote against?

Respondents have three possible answers: vote in favor, vote against or can't choose. Descriptive statistics in the appendix displays the distribution of responses from our dependent variable. There is a strong bias towards status quo, 58% of respondents choose to remain EU members. However, there is a significant amount of citizens who claim to vote in favor of an exit from the EU (25%) or are undecided (15%). People who refused to answer might be considered as indifferent citizens, their percentage is negligible (1%).

The analysis involves 5 countries: Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, and Great Britain.

Respondents are asked about the party they voted for in the last general elections in their respective countries:

- Finland: April 2011 (parliamentary elections)

- Ireland: February 2011
- Denmark: September 2011
- France: April 2012 (first round of the 2012's French Presidential Election)

Except for Great Britain where the question is: "If there were a general election tomorrow, which political party do you think you would be most likely to support?"

The votes are considered as exogenous because they do not come from EU elections or deal with EU related issues and the vote took place in the past and cannot influence the answers in the survey. The political parties included in the analysis are detailed in the appendix.

At the 2011 elections the incumbent coalition in Denmark led by Venstre (centre-right) lost power. With 44 seats in parliament, the Social Democrats established a centre-left coalition with the People's Socialist Party, and the Social-Liberal party. The Finnish parliamentary election, 2011 saw the breakthrough of the True Finns. The incumbent coalition (Centre Party, National Coalition Party (NPC), Green League and the Swedish People's Party) lost its majority and a coalition including 6 parties rules from 2011 to 2014⁴: the NCP, the Social Democratic Party (SDP), the Left Alliance, the Green League, the Swedish People's Party (SPP) and the Christian Democrats. In France, François Hollande, the Socialist Party candidate won the presidential elections in 2012 (over the incumbent UMP president Nicolas Sarkozy). In 2011 the incumbent governing party in Ireland (Fianna Fáil) and his leader Brian Cowen (Taoiseach of Ireland since 2008) have undergone a historic defeat. Fine Gael won 76 seats and became the largest party in the Dáil. Enda Kenny became Taoiseach, in a coalition with the second largest party (the Labor Party).

In the pooled regression, parties are then recoded on a left-right scale composed of 5 categories: Far left (communist etc.) 3.98 %, Left, center left 18.83 % Center, liberal 13.06% Right, conservative 20.75% Far right (fascist etc.) 2.39%. The remaining 40% do not vote in the last election.

The variable "trade union membership" always takes the value 0 for Great-Britain⁵. Thus when included in the pooled regression, British respondents might bias the coefficient for trade union membership. In the robustness checks section, table 13, Great-Britain is removed from the sample and the coefficient is unchanged.

⁴ In 2014 the Left Alliance and the Green League successively departed the government

⁵ In the original variable "UNION", 0 corresponds to the category "refused to answer"

ESTIMATION STRATEGY

The dependent variable encompasses three choices: "vote in favour", "vote against" and "can't choose". Following Stoeckel (2013) a multinomial logit is estimated (Greene, 2012, 763-766). Multinomial models compute the influence of an independent variable on the likelihood to fall into a respective category (for example can't choose) compared to the reference category (for example vote against). Therefore, absolute probability cannot be inferred from Multinomial estimates.

The determinants of support for the European integration are tested when the categories "in favor" and "against" are confronted. Such estimates give an opportunity to test the relevance of the usual predictors of public support for the European Union with a different survey question. The study focuses more specifically on the categories "against" and "can't choose". Our paper seeks to identify if ideology helps explaining the difference between those two categories. To account for ideology we use a left-right scale self-identification and the party voted for in the last election.

The baseline model corresponds to a pooled regression including the 5 countries that can be defined as:

$$VoteEUreferendum = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D + \beta_2 E + \beta_3 P + \beta_4 C + \varepsilon_2$$

D is a vector of individual socio-demographic characteristics (age and gender). E measures the socioeconomic position of individuals (ISCO classification, employment status, income and trade union membership). C is a country dummy which accounts for any omitted country-specific influence. P stands for partisanship (either a left-right scale self-identification or the party voted for in the last election). The results are presented in table 1 to table 3. To deepen the analysis, the baseline model is estimated at the country-level:

$$VoteEUreferendum = \delta_0 + \delta_1 D + \delta_2 E + \delta_3 P + \varepsilon_1$$

In the survey, respondents are asked which party they voted for in the last election. We use the political party which won the election as reference category: The Social Democratic Party in Denmark, the Socialist Party in France, the National Coalition Party in Finland and Fine Gael in Ireland. David Cameron, leader of the Conservative Party has been prime Minister of the United-Kingdom since 2010. Consequently, the Conservative Party serves as reference in the country regression.

Categorical dependent variable models adopt the maximum likelihood estimation⁶ method that requires an assumption about probability distribution. Logistic models treat as explanatory variable the likelihood of an event conditionally on the exogenous variables.

With k categorical outcomes and 1 is set as base outcome, the probability that the response for the j th observation is equal to the i th outcome is

$$p_{ij} = \Pr(y_j = i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{m=2}^k \exp(\mathbf{x}_j \beta_m)}, & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_j \beta_i)}{1 + \sum_{m=2}^k \exp(\mathbf{x}_j \beta_m)}, & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases}$$

Where x_j is the vector for observed values of the independent variables for the j th observation and β_m is the vector for outcome m .

The log pseudo likelihood is:

$$\ln L = \sum_j \sum_{i=1}^k I_i(y_j) \ln p_{ik}$$

with $I_i(y_j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } y_j = i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

In a logistic regression, it is assumed that the logit transformation of the outcome variable has a linear relationship with the predictor variables. The interpretation of the regression coefficients is thus difficult. In order to facilitate interpretation, we present Relative Risk Ratios (RRR). They are obtained by exponentiating the multinomial logit coefficients. In models where only two categories are considered, the multinomial logit model reduces to standard logit. Consequently, RRR are commonly interpreted as odds ratios: For a unit change in the predictor variable, the RRR of outcome m relative to the referent group is expected to change by a factor of the respective parameter estimate given the variables in the model are held constant.

⁶ Newton-Raphson maximum likelihood is used

RESULTS

In table 1, votes in favor of the membership of one's country in the European Union are used as reference category and compared to the votes against membership and indecision ("can't choose"). The main characteristics of people willing to exit the EU are trade union membership, low-skilled occupations, low income, and extreme political ideologies. Holding other variables at fixed value, the odds of voting against membership raises by 37.3% for trade union members compared to non members. Those findings confirm the previous results of the literature about support for the EU. Turning to ambivalent voters, the picture is not too different. The determinants of undecided and negative views are roughly the same, except coefficient are inferior and less significant which suggests that ambivalent preferences are least firmly held. The strongest determinants of indecision are female gender, and electoral abstention. Additionally, highly skilled occupations such as managers and professionals result in less undecided respondents.

In table 2 we compare the vote against and in favor of EU membership using "can't choose" as reference category. As expected, a very limited number of variables allow discriminating between undecided respondents and those would reject the European Union. Being a woman is one of them. Women are much less likely to display negative attitudes than ambivalent ones. The opposite is true for far right voters; they are highly more inclined to vote against the European Union than to be undecided on the issue. Far left voters also stand out but the effect is smaller and the significance weaker.

Table 3 summarizes the previous findings. The true cleavage is between anti and pro-EU citizens. The traditional supporters of European integration are students, professionals and high income families. On the other side, low skilled occupations and extreme political ideologies drive euroscepticism. It turns out difficult to draw distinctions between undecided citizens and opponents of European integration. They appear as less informed citizens with a high potential for political entrepreneurs to influence their votes.

