

Centre for European Studies (CES)

University of Twente
The Netherlands

CES Working Paper

No. 1/07

CATHERINE E. DE VRIES & MARTIN ROSEMA

The dual nature of EU issue voting: The impact of European integration in
national and European parliamentary elections*



www.mb.utwente.nl/ces

© 2007. All rights reserved.
No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form
without permission of the author(s).

Abstract

Ever since the first popular election of the European Parliament (EP) in 1979, voters are presented with two channels to legitimize decision-making within the European Union (EU). In national elections voters authorize and hold accountable their national representatives, who represent their interests in the European Council. Through EP elections voters elect and hold accountable their European representatives. These two electoral channels constitute a system of dual legitimation of EU policy-making. This paper examines the extent to which voters actually use both of these channels in order to express their attitudes regarding European integration or hold European or national political elites accountable for policies originating from the EU level. Utilizing European Election Survey (EES) data from 2004, we show that in some countries, like Denmark and the UK, the process of dual legitimation is indeed taking place. In other countries, like Germany and Spain, however, EU issue voting is absent from both electoral channels. However, this does not lead to poorer representation of citizens in terms of their EU attitudes. Hence, this study has important implications for our understanding of how issues regarding European integration affect electoral politics, as well as for the ongoing debate regarding legitimacy and accountability in EU politics.

* This paper has been presented at the 4th ECPR General Conference, Pisa, Italy, 6-8 September 2007, and at the IGS Conference, Enschede, The Netherlands, 28 September 2007.

1 Introduction

Politicians and social scientists alike have struggled with the question how to ensure that political decision-making in the European Union (EU) is democratic. What started off in the 1950s as a collaboration between six countries in one particular area of economic policy (coal and steel), has developed into an integration process that spans a large range of policy areas: from market integration and employment policy to foreign policy and immigration. The recent introduction of a single currency in twelve member states is perhaps the clearest example of this development. Although it remains to be seen whether in the years to come the EU will develop into a political union in which more substantial powers are transferred to the transnational level, the process so far has gone far enough to establish a widespread belief that decision-making at the European level requires direct legitimation from those who are governed.

The landmark event for the establishment of a democratic European polity was the introduction of popular elections for the European Parliament (EP) in 1979. However, the position of the EP in the European institutional troika with Commission and Council has been weak. Despite the recent increase in power of the EP, most decisions at the European level are still made without its direct consent: under consultation rather than co-decision. Hence, providing EU citizens only with the opportunity to voice their opinions in EP elections does not suffice to ensure direct legitimation. Currently, this lack of public input in EU decision-making is accounted for by the fact that politicians who decide at the EU level are authorized and held accountable at the national level. They are authorized by, and held accountable to, national parliaments, which in turn are directly elected.

Whether this indirect mechanism is adequate in order for the EU to qualify as a "democratic" polity, has been topic of extensive debate (Føllesdal, 2006). The skeptical view is captured by the notion of the "democratic deficit", two words that leave little doubt regarding the presumed quality of democracy in the EU (Kielmannsegg, 1996; Schmitt and Thomassen, 1999; Schmitt, 2002). Other scholars, however, have taken an opposing view arguing that a discussion regarding the democratic deficit is redundant. These scholars, for example, show that the relatively new European polity shows similar or even identical levels of democracy to those of established liberal democratic states (Zweifel, 2000), or argue that democratic legitimation at the European level is not a necessary requirement (Majone, 1998) or that this legitimation process in fact functions properly (Moravcsik, 2002). A third group of authors argues that the EU may not suffer from all the democratic insufficiencies for which has been accused, but it does bear one central democratic shortcoming: the absence of public contestation for political leadership and over public policy (Føllesdal and Hix, 2006: 556).

Indeed, one of the key arguments in the debate about the democratic deficit has been that in European elections voters do not base their choice on opinions about European affairs (see Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996). Instead, national concerns dominate those elections, which consequently merely mirror the popularity of national governments. Political parties contribute to this, as they focus their campaigns on issues salient in the national realm. Hence, EP elections constitute “second-order national elections” (Reif and Schmitt, 1980). In this paper we would like to broaden the scope of this debate by arguing that in order to judge whether the EU lacks democratic quality, one has to do more than identifying the impact of opinions about European integration in European elections.

There are two additional questions that are crucial for the whole debate, but have not yet received adequate attention. The first concerns for whom people vote, and, most importantly, why they do so. The mere fact that people vote similarly in EP elections as in national elections as such is not problematic for European democracy, as long as considerations that are relevant at the European level also play a role in elections at the national level. Judging the democratic quality of the EU thus requires a simultaneous look at national and European parliamentary elections. Because decision making about European integration is primarily in the hands of the national ministers who decide in the Council of Ministers and European Council, one could even argue that it makes sense for voters to voice their opinions about European integration in national elections rather than in EP elections (cf. Mair, 2005). After all, those ministers are not authorized by, and held accountable to, the EP, but via their national parliaments.

The second question concerns how policy preferences about European integration are related to ideological divisions in national politics. Even if one would observe that EU attitudes play no role in elections – neither national nor European elections – this need as such not even be problematic. If disagreement on the future of the European project would parallel disagreements on other salient issues in national politics, there will most likely be a match between EU attitudes and ideological positions. If voters then base their choices at the polls on a comparison between their own ideological position and those of the political parties, congruence between mass opinion and elite opinion on EU affairs would be established, even though perhaps not a single voter took EU attitudes as such into account. Hence, it is also crucial to determine whether voting on the basis of one’s attitudes about European integration would lead to different vote choice than deciding on the basis of other considerations, in particular perceived ideological agreement.

In the following, we first discuss the role of both national as well as EP elections in legitimizing political decision making within the EU and its implications for the democratic deficit discussion. Next, we identify the ways in which voters should ideally make their choices at the polls – in order to guarantee a “truly democratic” European polity. We then analyze to what extent voters actually meet these expectations. In doing so, we compare the impact of attitudes towards European integration on vote choice in national parliamentary elections to their impact in EP elections, and determine whether purely EU-based voting would have resulted in different outcomes. We conclude by discussing the implications of our findings for the functioning of democracy in the EU and the related debate on the democratic deficit.

2 The process of dual legitimation and the democratic deficit

European integration is not an isolated event. The process fits the worldwide development that is referred to by terms like “transnationalization” or “globalization”. These developments are considered a response to the fact that many of today’s problems cannot be adequately dealt with at the level of the nation state. The rise of transnational organizations such as NATO or WTO fits this shift to new modes of governance. What distinguishes the EU from almost all other transnational organizations, is the way power and decision making are legitimized democratically. No other transnational organization has similar structures that allow for, albeit indirect, citizen involvement.

When the EU is judged in terms of its democratic quality, it should be no surprise that the standards used for judgment are those of the kind of polity that does have its powers legitimized

through citizen involvement: the nation state. Whether it is appropriate to judge the EU on the basis of criteria developed in relation to democracies at the national level, is a matter of ongoing debate (see for example Coultrap, 1999; Katz, 2001). However, it is difficult to imagine studying the EU without any reference to how national democracies function. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that the EU differs substantially from the nation states it builds on and comprises, and thus judge the EU in its own right.

Legitimation of political power takes place differently in polities at a different scale. Dahl (1994) drew a parallel between the transformation from city states to nation states and the transformation from nation states to transnational systems. The former transformation was accompanied by a shift in the idea about the nature of democracy: whereas in the city state democracy was characterized by direct citizen involvement, the transformation to the nation state shifted the meaning of democracy by putting central the notion of representation. Similarly, Dahl argued, the transformation to transnational political systems may also require re-thinking the concept of democracy. The replacement of direct citizen involvement by elected representatives may need an equivalent at the transnational level, as the system of representative democracy as we know it may no longer be suitable.

The most thorough answer to this problem in relation to the EU is that of *dual legitimation* (Beetham and Lord, 1998). In this view, transnational political systems like the EU can only be democratic if citizens are provided with two channels to control political power: directly elected representatives at the European level *and* processes of authorization, representation, and accountability at the national level focused on the behavior of political leaders in transnational political structures. This view builds on the presumption that the EU can neither be adequately democratized through the *intergovernmental* approach, nor through the *supranational* approach. The former implies that the EU is basically a collaboration of nation states, and hence democratic legitimation depends on ratification of treaties by national parliaments, domestic elections for the EP, national allocation of Commissioners and MEPs, and authorization and accountability processes between European Council and Council of Ministers and the national parliaments. The supranational approach implies that the EU becomes a full-blown democracy in its own right, with an EU-wide election of the union's political leadership, and authorization and accountability processes between Commission and EP and between EP and European electorate. Because either approach is characterized by severe problems, the only solution seems to be to combine elements of both approaches and thus establish a process of dual legitimation (see Beetham and Lord, 1998).

Beetham and Lord (1998) also emphasized that the presence of democratic procedures, which establish processes of authorization, representation, and accountability through both channels, is not sufficient. They argue that the EU also needs to deliver, so to speak. This distinction between democratic procedures on the one hand, and adequate performance with respect to key policies on the other hand, is central in many writings, including Scharpf's (1999) distinction between *input legitimacy* and *output legitimacy*. In fact, deciding about the trade-off between citizen participation versus system effectiveness may well be the crucial dilemma for those deciding about the European integration (Dahl, 1994). The fact that this indeed often does involve a trade-off, is the precise reason why the legitimacy problems that the EU faces are considered unsolvable (Höreth, 1999).

Indeed, over the past years many authors have claimed that the EU suffers from a so-called democratic deficit. The more widespread the use of a particular concept becomes, the less clear its meaning. This statement clearly applies to the democratic deficit discussion. Although the term is widely used, it is far from clear what it exactly means. Or perhaps one should put it differently: because the concept has been so widely used, its exact meaning has blurred over the years. Being attentive to political, public, and academic discussions, some scholars have attempted to construct what they referred to as the "standard version" of the democratic deficit (Weiler, Haltern, and Mayer, 1995). More recently, Føllesdal and Hix (2006) have updated the "standard version" and identified five claims made by those who speak about a democratic deficit. These are some of the key problems that scholars have identified in the dual legitimation process of the EU.

The first claim refers to the fact that the European integration process has supposedly increased the power of the executive at the cost of national parliaments (Andersen and Burns, 1996; Raunio, 1999). Second, the EP, the only directly elected institution, has a relatively weak position in the European institutional configuration between Parliament, Commission and Council, because it is unable to perform the central function of a parliament, namely controlling the executive and holding it accountable (Kielmannsegg, 1996; Schmitt, 2002; Nugent, 2003). Third, even though the powers of the EP may have increased in recent years, European elections are primarily “second-order” in nature, meaning that national policy concerns dominate and no European-wide political parties compete (Reif and Schmitt, 1980, see also Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996; Schmitt and Thomassen, 1999; Schmitt, 2002). Fourth, European institutions are seen as “too distant from ordinary European citizens” (Føllesdal and Hix, 2006: 536). That is to say, the characteristics of the European polity exacerbate the lack of direct input from European citizens. Consider, for example, the lack of transparency of decision-making within the Council (Sbragia, 1992; Wallace and Smith, 1995; Nentwich, 1996; Magnette, 2003) or the weakness of an European public sphere (Meyer, 1999; Gerhards, 2000, 2001; Downey and Koenig, 2006). Finally, scholars argue that the policies adopted at the EU level are not supported by a majority of European citizens (see, for example, Scharpf, 1997, 1999). The predominantly neo-liberal character of the single market and the monetarist framework of the European Monetary Union (EMU) seem to have produced a “policy drift” from voters’ preferences, who on average are more in favor of a stronger regulated and social Europe (Hix, 1999; Hooghe, 2003, see also Schäfer, 2006a, 2006b). The “no” vote in the French and Dutch referendums fits this last claim. If national elections are not fought on European affairs, there is no guarantee that decisions made by European policy makers reflect the majority opinion. If particular decisions, such as the approval of the Constitutional Treaty, are then subjected to a referendum, it should be no surprise that the outcome will not always be positive (Aarts and Van der Kolk, 2006).

Several scholars have questioned these claims (Majone, 1996; Moravcsik, 2002; Zweifel, 2002). Arguably, Majone (1998) went furthest, arguing that decisions made within the EU do not need democratic legitimation. His starting point is the observation that the kind of policies adopted at the transnational level are those that are rather “apolitical” in which citizens are hardly interested and which are often beyond direct governmental control at the national level (see also Moravcsik, 2002). In this view, democratic legitimation by citizen participation would only become normatively justified if value-laden decisions would be taken at the European level. But precisely because there is no support among the European electorates for the transfer of such powers to the EU, this transfer has not taken place. Consequently, Majone argues, there is no need to arrange citizen involvement, directly or indirectly, to legitimize policy making in the EU at the present time.

A second objection to the notion of the democratic deficit is put forward by scholars who do think that citizen participation is crucial and that checks and balances are necessary, but who argue that the current institutional structure at the European level provides sufficient opportunities and safeguards. The basic argument here is that the intergovernmental processes by itself, but certainly in combination with a directly elected Parliament that has substantial rights when it comes to the selection of the European Commission, suffice for considering the EU democratic. Or put in the words of Moravcsik: “Constitutional checks and balances, indirect democratic control via national governments, and the increasing powers of the European Parliament are sufficient to ensure that EU policy-making is, in nearly all cases, clean, transparent, effective and politically responsive to the demands of European citizens” (2002: 605). In as far as there are deficiencies, he argues, these are not more severe than in any other national democratic system.

The arguments put forward by Moravcsik (2002) combine two approaches: comparing the practice of EU politics to democratic ideals as well as to the practice of democratic politics within nation states. A similar approach was adopted by Zweifel (2002), who examined whether the EU fulfilled criteria put forward by a range of scholars as definition of democracy. Zweifel (2002: 816-7) uses several established scales of democracy measurement, such as Freedom House, to demonstrate

that the relatively new European polity shows similar levels of democracy to the United States and Switzerland, which are considered respectable democracies.