Table 1: multinomial estimates. Pooled regression. Base outcome: in favor

Base outcome: vote in favour		Against		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error	
female	1.060	(0.75)	1.894***	(6.64)	
age	1.048**	(3.26)	1.015	(0.89)	
age2	1.000**	(-2.62)	1.000	(-0.79)	
<i>reference category: paid work</i>					
Unemployed	0.895	(-0.63)	1.025	(0.12)	
in education	0.491***	(-3.33)	0.625*	(-2.11)	
retired	0.831	(-1.42)	0.905	(-0.62)	
inactive	1.046	(0.27)	0.967	(-0.18)	
other	0.806	(-0.95)	1.027	(0.10)	
Member of a trade union	1.373**	(3.14)	1.052	(0.43)	
<i>reference category: clerks</i>					
armed forces	1.544*	(2.14)	1.231	(0.90)	
Managers	0.829	(-1.13)	0.598**	(-2.59)	
Professionals	0.625**	(-3.25)	0.504***	(-4.23)	
Associate professionals	0.985	(-0.11)	0.804	(-1.43)	
Serv and sales	1.676***	(3.57)	1.348	(1.92)	
Agri, forestry and fishery	1.824*	(2.49)	1.088	(0.27)	
Trade workers	1.916***	(3.88)	1.594*	(2.37)	
Plant and machin operators	2.085***	(4.09)	1.515	(1.94)	
Elementary occupations	2.702***	(5.46)	1.609*	(2.27)	
<i>reference category: Q3</i>					
Family income Q1	0.975	(-0.21)	0.953	(-0.34)	
Family income Q2	1.193	(1.64)	1.142	(1.05)	
Family income Q4	0.809	(-1.94)	0.893	(-0.88)	
Family income Q5	0.702**	(-3.09)	0.692**	(-2.59)	
<i>reference category: Denmark</i>					
Finland	2.483***	(8.31)	2.096***	(5.60)	
France	1.054	(0.45)	0.997	(-0.02)	
Ireland	0.509***	(-4.61)	0.559***	(-3.48)	
Great Britain	4.559***	(10.14)	3.361***	(6.87)	
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>					
Did not vote	1.570***	(3.73)	1.826***	(4.38)	
Far left	2.684***	(5.67)	1.669*	(2.32)	
Left, center left	1.032	(0.25)	0.928	(-0.50)	
Right, conservative	1.231	(1.65)	1.055	(0.36)	
Far right	8.221***	(10.79)	2.757***	(3.80)	
Log likelihood	-4604.0	N	5469		
pseudo R-sq	0.106	Chi2	1097.2		

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 2: multinomial estimates. Pooled regression. Base outcome: can't choose

Base outcome: can't choose	In favour		Against	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.528***	(-6.64)	0.560***	(-5.54)
age	0.986	(-0.89)	1.033	(1.80)
age2	1.000	(0.79)	1.000	(-1.35)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	0.976	(-0.12)	0.873	(-0.63)
in education	1.600*	(2.11)	0.786	(-0.90)
retired	1.105	(0.62)	0.918	(-0.50)
inactive	1.034	(0.18)	1.082	(0.39)
other	0.974	(-0.10)	0.785	(-0.84)
Member of a trade union	0.950	(-0.43)	1.305*	(1.97)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.812	(-0.90)	1.254	(0.87)
Managers	1.674**	(2.59)	1.387	(1.45)
Professionals	1.985***	(4.23)	1.241	(1.15)
Associate professionals	1.243	(1.43)	1.224	(1.17)
Serv and sales	0.742	(-1.92)	1.243	(1.27)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.920	(-0.27)	1.677	(1.59)
Trade workers	0.628*	(-2.37)	1.202	(0.87)
Plant and machin operators	0.660	(-1.94)	1.376	(1.42)
Elementary occupations	0.622*	(-2.27)	1.679*	(2.43)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.050	(0.34)	1.023	(0.15)
Family income Q2	0.876	(-1.05)	1.044	(0.32)
Family income Q4	1.120	(0.88)	0.907	(-0.70)
Family income Q5	1.445**	(2.59)	1.014	(0.09)
<i>reference category: Denmark</i>				
Finland	0.477***	(-5.60)	1.185	(1.17)
France	1.003	(0.02)	1.058	(0.34)
Ireland	1.788***	(3.48)	0.909	(-0.48)
Great Britain	0.298***	(-6.87)	1.357	(1.58)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.548***	(-4.38)	0.860	(-0.97)
Far left	0.599*	(-2.32)	1.608*	(1.98)
Left, center left	1.078	(0.50)	1.112	(0.63)
Right, conservative	0.948	(-0.36)	1.167	(0.92)
Far right	0.363***	(-3.80)	2.982***	(4.19)
Log likelihood	-4604.0	N	5469	
pseudo R-sq	0.106	Chi2	1097.2	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 3: multinomial estimates. Pooled regression. Base outcome: against

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.944	(-0.75)	1.787***	(5.54)
age	0.955**	(-3.26)	0.968	(-1.80)
age2	1.000**	(2.62)	1.000	(1.35)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.117	(0.63)	1.145	(0.63)
in education	2.035***	(3.33)	1.272	(0.90)
retired	1.203	(1.42)	1.089	(0.50)
inactive	0.956	(-0.27)	0.924	(-0.39)
other	1.241	(0.95)	1.275	(0.84)
Member of a trade union	0.728**	(-3.14)	0.766*	(-1.97)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.648*	(-2.14)	0.797	(-0.87)
Managers	1.207	(1.13)	0.721	(-1.45)
Professionals	1.599**	(3.25)	0.806	(-1.15)
Associate professionals	1.015	(0.11)	0.817	(-1.17)
Serv and sales	0.597***	(-3.57)	0.804	(-1.27)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.548*	(-2.49)	0.596	(-1.59)
Trade workers	0.522***	(-3.88)	0.832	(-0.87)
Plant and machin operators	0.480***	(-4.09)	0.727	(-1.42)
Elementary occupations	0.370***	(-5.46)	0.595*	(-2.43)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.026	(0.21)	0.977	(-0.15)
Family income Q2	0.838	(-1.64)	0.958	(-0.32)
Family income Q4	1.236	(1.94)	1.103	(0.70)
Family income Q5	1.425**	(3.09)	0.986	(-0.09)
<i>reference category: Denmark</i>				
Finland	0.403***	(-8.31)	0.844	(-1.17)
France	0.949	(-0.45)	0.946	(-0.34)
Ireland	1.966***	(4.61)	1.100	(0.48)
Great Britain	0.219***	(-10.14)	0.737	(-1.58)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.637***	(-3.73)	1.163	(0.97)
Far left	0.373***	(-5.67)	0.622*	(-1.98)
Left, center left	0.969	(-0.25)	0.899	(-0.63)
Right, conservative	0.813	(-1.65)	0.857	(-0.92)
Far right	0.122***	(-10.79)	0.335***	(-4.19)
Log likelihood	-4604.0	N	5469	
pseudo R-sq	0.106	Chi2	1097.2	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

In table 4 to 8 country estimates are presented. Against is the base outcome⁷. Contrary to the pooled regression where political orientations corresponded to a left-right scale self identification, we now rely on data about the political parties respondents voted for in the last general elections (the political parties are presented in the appendix). The number of observations is reduced compared to the previous table, thus the significance is much lower. Additionally, certain categories (such as LO voters in France) contain a very limited number of respondents, which leads to aberrant values.⁸

First we want to confirm the results presented in the pooled regression. Although the significance is weak, high-skilled workers are more inclined to support the EU while low-skilled workers oppose it. Trade union membership declines support in France and Finland. Vote in the last election is a good predictor of preference in European politics at the country-level. As expected, in each country, votes towards far right parties reduce support for remaining in the European Union: The National Front in France, the Danish Peoples party in Denmark, the True Finns in Finland, and Christian Solidarity in Ireland. Far right ideology in Great Britain is represented by the British National Party; unfortunately, this category is not included in our dataset. Finally, in all the countries women are more undecided than eurosceptic.