3 The ideal and actual role of voters in the EU

What becomes clear from our discussion of the process of dual legitimation in the EU and the presumed democratic deficit of EU politics, is that the democratic quality of the EU polity is debatable. Nonetheless, many political scientists studying EU politics would agree that there should be some sort of mechanism in order to enable public input in policy-making at the EU level. The elections to the EP are the most straightforward mechanism in order to ensure this public scrutiny. However, these elections do not always serve their democratic objective as they are dominated by national concerns. Indeed, researchers have put forward a rather skeptical view of the input of voters in EU affairs. Franklin, Van der Eijk and others argued that European politics is in a “crisis of legitimacy” (Franklin and Van der Eijk, 1996: 3). In their view, the origins of the democratic deficit at the EU level stem not so much from the weak institutional position of the EP, but rather from the inability of EP elections to perform its basic democratic function: the EP lacks a mandate to use its power. EP elections “are fought primarily on the basis of national political concerns, rather than on problems relevant to the European arena” (Franklin and Van der Eijk, 1996: 7).

One could argue, however, that, neither the mere fact that people vote similarly in EP elections as in national elections, nor the fact that votes in EP elections are based on attitudes dominant in national politics, need to be problematic as such. There are two scenarios in which those situations would not automatically lead to deficiencies in the democratic character of the EU. First, if considerations that are relevant at the European level also play a role in elections at the national level, voting similarly in EP elections as in national elections would not be problematic from a normative perspective. At present, it may even prove more effective for voters seeking a voice in the integration process to do so via national elections, as these elections provide them with the opportunity to authorize and hold accountable their national representatives, who in turn shape the course of integration in the Council of Ministers and the European Council (Gabel, 2000; Mair, 2005, 2007). Hence, as long as voters base their choices in national elections on their opinions about European integration, there is little need to also do so in the context of EP elections. In brief, the crucial question is not whether opinions about European integration are voiced in *EP* elections, but whether they are voiced in *national* elections. And if differences in the impact of EU attitudes between both types of elections can be observed, democracy in the EU would be best served if their impact was largest in national rather than EP elections.

The second situation in which the presumed deficiencies may not be as problematic as often argued, has to do with the way in which attitudes about European integration correlate with ideological divisions, cleavage structures, and policy preferences with respect to other salient issues. Consider the following example. If all British voters would base their vote choice in all elections on their own social class position and the extent to which competing parties serve the interests of their class, and if opinions about European integration would strongly correlate with their social class position (e.g., lower class voters and parties opposing and middle class voters and parties supporting European integration), then there is no reason for British voters to base their electoral choices on their EU opinions. In this case, the EU issue adds no additional information to a voter’s choice for a particular party. The same logic would apply to the impact of ideology or policy preferences concerning other salient issues.

Hence, in order to judge the extent to which voters can express their positions towards Europe and hold European elites accountable, and with that to evaluate the democratic quality of the EU, one needs to look at national and EP elections simultaneously. Furthermore, it is necessary to identify to what extent opinions about European integration parallel cleavage structures, ideological divisions, and salient policy preferences. This paper attempts to tackle both these issues.

We assess the democratic quality of European decision-making by taking up the notion of dual legitimation as developed by Beetham and Lord (1998). Thus, decision-making in the EU can only be democratic if citizens are provided with two channels to control political power: (1) directly elected representatives at the European level, and (2) processes of authorization, representation, and accountability at the national level focused on the behavior of political leaders in transnational political structures. In the EU context, two such pathways exist through which citizens may seek to exert influence on EU policy-making and institutions or to control its outputs, namely EP and national elections. The EU polity, thus, consists of two “channels of political influence, with two sets of delegates who may be mandated, and with two arenas in which politics might be played out” (Mair, 2007: 8). The interesting question then becomes, if voters actually use both of these channels in order to express their attitudes regarding European integration or hold European or national political elites accountable for policies originating from the EU level.

To tackle this issue, this paper compares the extent to which voters utilize their EU preferences in national versus EP elections. Before we do so, let us first briefly discuss the operationalizations, methods and data used in the empirical analysis.

4 Operationalization, data and methods

In order to assess the democratic quality of the EU, we have to analyze the extent to which attitudes towards European integration influence vote choice in national elections as well as EP elections. A data source that allows such a direct comparison is the European Election Survey (EES). Although this survey is aimed at understanding vote choice in EP elections, respondents were also asked about their vote preferences in national elections. In this paper we utilize the 2004 EES data.

Because the ten member states that fairly recently joined the EU have such a different position compared to the fifteen older members, we only focus on the latter. More specifically, we selected five countries out of the EU-15 that differ in terms of the saliency of the European integration issue. Germany and Spain are examples of two countries that have witnessed relatively little debate on European integration in national politics. Britain and Denmark take a different position, as European integration has been more widely debated in the national political arena of those countries. Finally, we included the Netherlands because of its intermediate position: the European integration issue appears to have become more salient only recently, when the Constitutional Treaty was submitted to a popular vote in a referendum – the negative result has not gone unnoticed.

If one is interested in deviations between vote choice in national elections and EP elections, one could compare the way that individuals have voted in both elections. However, such a comparison would entail one crucial problem: usually both elections are held at different points in time and hence any incongruence between vote choices in both elections need not be a consequence of the difference in level (national vs. EU). Since the EES was conducted shortly after the 2004 EP elections, in several cases there exists quite a time-lag between the last national parliamentary election prior to 2004 and the time-point at which this survey was administered. We therefore analyze vote choice in national elections on the basis of another measure, namely a question that asks voters shortly after the EP elections how they would vote “if there was a general election tomorrow” (in some countries the name of the legislative body was explicitly included in the question; e.g., in the Netherlands the “Second Chamber” was mentioned).

We perform two analyses with two different dependent variables; one estimating a model explaining a respondents’ vote preference in national parliamentary elections “tomorrow” and one analyzing their vote choice in the 2004 EP elections. We limit our analyses to parties that took part in both elections analyzed. This allows for a more fruitful comparison between vote preference in the parliamentary elections and voters’ actual choices in the 2004 EP elections, as any incongruence observed is then not biased by differences in the supply of alternative parties. In doing so, we for example exclude EU single issue parties that only compete in the EP elections, such as the Dutch

Europa Transparant headed by “whistleblower” Paul van Buitenen, but also the Movement of June and the People’s Movement Against the EU in Denmark for example, which are groupings that originally belonged to mainstream Danish parties but compete separately in EP elections. The parties included in the analysis are listed in the appendix.

To analyze EU issue voting in national and EP elections, we employ a conditional logit model (CL). All variables were standardized around their respective means. Since our dependent variable is categorical in nature, but has multiple values – i.e. vote choice for different parties – we need to address several methodological concerns (see Alvarez and Nagler, 1998; Agresti, 2002). First, since the probability of voting for a party can only vary between 0 and 1, ordinary least squares regression analysis is ruled out. The use of an ordered probit or logit model is also not appropriate, as it assumes the electoral space to be one-dimensional. Moreover, we use a CL rather than a multinomial logit (MNL) model. CL models are more appropriate when modeling electoral behavior in a spatial setting since they are based on positions of voters relative to parties rather than focusing solely on information about individual voters, as MNL does (Alvarez and Nagler, 1998: 56). One potential problem with a conditional logit model is the independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA) assumption. IIA means that the ratio of the choice probabilities for two alternatives, A and B, is independent from all other alternatives in the choice set (see Agresti, 2002). We computed a Hausman test statistic for the respective elections, which demonstrated that the IIA assumption seems reasonable. All estimations were conducted in STATA version 9.

We included four types of variables in the model. First, we included two variables to reflect the impact of cleavage structures. More specifically, we included a self-classification measure of social class and a measure of church attendance as proxy for religiosity. These variables range from a minimum value of 1 indicating “lower class” or “go to church every Sunday” to a maximum value of 5 indicating “upper class” or “never go to church” respectively. Second, we included a measure for perceived ideological agreement in terms of the left/right continuum. We simply computed the difference between the score individuals assigned to oneself from the scores they awarded each party. Third, we included a measure that indicates the voter’s evaluation of the performance of the national government. This links up with theories of retrospective voting, as well as with the hypothesis that EP elections are second-order national elections in which voters express their approval or disapproval of the *national* government. The survey item asks respondents if they “approve or disapprove the government’s record to date” (1 indicates disapproval and 2 indicates approval). Note that we have not included measures of partisanship – American readers might be surprised about this – because in many European countries it appears virtually impossible to disentangle party identification from vote choice, and hence the concept has no value as an explanatory variable (Thomassen, 1976; Thomassen and Rosema, in press).

To examine the extent of EU issue voting, we constructed a EU distance variable that indicates voters’ perceived (dis)agreement with political parties on the issue of European integration. The variable measures the absolute distance between a respondents’ self- and party placements on an EU scale. Respondents were asked to place themselves as well as several political parties on a ten-point European integration scale, where 1 stands for the process “has already gone to far” and 10 stands for the process “should be pushed further”. If attitudes on European integration have an independent effect on vote choice, the effect of EU issue distance should be negative and significant. In other words, an increase in disagreement between a respondent’s EU position and a party’s EU position should lead to a decrease in the likelihood of the respondent to vote for the party – a process referred to as *EU issue voting* (De Vries, 2007).

5 EU issue voting in national parliamentary elections

Let us start with exploring EU issue voting in national parliamentary elections. After all, the whole debate on the democratic deficit builds on the presumption that European integration plays virtually no role in national politics. Former President of the European Commission Jacques Delors identified this as the major problem, as he argued that “the problem with democracy in the European Union is not the insufficient incorporation of national governments into the Union’s political system, but the inadequate incorporation of the Union into the domestic politics of member societies” (cited in Beetham and Lord, 1998: 70).

Table 1 to Table 5 show the impact of attitudes regarding European integration, as well as the impact of cleavage structure, ideological divisions, and retrospective evaluations of national governments. The tables provide two types of estimates: conditional logit regression coefficients and odds ratios. The latter allow for more specific interpretations of the results (see Agresti, 2002; Long and Freese, 2006). An odds ratio refers to the change in the odds of the outcome for a unit increase in the predictor. Note that an odds ratio greater than 1 indicates a positive relationship, an odds ratio smaller than 1 indicates a negative relationship and an odds ratio 1 indicates no relationship. Odds ratios can be expressed as percent changes by using the following formula: $100 * (\text{odds ratio} - 1)$.

The models are based on the assumption that effects of ideology and policy preferences are uniform across parties: for each party, we expect that as perceived differences with a political party in terms of ideology (left/right) or policy preferences (European integration) increase, the chance of voting for that party decreases. This is reflected by the fact that a single coefficient represents the effect of these factors for all parties. With respect to social class, religion, and government approval, on the other hand, we expect different effects across parties. For example, we expect a working class self-image to have a positive effect on the chance of voting for some parties (e.g., Labor parties), but a negative or no effect with respect to other parties. The same applies to religiosity and incumbent approval. This is reflected by the fact that these factors are represented by a separate coefficient for each party.

Table 1: Explaining vote choice in national elections: results of conditional logit analysis, Spain (Pseudo $R^2 = .64$)

	ALL	PSOE	IU
Left/Right	-1.27* (.16) .28	-	-
EU Attitude	.27 (.30) 1.31	-	-
Government Approval	-	3.51* (.30) 33.45	1.25* (.25) 3.49
Class	-	-.29 (.28) .75	-.06 (.28) .94
Religiosity	-	.73* (.28) 2.07	.28 (.28) 1.33

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Partido Popular (People’s Party-PP) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 2: Explaining vote choice in national elections: results of conditional logit analysis, Germany (Pseudo R² = .13)

	ALL	Rep	FDP	SPD	Bd90/G	Linke
Left/Right	-.22* (.07) .80	-	-	-	-	
EU Attitude	-.17 (.16) .85	-	-	-	-	
Government Approval	-	-1.20* (.30) .30	-.97* (.31) .38	-1.89* (.28) .15	-1.41* (.29) .24	-1.01* (.31) .36
Class	-	-.27 (.20) .76	.20 (.20) 1.23	-.20 (.20) .82	-.09 (.20) .82	-.40* (.20) .76
Religiosity	-	.72* (.20) 2.06	.59* (.20) 1.81	1.29* (.21) 3.62	.70* (.21) 2.02	1.00* (.21) 2.72

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Christian Democratic Party (Christlich Demokratische Union/ Christlich-Soziale Union – CDU/CSU) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 3: Explaining vote choice in national elections: results of conditional logit analysis, the Netherlands (Pseudo R² = .32)

	ALL	VVD	LPF	CU/SGP	CDA	D66	GL	SP
Left/Right	-1.10* (.09) .33	-	-	-				
EU Attitude	-.19* (.09) .83	-	-	-				
Government Approval	-	1.87* (.24) 6.49	.74* (.26) 2.10	.82* (.27) 2.27	2.44* (.23) 11.47	.82* (.24) 2.27	.41* (.24) 1.51	.83* (.25) 2.29
Class	-	.85* (.22) 2.33	.24 (.22) 1.27	.48* (.24) 1.62	.34 (.21) 1.40	.71* (.21) 2.03	.46* (.19) 1.58	.34 (.22) 1.40
Religiosity	-	.20 (.23) 1.22	.24 (.20) 1.27	-1.27* (.23) .29	-.72* (.22) .49	-.28 (.22) .75	-.17 (.20) .84	-.11 (.24) .90

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Labour Party (Partij van de Arbeid – PvdA) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 4: Explaining vote choice in national elections: results of conditional logit analysis, Denmark (Pseudo R² = .32)