Let's give a closer look at preferences of voters towards the EU according to the party they voted for. In France, Ireland and Finland, government party sympathizers are the most supportive of the EU. In France, Green party voters are more supportive of the European Union compared to the Socialist Party that won the elections in 2012⁹. It should nevertheless be noted that the Green party allied with the Socialist Party in the second round of the election and Green Ministers were appointed in the first ruling government. In Ireland, the only party affiliation that is more supportive of the European Union is also the Green Party¹⁰. In Denmark the situation is more complex since the Social Democratic Party made an alliance with two other parties to obtain the majority number of sites: The Radical Liberal Party and the Socialist Peoples Party. The Radical Liberal Party is slightly more supportive of European integration while the Socialist Peoples Party is clearly less so (although the coefficient is not significant). Voters of Venstre, the governing party before the elections, are more inclined to support the remaining of Denmark in the EU than the new ruling political party. In Great Britain, supporters of the British conservative party are the most eurosceptical voters in the country. These results are consistent with the hypothesis presented in the theoretical framework.

⁷ Tables using "in favour" and "can't choose" as base outcomes are available upon request. However, they do not provide any additional piece of information

⁸ see also the employment status "other" and the political vote for the green party in Ireland, which have an extremely high relative risk ratio

⁹ although the coefficient is non-significant

¹⁰ The dummy variable is not significant because the green party voters in the survey (10 respondents) all claimed they would vote for Ireland to remain a member state of the European Union

The multinomial design allows us to distinguish between hard and soft euroscepticism. In France for example, voting for the Left Front strongly reduces support for the EU, however, the preferences of Left Front voters are not significantly different from the category "can't choose". Arise the Republic also attract voters who are either ambivalent or eurosceptic. National Front and UMP voters though appear as hard euroscepticism with strong anti-EU preferences. In Finland, the True Finns also seem to capture the votes of hard eurosceptic citizens in the EU.

The Danish Dansk Folkeparti is the only rightwing populist party affiliation that does not lead to hard eurosceptical views. Hard euroscepticism do not seem to thrive in Ireland. Two party affiliations show significantly different preferences for the maintenance of their country in the EU: Sinn Fein and Christian Solidarity. In Ireland, a large part of the population still suffers from the austerity program¹¹ and Sinn Fein is leading the opposition¹².

If the political parties position as hypothesized, the results weigh in favor of an electoral connection. Party affiliation allows us to discriminate between undecided and eurosceptic citizens. However, the estimation procedure does not allow proving this correlation and inferring the direction of causality. It is reasonable to think that it is a two-way relationship with political offer and demand shaping each other.

¹¹ although the country has returned to growth (4.8% in 2014)

¹² See the Right2Water campaign

Table 4: Multinomial estimates. France

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.971	(-0.18)	1.814**	(2.60)
Age	0.978	(-0.77)	0.986	(-0.37)
age2	1.000	(0.76)	1.000	(0.32)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.597	(1.27)	0.631	(-0.90)
in education	3.791*	(2.14)	1.025	(0.03)
Retired	1.579	(1.75)	1.303	(0.73)
inactive	2.006	(1.58)	0.884	(-0.20)
Other	1.022	(0.07)	0.548	(-1.19)
Member of a trade union	0.651**	(-2.61)	0.524**	(-2.67)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.934	(-0.16)	1.600	(0.87)
Managers	2.370*	(2.51)	0.696	(-0.70)
Professionals	3.381***	(3.66)	0.725	(-0.66)
Associate professionals	1.580	(1.62)	0.799	(-0.60)
Serv and sales	0.777	(-0.82)	0.979	(-0.05)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.812	(-0.48)	0.647	(-0.66)
Trade workers	0.693	(-1.07)	0.846	(-0.36)
Plant and machin operators	0.806	(-0.62)	1.215	(0.44)
Elementary occupations	0.591	(-1.28)	1.061	(0.12)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	0.979	(-0.09)	1.364	(0.96)
Family income Q2	1.150	(0.64)	1.202	(0.63)
Family income Q4	1.316	(1.21)	1.017	(0.05)
Family income Q5	1.333	(1.19)	1.061	(0.16)
<i>reference category: PS</i>				
Did not vote	0.444**	(-3.18)	0.923	(-0.24)
Worker's Struggle - LO	0.687	(-0.32)	0.00000316	(-0.02)
New Anticapitalist Party - NPA	0.319	(-1.31)	0.863	(-0.12)
Left Front - FG	0.370***	(-3.69)	0.874	(-0.36)
Green Party - EELV	4.073	(1.88)	2.075	(0.77)
Democratic Movement - MoDem	0.973	(-0.08)	1.281	(0.49)
Union for a Popular Movement – UMP	0.647*	(-2.12)	0.541*	(-1.98)
Arise the Republic - DLR	0.134**	(-2.89)	1.049	(0.07)
National front - FN	0.126***	(-8.16)	0.350**	(-3.03)
Invalid ballot, Vote blank	0.338**	(-3.26)	1.446	(0.94)
Log likelihood	-1077.0	N	1425	
pseudo R-sq	0.133	Chi2	329.6	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 5: Multinomial estimates. Denmark

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	1.223	(1.18)	1.955**	(2.73)
Age	0.918*	(-2.09)	0.927	(-1.35)
age2	1.001	(1.82)	1.001	(1.15)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	3.146	(1.92)	2.549	(1.27)
in education	1.015	(0.04)	1.133	(0.23)
Retired	0.803	(-0.67)	0.726	(-0.67)
Inactive	1.050	(0.11)	1.869	(1.17)
Other	0.612	(-0.79)	1.164	(0.19)
Member of a trade union	0.867	(-0.49)	1.273	(0.58)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.491	(-1.74)	0.301*	(-2.16)
Managers	0.854	(-0.39)	0.801	(-0.43)
Professionals	1.243	(0.61)	0.654	(-0.92)
Associate professionals	0.806	(-0.64)	0.561	(-1.37)
Serv and sales	0.710	(-0.93)	0.412	(-1.89)
Agri, forestry and fishery	1.213	(0.23)	0.000000805	(-0.02)
Trade workers	0.823	(-0.49)	0.567	(-1.06)
Plant and machin operators	0.298*	(-2.46)	0.316	(-1.67)
Elementary occupations	0.448	(-1.89)	0.247*	(-2.31)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.639	(1.59)	1.290	(0.60)
Family income Q2	0.597*	(-2.07)	0.749	(-0.84)
Family income Q4	1.145	(0.58)	0.950	(-0.15)
Family income Q5	1.478	(1.54)	1.032	(0.09)
<i>reference category: SD</i>				
Did not vote	1.169	(0.47)	2.817*	(2.36)
Radical Liberal Party - RV	2.399*	(2.40)	1.669	(0.93)
Conservative Peoples Party - KP	2.133	(1.80)	2.605	(1.63)
Socialist Peoples Party - SF	0.706	(-1.25)	1.251	(0.55)
Christian Peoples Party - KRF	0.263	(-1.24)	0.000000432	(-0.01)
Danish Peoples Party - DF	0.150***	(-6.24)	0.545	(-1.42)
Liberal Party - V	1.915**	(2.90)	2.596**	(2.90)
New Alliance - NA	1.637	(0.93)	1.819	(0.82)
Leftwing Alliance - EL	0.400**	(-2.97)	0.630	(-0.92)
Other Party	2.558	(0.85)	8.727	(1.80)
Voted blank	0.675	(-0.81)	1.594	(0.74)
Log likelihood	-954.5	N	1221	
pseudo R-sq	0.114	Chi2	245.5	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 6: Multinomial estimates. Ireland

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	1.023	(0.08)	2.578*	(2.25)
age	1.037	(0.56)	1.069	(0.77)
age2	1.000	(-0.43)	0.999	(-0.85)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.036	(0.07)	0.642	(-0.56)
in education	5.110	(1.48)	8.442	(1.81)
retired	3.667*	(2.08)	3.689	(1.65)
inactive	0.698	(-0.94)	0.433	(-1.49)
other	4231595.6	(0.01)	7902275.9	(0.02)
Member of a trade union	1.217	(0.75)	1.071	(0.20)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.493	(-1.18)	0.896	(-0.15)
Managers	0.863	(-0.29)	0.602	(-0.73)
Professionals	0.673	(-0.97)	0.614	(-0.93)
Associate professionals	1.395	(0.68)	1.210	(0.32)
Serv and sales	0.519	(-1.58)	0.719	(-0.63)
Agri, forestry and fishery	1.015	(0.01)	0.000000434	(-0.01)
Trade workers	0.288*	(-2.01)	1.213	(0.25)
Plant and machin operators	0.466	(-1.36)	0.505	(-0.82)
Elementary occupations	0.0806***	(-3.54)	2.72e-09	(-0.00)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.066	(0.15)	0.729	(-0.56)
Family income Q2	0.562	(-1.56)	0.759	(-0.59)
Family income Q4	1.718	(1.24)	0.970	(-0.05)
Family income Q5	1.058	(0.14)	0.695	(-0.65)
<i>reference category: Fine Gael</i>				
Did not vote	0.480*	(-2.05)	0.635	(-0.94)
Labour Party	0.621	(-1.07)	0.892	(-0.20)
Fianna Fail	1.024	(0.05)	1.376	(0.51)
Sinn Fein	0.165***	(-3.81)	0.449	(-1.25)
United Left Alliance	0.146*	(-2.00)	0.450	(-0.59)
Green Party	1765755.8	(0.01)	0.560	(-0.00)
Christian Solidarity	0.0288**	(-2.66)	4.64e-14	(-0.00)
Independent	0.524	(-1.13)	0.956	(-0.06)
Other - Multiple parties selected	0.727	(-0.79)	0.780	(-0.46)
Log likelihood	-500.5	N	878	
pseudo R-sq	0.125	Chi2	143.0	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 7: Multinomial estimates. Finland

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.918	(-0.44)	1.845*	(2.45)
Age	0.901*	(-2.38)	0.931	(-1.34)
age2	1.001*	(1.99)	1.001	(1.04)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	0.599	(-1.15)	1.196	(0.38)
in education	1.455	(0.88)	0.924	(-0.15)
Retired	1.721	(1.57)	1.192	(0.40)
Inactive	0.700	(-0.46)	2.517	(1.42)
Other	2.366	(1.56)	1.061	(0.08)
Member of a trade union	0.486**	(-2.97)	0.651	(-1.45)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.717	(-0.55)	1.629	(0.65)
Managers	0.912	(-0.20)	0.986	(-0.02)
Professionals	1.145	(0.40)	1.248	(0.47)
Associate professionals	0.802	(-0.66)	1.646	(1.13)
Serv and sales	0.458*	(-2.27)	1.049	(0.11)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.219**	(-2.90)	0.916	(-0.14)
Trade workers	0.498	(-1.82)	1.832	(1.22)
Plant and machin operators	0.501	(-1.55)	1.144	(0.22)
Elementary occupations	0.239***	(-3.31)	1.124	(0.24)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.228	(0.61)	1.669	(1.26)
Family income Q2	0.707	(-1.30)	1.064	(0.19)
Family income Q4	1.114	(0.42)	2.026*	(2.25)
Family income Q5	1.831*	(2.19)	1.077	(0.19)
<i>reference category: KOK</i>				
Did not vote	0.253***	(-4.60)	0.514	(-1.79)
Social Democratic Party - SDP	0.561	(-1.93)	0.728	(-0.81)
Centre Party of Finland - KESK	0.320***	(-3.73)	0.658	(-1.07)
Left Alliance - VAS	0.392*	(-2.56)	0.389	(-1.85)
Swedish Peoples Party - SFP/RKP	0.310*	(-2.48)	0.330	(-1.53)
Green League - VIHR	0.649	(-1.24)	0.546	(-1.28)
Christian Democrats - KD	0.147**	(-3.24)	0.575	(-0.97)
True Finns - PS	0.163***	(-5.23)	0.434*	(-1.98)
Other Party	0.174	(-1.74)	0.233	(-1.16)
Log likelihood	-842.3	N	934	
pseudo R-sq	0.117	Chi2	223.1	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 8: Multinomial estimates. Great Britain

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.851	(-0.81)	1.793*	(2.50)
age	0.959	(-1.34)	0.982	(-0.54)
age2	1.000	(0.92)	1.000	(0.41)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	0.925	(-0.18)	1.504	(0.91)
in education	1.948	(1.00)	0.283	(-1.09)
Retired	0.658	(-1.29)	0.827	(-0.53)
Inactive	0.863	(-0.45)	0.778	(-0.73)
Other	2.239	(0.62)	5.782	(1.30)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.852	(-0.11)	0.00000215	(-0.02)
Managers	1.445	(1.02)	0.763	(-0.64)
Professionals	1.962*	(2.04)	0.770	(-0.66)
Associate professionals	0.892	(-0.34)	0.541	(-1.55)
Serv and sales	0.556	(-1.76)	1.115	(0.33)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.232	(-1.29)	0.212	(-1.33)
Trade workers	0.473	(-1.81)	0.745	(-0.66)
Plant and machin operators	0.440*	(-1.97)	0.743	(-0.67)
Elementary occupations	0.460	(-1.94)	0.692	(-0.90)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	0.865	(-0.51)	0.547	(-1.94)
Family income Q2	0.998	(-0.01)	0.963	(-0.12)
Family income Q4	1.321	(0.99)	0.751	(-0.93)
Family income Q5	1.088	(0.30)	0.538	(-1.95)
<i>reference category: CONS</i>				
Did not vote	1.118	(0.44)	1.537	(1.60)
Labour – LAB	2.734***	(4.15)	1.511	(1.50)
Liberal Democrats – SLD	2.437**	(3.09)	1.251	(0.64)
Scottish National Party – SNP	1.494	(0.42)	0.564	(-0.48)
Plaid Cymru – PC	2.147	(0.69)	0.731	(-0.25)
Green Party	0.396	(-0.78)	1.221	(0.21)
Other party	0.566	(-0.68)	1.005	(0.01)
Log likelihood	-759.1	N	777	
pseudo R-sq	0.089	Chi2	148.9	

t statistics in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

ROBUSTNESS CHECKS

In table 9 to 13, each of the 5 countries is excluded one by one in order to make sure that the results in the pooled regression are not driven by an outlier.

The traditional opposition between supporters and opponents (confronting "against" and "in favor") offers robust results and confirms what is usually found in the literature (students are strong supporters of the EU, as well as professionals and high income households). In this study, the focus is on what we call hard Euroscepticism, here citizens who would rather oppose membership (category "against") than being ambivalent (category "can't choose"). Put differently, we want to find the variables that drive people to choose "against EU membership" above any other possible response. Thus we will focus on 4 predictors: elementary occupation, trade union membership, far left ideology and far right ideology.