	ALL	DF	V	KF	RV	SF
Left/Right	-.84* (.06) .43	-	-	-	-	-
EU Attitude	-.31* (.06) .73	-	-	-	-	-
Government Approval	-	1.44* (.16) 4.2	2.84* (.15) 17.12	1.51* (.15) 4.53	.72* (.12) 2.05	.67* (.12) 1.95
Class	-	.19 (.15) 1.21	.55* (.14) 1.74	.85* (.15) 2.34	.72* (.13) 2.05	.47* (.12) 1.59
Religiosity	-	.22 (.16) 1.25	-.06 (.14) .94	-.04 (.15) .96	-.05 (.13) .96	.00 (.13) 1.00

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. Social Democracy (Socialdemokratiet-S) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 5: Explaining vote choice in national elections: results of conditional logit analysis, United Kingdom (Pseudo R² = .23)

	ALL	Con	LibDem	SNP	PC	UKIP
Left/Right	-.95* (.09) .39	-	-	-	-	-
EU Attitude	-.44* (.10) .64	-	-	-	-	-
Government Approval	-	-2.63* (.14) .07	-1.64* (.13) .19	-1.08* (.13) .34	-1.24* (.12) .29	-1.48* (.13) .23
Class	-	.56* (.15) 1.74	.27* (.16) 1.32	.38* (.15) 1.47	.31* (.15) 1.36	.34* (.15) 1.41
Religiosity	-	-.19 (.13) .83	-.18 (.13) .84	-.28* (.13) .76	-.18 (.13) .84	-.34* (.14) .71

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Labour Party (Labour-LAB) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

The key figures in the tables are those that concern the impact of attitudes about European integration. These figures indicate to what extent EU issue voting occurred. The results are mixed. In Spain and Germany we find no evidence of EU issue voting in national elections, whereas EU issue voting is present in national elections in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Britain. In these countries, the EU issue distance variable is both negative and significant, indicating that as the distance between a voter and a party on the EU scale increases, the likelihood of that voter voting for this

respective party decreases. So in these countries EU issue voting exists independent from traditional sources (cleavage structure, ideology, retrospective evaluations) influencing voters' decisions at the ballot box.

At least as important as the fact *that* attitudes concerning European integration have an impact on vote choice, is *how strong* their impact is. Particularly relevant is how it compares to the impact of ideology and incumbent approval. It should be no surprise that perceived ideological differences have a stronger impact on vote choice than EU attitudes (this can be seen in the tables: odds ratios for left/right deviate more strongly from 1 than odds ratios for EU attitudes). After all, ideological labels like "left" and "right" almost by definition comprise the most important disagreements in politics – if they do not, the meaning of those labels presumably shifts (see, for example, Rosema, Aarts, and Van der Kolk, in press). Hence, any single issue – whether this is European integration or another (domestic) issue – may be expected to have a weaker impact than left/right. From the perspective of democratic quality this is not bad, as the left/right continuum may be viewed as a shortcut to a much wider range of policies (cf. Downs, 1957).

Whereas the impact of left/right ideology may be conceived of as serving the future-oriented mandate function of elections, the impact of incumbent approval serves the accountability function. In elections, voters are expected (in a normative sense) to base their choice, at least partly, on their judgment of the incumbent government. This is what we indeed observe in all five countries: the impact of incumbent approval clearly exceeds the impact of EU attitudes. So in national elections voters indeed express their approval or disapproval of the national government by opting to vote for a particular party.

6 EU issue voting in EP elections

Before we analyze the extent of EU issue voting in EP elections, let us first explore the extent to which voters actually switch their vote preferences when deciding which party to vote for in both kinds of elections. Table 6 conveys this information for our five cases, as well as the ten other member states of the EU-15. It lists the percentages of voters that prefer to vote for the same party in national elections "tomorrow" as just voted for in the EP elections ("stable voters"), as well as the percentage of voters that prefer to switch party in a national parliamentary election as compared to the 2004 EP elections ("switching voters"). Recall that these percentages are based only on vote preferences for parties that compete in both the national and EP elections, and hence we might underestimate the differences between national elections and EP elections.

The table shows that there is extensive variation in the degree to which voters switch parties between both electoral channels. In Spain, for example, virtually all voters (97 percent) indicate that they would vote for the same party in national elections as they voted for in the 2004 EP elections. The situation is starkly different in Sweden and Britain. In these countries almost thirty percent of the electorate indicates that they prefer to vote for a different party nationally. Note that the five cases we selected – Britain, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain – cover the range of party switching between both electoral channels. Spain and Germany showed low levels of switching, whereas Britain demonstrated a high percentage of voters that changed their vote preference. The percentages in the cases of the Netherlands and Denmark are close to the average level for the EU-15.

Table 6: Discrepancy between vote choice in 2004 EP elections and vote choice in national parliamentary elections in the EU-15

Country	Percentage Stable Voters	Percentage Changing Voters
Spain	97.2	2.8
Greece	93.8	6.2
Portugal	92.0	8.0
Germany	91.2	8.8
Finland	87.8	12.2
Italy	84.1	15.9
<i>Average for EU-15</i>	<i>83.5</i>	<i>16.5</i>
Netherlands	82.9	17.1
Belgium	82.3	17.7
Austria	81.3	18.7
Denmark	81.3	18.7
France	81.1	18.9
Ireland	79.3	20.7
Luxembourg	75.6	24.4
Sweden	71.4	28.6
Britain	71.5	28.5

Note: Stable voters indicate the percentage of voters that prefer to vote the same party as in national parliamentary elections as in the 2004 EP elections; changing voters indicate the percentage of voters that prefer to vote for a different party in national parliamentary elections compared to the 2004 EP elections.

In the next step, we analyze the extent to which voters form vote preferences on the basis of their EU attitudes in the European realm. We perform similar conditional logit regressions as above, but now attempting to explain vote preferences in the 2004 EP elections. The results are presented in Table 7 to Table 11. The first observation is that in Spain and Germany EU issue voting does not occur in EP elections either, whereas in the Netherlands, Denmark and Britain EU attitudes do have an impact. The comparison of EU issue voting in the national and European electoral channel among these five different cases shows that if EU issue voting exists in a country, it exists in both electoral channels. In other words, if the EU issue influences electoral and party politics, it does so at the national as well as the European level. Although some scholars have argued that there may be possibilities for national elites to either contain the EU issue to the European level or depoliticize the issue within the national arena (Worre, 1996; Mair, 2000), these results show a different pattern, at least for 2004.