The influence of elementary occupation is robust, although weakly significant. Except when Denmark is excluded from the sample, the least skilled are on average 40% less likely to be undecided than to oppose EU membership.

The influence of trade union membership appears to be heavily driven by Finland. When Finland is excluded from the sample the coefficient is no longer significant (even when "against" is opposed to "in favor"). France also seems to play a major role, when excluded, the significance falls to 10% for supporters of the EU and the category can't choose is not relevant anymore. The exclusion of Denmark and Ireland do not affect our main result. When Great-Britain is removed from the sample (table 13), the coefficient for trade union membership is roughly the same compared to table 3: if the respondent is unionized being in favor of EU membership decreases by 28% and 27% respectively. However, the opposition between "can't choose" and "against" do not come out anymore.

Far left self-positioning reduces the relative risk ratio of being in favor of EU membership but also being undecided. For the second category however, the significance is weak (10% at best) and the coefficient becomes insignificant when Denmark, Ireland or Great-Britain are excluded from the sample. Far right self-positioning on the other hand has a strong and robust influence and increases the relative risk of being against EU membership compared to the two other possible response. Far-right political ideology appears as the only robust predictor of genuine anti-EU attitudes in our study.

CONCLUSION

The present analysis has proposed to explore the preferences of European citizens on EU membership in 5 member states. Four characteristics distinguish people willing to exit the EU from ambivalent people: elementary occupation, trade union membership, far left ideology and far right ideology. Among them, we find that only far right ideology is robust. On the other hand, the strongest determinants of indecision are female gender, and electoral abstention. On balance, the party people vote for is critical to determine if criticism towards the EU will remain indecision or become hard euroscepticism. If the political parties position as hypothesized, the results weigh in favor of an electoral connection, most likely a two-way relationship with political offer and demand shaping each other. Finally, government parties are used as a reference category to test whether voters of opposition parties have distinct preferences about European integration. In 3 of the 5 countries in the analysis, the governing parties are the most pro-EU. Several opposition parties are gaining votes. So it is relevant to wonder what would happen to the European process if governing parties are not longer supportive of the EU. In Finland, Juha Sipilä became Prime Minister in May 2015 and formed a centre-right coalition, appointing Timo Soini as Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. So far, the True Finns have toned down the Eurosceptical rhetoric and joined the consensus to contribute to the Greek rescue plan. Nonetheless, changing governing parties might change the consensus as well, notably if anti-EU parties were to rule a major country like France.

Is the sleeping giant waking up? Giving the low number of non-response and limited number of "can't choose" answer, one may be tempted to say yes. On the other hand, the empirical evidence provides only weak evidence that political parties are able to exploit the concerns about European integration.

REFERENCES:

- Anderson, C. J., & Reichert, M. S. (1995). Economic benefits and support for membership in the EU: A cross-national analysis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 15, 231-250.
- Eichenberg, R. C. and Dalton, R. J. (1993) 'Europeans and the European Union: The Dynamics of Public Support for European Integration', *International Organization*, 47, 507-534.
- Eichenberg, R. C. and Dalton, R. J. (2007) 'Post-Maastricht Blues: The Transformation of Citizen Support for European Integration, 1973-2004', *Acta Politica*, 42, 128-152.
- Cautrès, B. (2005) 'Les Clivages Socio-Politiques Sur L'intégration Européenne Et Le Vote Du 29 Mai 2005', *Cahiers du CEVIPOF*, 142-155
- De Vries, C. E. (2007). Sleeping giant: Fact or fairytale? How European integration affects national elections. *European Union Politics*, 8(3), 363-385.
- De Vries, C. E., & Edwards, E. E. (2009). Taking europe to its extremes extremist parties and public Euroscepticism. *Party Politics*, 15(1), 5-28.
- Down, I., & Wilson, C. J. (2013). A rising generation of Europeans? Life-cycle and cohort effects on support for 'Europe'. *European Journal of Political Research*, 52(4), 431-456.
- Duchesne, Sophie, Frazer, Elizabeth, Haegel, Florence, & Van Ingelgom, Virginie. (2013). *Citizens' Reactions to European Integration Compared. Overlooking Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gabel, M., & Palmer, H. D. (1995). Understanding variation in public support for European integration. *European Journal of Political Research*, 27(1), 3-19.
- Gabel, M. J. (2009). *Interests and integration: Market liberalization, public opinion, and European Union*. University of Michigan Press.
- Giddens, A. (2013). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Greene, W. H. 2012. *Econometric Analysis*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hix, S. (1999). *The political system of the European Union*. London: Macmillan
- Hobolt Sara B., 2014, « Ever closer or ever wider? Public attitudes towards further enlargement and integration in the European Union », *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 21, n° 5, p. 664-680.
- Hooghe, L., Marks, G., & Wilson, C. J. (2002). Does left/right structure party positions on European integration?. *Comparative political studies*, 35(8), 965-989.
- Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2005). Calculation, community and cues public opinion on European integration. *European Union Politics*, 6(4), 419-443.
- ISSP Research Group (2015): International Social Survey Programme: National Identity III - ISSP 2013. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5950 Data file Version 1.0.0
- Koopmans, R. (2007) 'Who Inhabits the European public sphere? Winners and losers, supporters and opponents in Europeanized public debates', *European Journal of Political Research* 46(2): 183-210
- Kriesi, H. (2007). The role of European integration in national election campaigns. *European Union Politics*, 8(1), 83-108.

- Kuhn, T., & Stoeckel, F. (2014). When European integration becomes costly: the euro crisis and public support for European economic governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(4), 624-641.
- Leconte, C. (2010). *Understanding euroscepticism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lindberg, L.N. & Schiengold, S.A. (1970). *Europe's would-be polity: Patterns of change in the European Community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lipset S.M. & Rokkan S. (1967) Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction, Lipset S.M. et Rokkan S. (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments. Cross National Perspectives*, The Free Press, New-York, 1967, p. 35.
- Mair, P. (2000). The limited impact of Europe on national party systems. *West European Politics*, 23(4), 27-51.
- Marks, G., & Steenbergen, M. (2002). Understanding political contestation in the European Union. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(8), 879-892.
- Marks, G., & Steenbergen, M. R. (2004). *European integration and political conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marks, G., & Wilson, C. J. (2000). The past in the present: a cleavage theory of party response to European integration. *British Journal of Political Science*, 30(3), 433-459.
- McLaren, L.M. (2002). Public support for the European Union: Cost/benefit analysis or perceived cultural threat? *Journal of Politics* 64(2): 551-566.
- Stoeckel, F. (2013). Ambivalent or indifferent? Reconsidering the structure of EU public opinion. *European Union Politics*, 14(1), 23-45.
- Taggart, P. (1998). A touchstone of dissent: Euroscepticism in contemporary Western European party systems. *European Journal of Political Research*, 33(3), 363-388.
- Taggart, P. and Szczerbiak, A. (2002) 'The Party Politics of Euroscepticism in EU member and Candidate States', Brighton: Sussex European Institute, working paper no.51.
- Tsebelis, G., & Garrett, G. (2000). Legislative politics in the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 1(1), 9-36.
- Van der Eijk, C., & Franklin, M. N. (1996). Choosing Europe? The European electorate and national politics in the face of union.
- Van der Eijk, C., & Franklin, M. N. (2004). Potential for contestation on European matters at national elections in Europe. *European integration and political conflict*, 32-50.
- Van der Brug, W. and Van Spanje, J. (2009) 'Immigration, Europe and the 'New' Cultural Dimension', *European Journal of Political Research*, 48, 309-334

APPENDICES

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT ELECTION, 2014

Many eurosceptical parties have gained ground in the 2014 elections. Several of them came out ahead in the polls: The National Front in France (Front National), the Danish People's Party in Denmark (Dansk Folkeparti), Law and Justice in Poland (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość) and the Hungarian Civic Alliance in Hungary (Fidesz). However not all the eurosceptical parties are right-wing (notably Siriza). It should be noted that right-wing parties are losing ground in Romania, Slovakia, Belgium and the Netherlands. In fact sovereignist parties appear to be the biggest winners: True Finns (Finland), Dansk Folkeparti (Denmark), Alternative for Germany and UKIP (UK). The elections displayed a 43,11% voter participation. The European People's Party won the elections with 28,89 % of votes and Jean-Claude Juncker was elected President of the European Commission.

Summary of the results

 EPP	221 
 S&D	191 
 ECR	70 
 ALDE	67 
 GUE/NGL	52 
 Greens/EFA	50 
 EFDD	48 
 NI	52 

source: The European Parliament: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/>

EPP: European People's Party
S&D: Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats
ECR: European Conservatives and Reformists
ALDE: Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Group
GUE/NGL: European United Left–Nordic Green Left
G-EFA: The Greens–European Free Alliance
EFD: Europe of Freedom and Democracy
NI: Non-Inscrits

PARTIES	%	Seats	EPP	S&D	ECR	ALDE	GUE/NGL	Greens/EFA	EFDD	NI
DENMARK	100	13	1	3	4	3	1	1	0	0
O. (DF) : Dansk Folkeparti	26.60	4			4					
A. (S) : Socialdemokratiet	19.10	3		3						
V. (V) : Venstre, Danmarks Liberale Parti	16.70	2				2				
F. (SF) : Socialistisk Folkeparti	11.00	1						1		
C. (KF) : Det Konservative Folkeparti	9.10	1	1							
N. : Folkebevægelsen mod EU	8.10	1					1			
B. (RV) : Det Radikale Venstre	6.50	1				1				
I. (LA) : Ny Alliance	2.90	0								
FINLAND	100	13	3	2	2	4	1	1	0	0
KOK : Kansallinen Kokoomus	22.60	3	3							
KESK : Suomen Keskusta	19.70	3				3				
PS : Perussuomalaiset	12.90	2			2					
SDP : Finlands Socialdemokratiska Parti	12.30	2		2						
VAS : Vasemmistoliitto	9.30	1					1			
VIHR : Vihreä liitto	9.30	1						1		
SFP (RKP) : Svenska folkpartiet	6.80	1				1				
KD : Suomen Kristillisdemokraatit	5.20	0								
Other parties	1.90	0								
FRANCE	100	74	20	13	0	7	4	6	1	23
FN : Front national	24.86	23								23
UMP : Union pour un Mouvement Populaire	20.81	20	20							
Parti Socialiste - Parti radical de gauche	13.98	13		13						
Alternative (UDI+MoDem)	9.94	7				7				
Europe Ecologie	8.95	6						6		
Coalition Front de gauche	6.33	3					3			
DLR : Debout la République	3.82	0								
Nouvelle Donne : Nouvelle Donne	2.90	0								
LO : Liste ouvrière	1.00	0								
NPA : Nouveau Parti anticapitaliste	0.30	0								
UOM : Union pour les Outre-Mer	0.00	1					1			
Ind. : Indépendant	0.00	1							1	
Other parties	7.11	0								
IRELAND	100	11	4	1	1	1	4	0	0	0
Independents + other parties	25.64	3		1		1	1			
FF : Fianna Fáil Party	22.31	1			1					
FG : Fine Gael Party	22.28	4	4							
SF : Sinn Féin	19.52	3					3			
Lab. : Labour Party	5.33	0								
GP : Green Party	4.92	0								

UNITED KINGDOM	100	73	0	20	20	1	1	6	24	1
UKIP : United Kingdom Independence Party	26.77	24							24	
Lab. : Labour Party	24.74	20		20						
Cons. : Conservative Party	23.31	19			19					
GP : Green Party	7.67	3						3		
LDP : Liberal Democrats Party	6.69	1				1				
SNP : Scottish National Party	2.40	2						2		
BNP : The British National Party	1.11	0								
PL-PW : Plaid Cymru - Party of Wales	0.69	1						1		
SF : Sinn Féin	0.66	1					1			
DUP : Democratic Unionist Party	0.54	1								1
UUP : Conservative & Ulster Unionist Alliance	0.35	1			1					
SDLP : Social Democratic & Labour Party	0.34	0								
Other parties Great Britain	4.02	0								
Other parties Northern Ireland	0.71	0								

THE POLITICAL PARTIES

	Parties	Frequency	Percentage
Denmark	Did not vote	155	11,99
	Social Democratic Party - SD, Socialdemokraterne	266	20,57
	Radical Liberal Party - RV, Det Radikale Venstre	111	8,58
	Conservative Peoples Party - KP, Det Konservative Folkeparti	63	4,87
	Socialist Peoples Party - SF, Socialistik Folkeparti	112	8,66
	Christian Peoples Party - KRF, Kristend	4	0,31
	Danish Peoples Party - DF, Dansk Folkeparti	95	7,35
	Liberal Party - V, Venstre	320	24,75
	New Alliance - NA, Ny Alliance	37	2,86
	Leftwing Alliance - EL, Enhedslisten	78	6,03
	Other Party	10	0,77
	Voted blank	42	3,25
	Total	1293	100

	Parties	Frequency	Percentage
France	Did not vote	218	11,98
	Worker's Struggle - LO -	8	0,44
	New Anticapitalist Party - NPA -	11	0,6
	Left Front - FG -	135	7,42
	Socialist Party - PS -	478	26,26
	Green Party - EELV -	56	3,08
	Democratic Movement - MoDem -	114	6,26
	Union for a Popular Movement - UMP	493	27,09
	Arise the Republic - DLR -	17	0,93
	National front - FN -	175	9,62
	Invalid ballot, Vote blank	115	6,32
	Total	1820	100

	Parties	Frequency	Percentage
Finland	Did not vote	260	24,44
	Social Democratic Party - SDP	151	14,19
	Centre Party of Finland - KESK	134	12,59
	National Coalition Party - KOK	194	18,23
	Left Alliance - VAS	67	6,3
	Swedish Peoples Party - SFP/RKP	33	3,1
	Green League - VIHR	92	8,65
	Christian Democrats - KD	30	2,82
	True Finns - PS	97	9,12
	Other Party	6	0,56
	Total	1064	100

	Parties	Frequency	Percentage
Ireland	Did not vote	219	19,13
	Fine Gael	354	30,92
	Labour Party	121	10,57
	Fianna Fail	138	12,05
	Sinn Fein	54	4,72
	United Left Alliance	11	0,96
	Green Party	10	0,87
	Christian Solidarity	3	0,26
	Independent	60	5,24
	Other - Multiple parties selected	175	15,28
	Total	1145	100

	Parties	Frequency	Percentage
Great-Britain	Did not vote	232	28,61
	Conservative - CONS	232	28,61
	Labour - LAB	208	25,65
	Liberal Democrats - SLD	108	13,32
	Scottish National Party - SNP	7	0,86
	Plaid Cymru - PC	5	0,62
	Green Party	7	0,86
	Other party	12	1,48
	Total	811	100