Table 7: Explaining vote choice in EP elections: results of conditional logit analysis, Spain (Pseudo R² = .68)

	ALL	PSOE	IU
Left/Right	-1.62* (.22) .20	-	-
EU Attitude	.06 (.04) 1.06	-	-
Government Approval	-	3.82* (.42) 45.60	1.48 (.37) 4.39
Class	-	.28 (.39) 1.33	.18 (.39) 1.20
Religiosity	-	1.17* (.37) 3.23	.76* (.37) 2.15

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Partido Popular (People's Party-PP) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 8: Explaining vote choice in EP elections: results of conditional logit analysis, Germany (Pseudo R² = .16)

	ALL	Rep	FDP	SPD	Bd90/G	Linke
Left/Right	-.25* (.09) .78	-	-	-	-	-
EU Attitude	-.20 (.20) .82	-	-	-	-	-
Government Approval	-	-1.13* (.35) .32	-.89* (.34) .41	-1.89* (.33) .15	-1.48* (.33) .23	-.92* (.37) .40
Class	-	-.32 (.25) .73	.34 (.26) 1.40	-.61* (.25) .54	-.27 (.26) .76	-.43* (.25) .65
Religiosity	-	.95* (.25) 2.58	.94* (.26) 2.56	1.39* (.26) 4.02	.74* (.25) 2.08	1.14* (.27) 3.12

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Christian Democratic Party (Christlich Demokratische Union/ Christlich-Soziale Union – CDU/CSU) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 9: Explaining vote choice in EP elections: results of conditional logit analysis, the Netherlands (Pseudo R² = .32)

	ALL	VVD	LPF	CU/SGP	CDA	D66	GL	SP
Left/Right	-.84* (.09) .43	-	-	-				
EU Attitude	-.28* (.11) .76	-	-	-				
Government Approval	-	2.31* (.27) 10.07	1.11* (.31) 3.03	1.36* (.29) 3.90	2.82* (.26) 16.78	1.40* (.29) 4.06	.88* (.28) 2.41	.58* (.32) 1.79
Class	-	.49* (.27) 1.63	.19 (.27) 1.21	.07 (.26) 1.07	.41* (.25) 1.51	.53* (.26) 1.70	.74* (.23) 2.10	-.08 (.25) .92
Religiosity	-	.17 (.26) 1.18	-.01 (.28) .99	-1.43* (.25) .24	-.69* (.25) .50	-.14 (.26) .87	-.28 (.23) .76	-.18 (.26) .84

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Labour Party (Partij van de Arbeid –PvdA) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 10: Explaining vote choice in EP elections: results of conditional logit analysis, Denmark (Pseudo R² = .26)

	ALL	DF	V	KF	RV	SF
Left/Right	-.77* (.07) .46	-	-	-	-	-
EU Attitude	-.39* (.07) .67	-	-	-	-	-
Government Approval	-	.87* (.18) 2.39	1.89* (.17) 6.62	1.19* (.16) 3.29	.65* (.14) 1.92	.46* (.14) 1.58
Class	-	.42* (.17) 1.53	.83* (.16) 2.29	.82* (.15) 2.26	.68* (.14) 1.97	.34* (.14) 1.41
Religiosity	-	.08 (.18) 1.08	-.16 (.16) .85	-.03 (.17) .97	-.11 (.15) .89	.15 (.15) 1.17

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. Social Democracy (Socialdemokratiet-S) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables. * significant at $p < .05$.

Table 11: Explaining vote choice in EP elections: results of conditional logit analysis, United Kingdom (Pseudo R² = .19)

	ALL	Con	LibDem	SNP	PC	UKiP
Left/Right	-.50* (.11) .61	-	-	-	-	-
EU Attitude	-.55* (.13) .58	-	-	-	-	-
Government Approval	-	-2.09* (.18) .12	-1.44* (.16) .24	-.96* (.15) .38	-1.17* (.15) .31	-2.29* (.18) .10
Class	-	.73* (.19) 2.07	.38* (.20) 1.46	.37* (.19) 1.45	.38* (.20) 1.46	.62* (.20) 1.86
Religiosity	-	-.19 (.17) .82	-.02 (.16) .98	-.35* (.17) .71	-.29* (.17) .74	-.62* (.17) .54

Notes: Table entries are conditional logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses as well as odds ratios. The Labour Party (Labour-LAB) is the omitted reference group for individual-specific variables.* significant at $p < .05$.

A close inspection of the odds ratios for the EU distance variable reveals that the extent of EU issue voting in EP elections is of a similar magnitude as in national elections, or slightly higher. In case of the Netherlands, for example, the percentage by which the odds of voting for a party in the EP elections change for a unit increase in EU issue distance amounts to -24%, while it is -17% for vote preferences in the national context. Similarly, in Denmark the change in the odds of voting for a party for a unit increase in EU issue distance amounts to -33% in EP elections and -27% in the national context, whereas the corresponding figures for Britain are -42% in EP elections and -36% in national elections. In brief, in EP elections voters' attitudes concerning European integration have a slightly stronger impact in EP elections as compared to national parliamentary elections.

Let us now shift to the impact of approval of the *national government* on vote choice in the 2004 EP elections. The idea that EP elections constitute second order national elections entails that even though national governmental power is not at stake in EP elections, voters still base their choice on their approval of the national government. The figures indicate that in Spain and Germany the impact of government approval in EP elections is similar to its impact in national elections. At this point in the analysis this comes as no surprise, as we showed above that in these countries voters seldom switch parties between both kinds of elections. This means that the effects of particular factors will by definition be virtually identical.

The more interesting cases are the three countries in which vote switching occurred more frequently. Here we see unanticipated differences. Denmark and Britain show the pattern one might expect. Albeit incumbent approval affects the probability of voting for each party in the EP elections, its effect is somewhat weaker than in national elections (odds ratios deviate less strongly from 1 in EP elections as compared to national elections). For example, in Britain approval of the (Labour) government results in much smaller chances to vote for the Conservatives or Liberal Democrats, but in the EP election this effects is somewhat smaller than in national elections (the only exception is the UK Independence Party). In the Netherlands, on the other hand, the pattern is reversed. The impact of government approval is *stronger* in EP elections than in national elections. This is what one would expect if EP elections serve as a means to express discontent with the government, but then in a sense enables voters to go back to the government party. The 2004 EP elections in the Netherlands appear to have been truly second-order *national* elections.

7 Representation and European integration

A key function of elections is to ensure congruence between the policy preferences of those who are governed and those who govern (Powell, 2000). If citizens would strongly base their vote choice on their opinions concerning European integration, it is fairly likely that the decisions of the European political elite match the desires of their electorates. The analyses presented above, however, indicate that in some countries attitudes concerning European integration have no effect at all, whereas in other countries its effect is fairly modest. The question rises whether this means that democracy is poorly served by those elections, at least as far as the crucial issue of European integration is concerned. In the introduction of this paper, we argued that is not necessarily the case. It will depend on the way attitudes about European integration are related to the factors that do influence vote choice strongly, in particular cleavage structures and ideological divisions.

There are different ways to examine this matter. One straightforward option would be to just analyze the relationship between cleavage structure and ideological divisions on the one hand, and positions regarding the issue of European integration on the other hand. An alternative method, which we employ here, is to focus not on the determinants of vote choice, but on their effects. More specifically, the question we address next is whether the votes that citizens cast serve their policy preferences regarding European integration. We analyze this by determining which party voters perceived as having the most similar views with respect to European integration, and comparing this with their actual vote choice. In other words, we test to what extent citizens vote preferences conform to the "smallest distance hypothesis" applied to the European integration issue (cf. Downs, 1957; Enelow and Hinich, 1984). We perform this analysis for both national elections and EP elections.

Our analysis presented above indicates that European integration had no impact on vote choice in Spain and Germany, whereas it had in the three other countries. Hence, one might expect that Spanish and German citizens vote for parties that hold similar views on European integration less often than those in the three other countries. This, however, appears not to be the case. In fact, Spanish voters were much more likely to vote for the party they perceived as closest to them on the issue of European integration than voters in the four other countries (see Table 12). Among the latter, the differences are very limited: roughly half of the voters met the expectations of the smallest distance hypothesis applied to European integration. The deviating Spanish figures result in part from its party system (and therefore only three parties in the model, which means that the party voted for has by definition a better chance of being closest than in a model with more parties, like the other countries).

There are some differences between national elections and EP elections, but these are limited. The fact that opinions about European integration were given slightly more weight in EP elections than in national elections, is reflected in the figures in Table 12. In EP elections vote preferences link up with perceived agreement on the European integration issue slightly better.

When judging these figures, the glass can be considered either half empty or half full. To meaningfully interpret these figures, it is useful to compare them to the extent to which vote choice matches perceived ideological agreement, as left/right ideology is considered the most important factor (Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996). Analyses presented elsewhere (Rosema, in press) indicate that in Spain 72 per cent of all voters cast their EP vote in line with the smallest distance hypothesis applied to left/right ideology. Across the other four countries the figure varied between 50 per cent (Denmark) and 62 per cent (Britain), resulting in a mean score for these five countries of 60 per cent. The difference with the figure for European integration is so small (57 per cent in EP elections), that there seems little reason to be specifically worried about representation in terms of the European integration issue. If there is a problem regarding representation, it is as severe for the ideological positions as for the European integration issue.

Table 12: Percentage of voters whose vote preferences are in line with the “smallest distance hypothesis” applied to European integration.

	National Elections	EP Elections
Spain	76% (525)	74% (389)
Germany	48% (354)	55% (221)
Netherlands	47% (428)	52% (629)
Denmark	47% (877)	50% (619)
Britain	50% (959)	52% (591)
average	54%	57%

Notes: Table entries are percentage of voters who perceive the party they preferred to vote for as closest to them regarding stands on the issue of European integration. Number of observations are in parentheses. The Conservative People’s Party (Denmark) has been excluded, because data on perceptions of its issue stands are not available. Perceived issue positions of German CDU/CSU voters concern CDU; perceived issue positions of Dutch CU/SGP voters concern CU.

8 Conclusion

In the debate about the so-called democratic deficit of the European Union elections play a crucial role. Indeed, the choices that voters make have important implications for the functioning of democracy. Elections enable citizens to select politicians and parties that hold similar views and also to hold them accountable. If voters base their choice on their judgment of the performance in office of those who governed, as well as on their judgment of politicians plans for the future, the functions of elections are well served. It has been argued that in the European Union these mechanisms do not function properly (Føllesdal and Hix, 2006). One problem is that those who govern, in particular the European Commission, are neither authorized through popular contestation, nor held accountable to the European electorate or its representatives in the European Parliament. Voters have thus virtually no influence on who lead Europe from Brussels. Furthermore, in neither of the two electoral channels – EP elections and national elections – public opinion about European integration appears to play an important role (Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996). Arguably, the most crucial conclusion drawn in electoral research is that EP elections are basically fought and hence determined on the basis of national politics rather than European politics. Hence, EP elections are referred to as second-order national elections (Reif and Schmitt, 1980).

The key thought underlying much of the debate, seems that in European elections voters ought to base their choice on considerations related to EU politics. Hence the preoccupation in the literature with EP elections. At least as important, however, is the impact of EU attitudes in national elections (De Vries, 2007). After all, national ministers are key actors in EU decision-making in their role in the European Council and Council of Ministers. One could even argue that it makes more sense for voters to voice their opinions about European integration in the context of national politics,

since national ministers are more directly concerned with such policies than the European Parliament (cf. Mair, 2005). The key problem for democracy in the EU might well be, as former European Commission president Jacques Delors argued, the absence of the EU in *domestic* politics. Hence, in order to assess the democratic quality of the EU it is essential to simultaneously focus on EP elections and national elections and determine the impact of attitudes concerning European integration (we label this EU issue voting, cf. De Vries, 2007).

The analysis presented in both national and EP elections shows that both electoral channels are used by European voters to express their opinions regarding the European project. If EU issue voting exists in a country in the first place, it is likely to impact both national as well as European elections. So, at first glance, these findings would qualify the conclusion by Moravcsik (2002) among others that the current dual legitimation structure within the EU ensures public legitimation and accountability of EU politics. This being said, however, EU issue voting is not uniformly taking place across European and national elections within all member states. In Spain and Germany, for example, neither channel is used by voters to express their attitudes towards Europe. This may be due to a lack of concern for Europe among German and Spanish voters or a lack of conflict regarding the EU among German and Spanish political parties (see De Vries, 2007).

One may be tempted to conclude that if European integration plays no role in elections, the democratic quality of the European Union will suffer. This conclusion would only be warranted, however, if low salience of European affairs leads to incongruence between elite opinion and mass opinion, like became manifest in the French and Dutch 'No' vote in referendums on the Constitutional Treaty. Our analysis indicates, however, that there is no linear relationship between the extent to which EU issue voting takes place and the extent to which voters cast their votes for parties that hold similar views regarding European integration. Furthermore, if we compare the findings with research on the impact of left/right ideology in EP elections (Rosema, in press), citizens are not represented much more poorly in terms of their opinions on European integration as compared to left/right ideology. Because opinions about European integration are constrained by cleavage structures and ideological positions, voters' choices at the polls still link up with the ideals of representation fairly well. So, the mere fact that in EP elections voters vote similarly as in national elections, because they base their EP vote on considerations about domestic politics, does not tell us much about the democratic quality of the EU.

Appendix

Table A: List of parties included in the analysis

Country	Original Name	English Name	Acronym
Denmark	Dansk Folkeparti	Danish People's Party	DF
	Venstre	Liberals	V
	Konservative Folkeparti	Conservative People's Party	KF
	Radikale Venstre	Danish Social Liberal Party	RV
	Socialdemokratiet	Social Democratic Party	S
	Socialistisk Folkeparti	Socialist People's Party	SF
Germany	Republikaner	Republicans	Rep
	Christlich Demokratische Union / Christlich-Soziale Union	Christian Democratic Union / Christian Social Union	CDU/CSU
	Freie Demokratische Partei	Free Democratic Party	FDP
	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands	Social Democratic Party	SDP
	Bündnis'90/Die Grünen	Alliance '90/Greens	Bd90/G
	Die Linke / Partei des Demokratischen Sozialismus	The Left / Party of German Socialism	Linke
Netherlands	Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie	People's Party for Freedom and Democracy	VVD
	Lijst Pim Fortuyn	List Pim Fortuyn	LPF
	Christen Unie / Staatskundig Gereformeerde Partij	Christian Union / Reformed Political Party	CU/SGP
	Christen-Democratisch Appèl	Christian Democratic Appeal	CDA
	Partij van de Arbeid	Labour Party	PvdA
	Democraten 66	Democrats 66	D66
	Groen Links	Green Left	GL
	Socialistische Partij	Socialist Party	SP
Spain	Partido Popular	People's Party	PP
	Partido Socialista Obrero Español	Spanish Socialist Workers' Party	PSOE
	Convergencia I Unió	United Left	IU
United Kingdom		Conservative Party	CON
		UK Independence Party	UKIP
		Liberal Democrats	LIB
		Labour Party	LAB
		Plaid Cymru	PC
		Scottish National Party	SNP