Source: ISSP 2013

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Referendum to remain member state of the EU			
	Vote against or can't choose	Vote in favour	Total
Occupation			
Armed forces	43.80	56.20	100.00
Managers	28.69	71.31	100.00
Professionals	25.39	74.61	100.00
Associate professionals	37.16	62.84	100.00
Service and sales managers	40.03	59.97	100.00
Clerks	53.31	46.69	100.00
Agriculture, forestry and fishery	45.78	54.22	100.00
Trade workers	54.79	45.21	100.00
Plant and machin operators	56.51	43.49	100.00
Elementary occupations	62.50	37.50	100.00
Employment status			
In paid work	40.04	59.96	100.00
Unemployed	48.16	51.84	100.00
In education	33.88	66.12	100.00
Retired	41.72	58.28	100.00
Inactive	48.49	51.51	100.00
Other	41.64	58.36	100.00
Left-right scale			
Did not vote	47.41	52.59	100.00
Far left	47.37	52.63	100.00
Left, center left	35.33	64.67	100.00
Center, liberal	29.23	70.77	100.00
Right, conservative	38.14	61.86	100.00
Far right	74.16	25.84	100.00
Family income			
Q1	43.08	56.92	100.00
Q2	48.28	51.72	100.00
Q3	45.22	54.78	100.00
Q4	36.16	63.84	100.00
Q5	30.74	69.26	100.00
Total	40.68	59.32	100.00

Source: ISSP 2013

Referendum to remain member state of the EU	France	Ireland	Denmark	Finland	Great Britain	Total
Vote in favour	1225	909	838	546	300	3818
Vote against	460	144	322	406	319	1651
Cant choose	280	119	161	246	190	996
No answer	28	7	0	16	15	66
Total	1993	1179	1321	1214	824	6531

Source: ISSP 2013

Referendum to remain member state of the EU	France	Ireland	Denmark	Finland	Great Britain	Total
Vote in favour	61.47	77.10	63.44	44.98	36.41	58.46
Vote against	23.08	12.21	24.38	33.44	38.71	25.28
Cant choose	14.05	10.09	12.19	20.26	23.06	15.25
No answer	1.40	0.59	0.00	1.32	1.82	1.01
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: ISSP 2013

SUMMARY STATISTICS

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Total
Referendum to remain member state of the EU (recoded)			
Vote against+can't choose	2,647	40.94	6,465
Vote in favour	3,818	59.06	6,465
Referendum to remain member state of the EU			
Vote in favour	3,818	58.46	6,531
Vote against	1,651	25.28	6,531
Cant choose	996	15.25	6,531
No answer	66	1.01	6,531
Gender			
male	3,029	46.44	6,522
female	3,493	53.56	6,522
Employment status			
In paid work	3,528	54.02	6,531
Unemployed	274	4.20	6,531
In education	426	6.52	6,531
Retired	1,656	25.36	6,531
Inactive	370	5.67	6,531
Other	277	4.24	6,531

Member of a trade union			
No	3,183	49.26	6,462
Yes (currently or previously)	3,279	50.74	6,462
Occupation			
Armed forces	355	5.62	6,314
Managers	629	9.96	6,314
Professionals	1,224	19.39	6,314
Associate professionals	1,243	19.69	6,314
Service and sales managers	656	10.39	6,314
Clerks	844	13.37	6,314
Agriculture, forestry and fishery	167	2.64	6,314
Trade workers	499	7.90	6,314
Plant and machin operators	368	5.83	6,314
Elementary occupations	329	5.21	6,314
Family income			
Q1	1,145	19.95	5,738
Q2	1,147	19.99	5,738
Q3	1,148	20.01	5,738
Q4	1,147	19.99	5,738
Q5	1,151	20.06	5,738
Country			
Denmark (DK)	1,321	20.23	6,531
Finland (FI)	1,214	18.59	6,531
France (FR)	1,993	30.52	6,531
Breat Britain (GB)	824	12.62	6,531
Ireland (IE)	1,179	18.05	6,531
Left-right scale			
Did not vote	2,001	30.64	6,531
Far left	362	5.54	6,531
Left, center left	1,416	21.68	6,531
Center, liberal	1,026	15.71	6,531
Right, conservative	1,456	22.29	6,531
Far right	270	4.13	6,531
Variable			
age	50.51912	17.24454	6486
age2	2849.51	1769.285	6486

Source: ISSP 2013

ROBUSTNESS CHECKS

Table 9: Multinomial estimates, pooled regression (France excluded)

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.947	(-0.60)	1.770***	(4.76)
age	0.955**	(-2.66)	0.964	(-1.75)
age2	1.000*	(1.98)	1.000	(1.24)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.015	(0.07)	1.292	(1.07)
in education	1.769*	(2.46)	1.290	(0.88)
retired	1.128	(0.78)	1.068	(0.33)
inactive	0.804	(-1.18)	0.944	(-0.26)
other	1.696	(1.59)	2.195*	(2.04)
Member of a trade union	0.734*	(-2.30)	0.856	(-0.89)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.565*	(-2.44)	0.641	(-1.44)
Managers	0.989	(-0.06)	0.742	(-1.18)
Professionals	1.312	(1.66)	0.783	(-1.18)
Associate professionals	0.883	(-0.77)	0.820	(-1.00)
Serv and sales	0.559***	(-3.51)	0.752	(-1.46)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.460*	(-2.55)	0.605	(-1.29)
Trade workers	0.486***	(-3.71)	0.825	(-0.80)
Plant and machin operators	0.433***	(-3.91)	0.604	(-1.88)
Elementary occupations	0.334***	(-5.32)	0.538*	(-2.57)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.057	(0.39)	0.838	(-1.00)
Family income Q2	0.806	(-1.70)	0.839	(-1.13)
Family income Q4	1.174	(1.27)	1.027	(0.17)
Family income Q5	1.405*	(2.58)	0.930	(-0.42)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.683**	(-2.94)	1.176	(0.98)
Far left	0.339***	(-5.08)	0.545*	(-2.05)
Left, center left	0.864	(-1.05)	0.886	(-0.66)
Right, conservative	0.854	(-1.14)	0.950	(-0.28)
Far right	0.0916***	(-8.13)	0.281**	(-3.25)
<i>reference category: Denmark</i>				
Finland	0.379***	(-8.42)	0.805	(-1.42)
Ireland	1.850***	(3.98)	1.111	(0.50)
Great Britain	0.214***	(-8.88)	0.784	(-1.09)
Log likelihood	-3439.3		N	4000
pseudo R-square	0.107		Chi2	826.2

Table 10: Multinomial estimates, pooled regression (Denmark excluded)

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.874	(-1.51)	1.768***	(4.83)
age	0.970	(-1.93)	0.980	(-1.07)
age2	1.000	(1.50)	1.000	(0.69)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	0.951	(-0.26)	1.040	(0.17)
in education	2.419***	(3.35)	1.321	(0.87)
retired	1.285	(1.71)	1.211	(1.01)
inactive	0.967	(-0.18)	0.845	(-0.76)
other	1.374	(1.27)	1.297	(0.82)
Member of a trade union	0.713**	(-3.09)	0.719*	(-2.27)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.664	(-1.61)	1.067	(0.21)
Managers	1.323	(1.52)	0.672	(-1.55)
Professionals	1.650**	(3.12)	0.839	(-0.84)
Associate professionals	1.058	(0.37)	0.854	(-0.81)
Serv and sales	0.540***	(-3.86)	0.895	(-0.60)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.471**	(-2.93)	0.648	(-1.30)
Trade workers	0.430***	(-4.46)	0.875	(-0.57)
Plant and machin operators	0.481***	(-3.75)	0.790	(-0.97)
Elementary occupations	0.315***	(-5.54)	0.657	(-1.82)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.041	(0.29)	1.084	(0.48)
Family income Q2	0.867	(-1.16)	1.062	(0.40)
Family income Q4	1.209	(1.52)	1.173	(1.00)
Family income Q5	1.379*	(2.46)	1.042	(0.23)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.676**	(-3.03)	1.127	(0.73)
Far left	0.424***	(-3.58)	0.746	(-0.92)
Left, center left	1.147	(0.98)	0.999	(-0.01)
Right, conservative	0.739*	(-2.18)	0.731	(-1.72)
Far right	0.153***	(-7.82)	0.380**	(-3.06)
<i>reference category: Finland</i>				
France	2.170***	(6.21)	1.019	(0.12)
Ireland	4.673***	(10.88)	1.254	(1.22)
Great Britain	0.531***	(-4.27)	0.840	(-0.96)
Log likelihood		-3552.6	N	4207
pseudo R-square		0.117	Chi2	944.7

Table 11: Multinomial estimates, pooled regression (Ireland excluded)

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.969	(-0.38)	1.753***	(5.14)
age	0.949***	(-3.50)	0.964*	(-2.01)
age2	1.000**	(2.73)	1.000	(1.58)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.129	(0.63)	1.218	(0.87)
in education	1.876**	(2.86)	1.064	(0.22)
retired	1.188	(1.25)	1.053	(0.29)
inactive	1.091	(0.45)	1.136	(0.57)
other	1.036	(0.15)	0.957	(-0.14)
Member of a trade union	0.645***	(-3.91)	0.722*	(-2.16)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.741	(-1.33)	0.807	(-0.75)
Managers	1.302	(1.47)	0.742	(-1.24)
Professionals	1.864***	(3.94)	0.816	(-1.00)
Associate professionals	1.067	(0.43)	0.817	(-1.10)
Serv and sales	0.640**	(-2.83)	0.816	(-1.10)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.548*	(-2.33)	0.639	(-1.35)
Trade workers	0.579**	(-3.07)	0.806	(-0.97)
Plant and machin operators	0.514***	(-3.41)	0.759	(-1.16)
Elementary occupations	0.421***	(-4.50)	0.642*	(-2.00)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.020	(0.16)	1.008	(0.05)
Family income Q2	0.866	(-1.26)	0.955	(-0.32)
Family income Q4	1.223	(1.76)	1.109	(0.70)
Family income Q5	1.433**	(2.99)	0.986	(-0.08)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.682**	(-2.77)	1.357	(1.74)
Far left	0.427***	(-4.66)	0.717	(-1.32)
Left, center left	1.168	(1.12)	1.010	(0.05)
Right, conservative	0.925	(-0.58)	0.976	(-0.13)
Far right	0.137***	(-9.86)	0.375***	(-3.63)
<i>reference category: Finland</i>				
France	2.197***	(6.45)	1.077	(0.46)
Great Britain	0.484***	(-4.86)	0.800	(-1.20)
Denmark	2.433***	(8.08)	1.177	(1.12)
Log likelihood	-4033.6		N	4577
pseudo R-square	0.098		Chi2	873.9

Table 12: Multinomial estimates, pooled regression (Finland excluded)

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	0.940	(-0.71)	1.817***	(4.95)
age	0.958**	(-2.70)	0.973	(-1.35)
age2	1.000*	(2.21)	1.000	(1.02)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.395	(1.58)	1.156	(0.55)
in education	1.973**	(2.58)	1.309	(0.81)
retired	1.100	(0.65)	1.040	(0.20)
inactive	0.959	(-0.24)	0.806	(-0.98)
other	1.132	(0.49)	1.243	(0.66)
Member of a trade union	0.842	(-1.49)	0.795	(-1.44)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.645*	(-1.98)	0.725	(-1.11)
Managers	1.278	(1.34)	0.715	(-1.38)
Professionals	1.660**	(3.08)	0.752	(-1.34)
Associate professionals	1.031	(0.19)	0.701	(-1.81)
Serv and sales	0.640**	(-2.72)	0.814	(-1.06)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.728	(-1.08)	0.422	(-1.87)
Trade workers	0.575**	(-2.89)	0.750	(-1.17)
Plant and machin operators	0.477***	(-3.67)	0.709	(-1.37)
Elementary occupations	0.431***	(-4.04)	0.535*	(-2.48)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	1.018	(0.14)	0.941	(-0.35)
Family income Q2	0.876	(-1.09)	0.946	(-0.36)
Family income Q4	1.256	(1.82)	0.996	(-0.02)
Family income Q5	1.313*	(2.09)	0.957	(-0.25)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.443***	(-5.37)	0.966	(-0.18)
Far left	0.264***	(-6.90)	0.527*	(-2.42)
Left, center left	0.705*	(-2.23)	0.758	(-1.32)
Right, conservative	0.558***	(-3.69)	0.703	(-1.67)
Far right	0.0868***	(-11.49)	0.282***	(-4.46)
<i>reference category: Denmark</i>				
France	1.037	(0.29)	0.964	(-0.21)
Ireland	1.844***	(4.03)	1.028	(0.13)
Great Britain	0.244***	(-8.90)	0.749	(-1.39)
Log likelihood		-3559.5	N	4413
pseudo R-square		0.112	Chi2	901.4

Table 13: Multinomial estimates, pooled regression (Great Britain excluded)

Base outcome: against	In favour		Can't choose	
Variable	RRR	Std-Error	RRR	Std-Error
female	1.015	(0.17)	1.855***	(5.13)
age	0.935***	(-3.86)	0.955*	(-2.02)
age2	1.001***	(3.46)	1.000	(1.75)
<i>reference category: paid work</i>				
Unemployed	1.163	(0.77)	1.030	(0.12)
in education	2.148***	(3.33)	1.425	(1.23)
retired	1.302	(1.76)	1.063	(0.30)
inactive	0.999	(-0.00)	0.938	(-0.25)
other	1.259	(0.99)	1.188	(0.57)
Member of a trade union	0.718**	(-3.24)	0.776	(-1.84)
<i>reference category: clerks</i>				
armed forces	0.624*	(-2.21)	0.812	(-0.75)
Managers	1.167	(0.80)	0.744	(-1.09)
Professionals	1.520*	(2.55)	0.837	(-0.81)
Associate professionals	1.035	(0.22)	0.897	(-0.55)
Serv and sales	0.619**	(-2.92)	0.751	(-1.39)
Agri, forestry and fishery	0.588*	(-2.04)	0.630	(-1.29)
Trade workers	0.557**	(-3.13)	0.903	(-0.42)
Plant and machin operators	0.497***	(-3.45)	0.770	(-0.99)
Elementary occupations	0.361***	(-4.90)	0.601*	(-2.00)
<i>reference category: Q3</i>				
Family income Q1	0.976	(-0.18)	1.008	(0.04)
Family income Q2	0.781*	(-2.08)	0.984	(-0.10)
Family income Q4	1.325*	(2.34)	1.214	(1.20)
Family income Q5	1.614***	(3.66)	1.003	(0.02)
<i>reference category: Center, liberal</i>				
Did not vote	0.707**	(-2.59)	1.174	(0.91)
Far left	0.421***	(-4.73)	0.612	(-1.92)
Left, center left	0.967	(-0.23)	0.822	(-1.01)
Right, conservative	1.002	(0.02)	0.925	(-0.40)
Far right	0.136***	(-9.89)	0.341***	(-3.97)
<i>reference category: Finland</i>				
France	2.298***	(6.91)	1.128	(0.75)
Ireland	5.177***	(11.69)	1.347	(1.60)
Denmark	2.463***	(8.16)	1.171	(1.08)
Log likelihood	-3787.6		N	4679
pseudo R-square	0.100		Chi2	845.2