References

- Aarts, K., & Van der Kolk, H., 2006. Understanding the Dutch 'No': the Euro, the East, and the elite. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 39 (2), 243-246.
- Agresti, A., 2002. *Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Alvarez, R. M., & Nagler, J., 1998. When politics and models collide: Estimating models of multiparty elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42 (1), 55-96.
- Andersen, S. S., & Burns, T., 1996. The European Union and the erosion of parliamentary democracy: A study of post-parliamentary governance. In S. S. Andersen & K. A. Eliassen (eds.), *The European Union: How Democratic is It?* (pp. 227-52). London: Sage Publications.
- Beetham, D., & Lord, C., 1998. *Legitimacy and the EU*. London: Longman.
- Coultrap, J., 1999. From parliamentarism to pluralism: Models of democracy and the European Union's 'democratic deficit'. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 11 (1), 107-35.
- Dahl, R. A., 1994. A democratic dilemma: system effectiveness versus citizen participation. *Political Science Quarterly*, 109 (1), 23-34.
- De Vries, C. E., 2007. Sleeping giant: fact or fairytale? How European integration affects vote choice in national elections. *European Union Politics*, 8 (3), 363-85.
- Downey, J. & Koenig, T., 2006. Is there a European public sphere? The Berlusconi-Schulz case. *European Journal of Communication*, 21 (2), 165-87.
- Downs, A., 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Enelow, J. M. & Hinich, M. J., 1984. *The Spatial Theory of Voting: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Føllesdal, A., 2006. Survey article: The legitimacy deficits of the European Union. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 14 (4), 441-468.
- Føllesdal, A., & Hix, S., 2006. Why there is a democratic deficit in the EU: A response to Majone and Moravcsik. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44 (3), 533-562.
- Franklin, M. N. & Van der Eijk, C., 1996. The problem: Representation and democracy in the European Union. In C. van der Eijk & M. N. Franklin (eds.), *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of the Union* (pp. 3-10). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gabel, M. J., 2000. European integration, voters, and national politics. *West European Politics*, 23 (4), 52-72.
- Gerhards, J., 2000. Europäisierung von Ökonomie und Politik und die Trägheit der Entstehung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit. In M. Bach (ed.), *Sonderheft 40 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie: Die Europäisierung nationaler Gesellschaften* (pp. 277-305). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Gerhards, J., 2001. Missing a European public sphere. In M. Kohli & M. Novak (eds.) *Will Europe Work* (pp. 145-58). London: Routledge.
- Hix, S. (1999) Dimensions and alignments in European Union politics: Cognitive constraints and partisan responses. *European Journal of Political Research*, 35 (1), 69-106.

- Hooghe, L., 2003. Europe divided? Elites vs. public opinion on European integration. *European Union Politics*, 4 (3), 281-305.
- Höreth, M., 1999. No way out for the beast? The unsolved legitimacy problem of European governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6 (2), 249-268.
- Katz, R. S., 2001. Models of democracy: Elite attitudes and the democratic deficit in the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 2 (1), 53-79.
- Kielmannsegg, P. G., 1996. Integration und Demokratie. In M. Jachtenfuchs & B. Kohler-Koch (eds.), *Europäische Integration* (pp. 47-71). Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Long, Scott J. & Freese, J., 2006. *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata. Second Edition*. College Station: Stata Press.
- Magnette, P., 2003. European governance and civic participation: Beyond elitist citizenship? *Political Studies*, 51 (1), 144-60.
- Mair, P., 2000. The limited impact of Europe on national party systems. *West European Politics*, 23 (4), 27-51.
- Mair, P., 2005. Popular democracy and the European Union polity. *European Governance Papers (EUROGOV) No. C-05-03*, <http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov/pdf/egp-connex-c-05-03.pdf>.
- Mair, P., 2007. Political opposition and the European Union. *Government and Opposition*, 42 (1), 1-17.
- Majone, G., 1998. Europe's 'democratic deficit': The question of standards. *European Law Journal*, 4 (1), 5-28.
- Meyer, C., 1999. Political legitimacy and the invisibility of politics: Exploring the European Union's communication deficit. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37 (4), 617-639.
- Moravcsik, A., 2002. In defence of the 'democratic deficit': Reassessing legitimacy in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40 (4), 603-624.
- Nentwich, M., 1996. Opportunity structures for citizens' participation: the case of the European Union. *European Integration Online Papers* 0 (1), <http://eiop.ac.at/eiop/texte/1996-001.htm>.
- Nugent, N., 2003. *The Government and Politics of the European Union*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Powell, G. Bingham, Jr., 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Raunio, T., 1999. Always one step behind? National legislatures and the European Union. *Government and Opposition*, 34 (2), 180-202.
- Reif, K., & Schmitt, H., 1980. Nine second-order national elections: A conceptual framework for the analysis of European election results. *European Journal of Political Research*, 8 (1), 3-44.
- Rosema, M., in press. Low turnout: threat to democracy or blessing in disguise? Consequences of citizens' varying tendencies to vote, *Electoral Studies*, 26 (3).
- Rosema, M., Aarts, K., & Van der Kolk, H., in press. De uitgesproken opvattingen van de Nederlandse kiezer. In K. Aarts, H. van der Kolk, & M. Rosema (eds.), *Een Verdeeld Electoraat: De Tweede Kamerverkiezingen van 2006*. Utrecht: Spectrum.
- Sbragia, A., 1992. *Euro-Politics: Institutions and Policy-Making in the 'New' European Community*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.

- Schäfer, A., 2006a. Die Demokratische Grenze Outputorientierter Legitimation. *Integration*, 29 (3), 106-119.
- Schäfer, A., 2006b. Nach dem Permissiven Konsens: Das Demokratiedefizit der Europäischen Union. *Leviathan*, 34 (3), 350-76.
- Scharpf, F., 1997. Economic integration, democracy and the welfare state. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4 (1), 128-145.
- Scharpf, F., 1999. *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, H., 2002. Willensbildung und Interessenvermittlung in der Europäischen Union. In D. Fuchs, E. Roller, & B. Weßels (eds.), *Bürger und Demokratie in Ost und West. Studien zur politischen Kultur und zum politischen Prozeß. Festschrift für Hans-Dieter Klingemann* (pp. 516-530). Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Schmitt, H. & Thomassen, J. J. A. (eds.), 1999. *Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomassen, J. J. A., 1976. Party identification as a cross-national concept: its meaning in the Netherlands. In I. Budge, I. Crewe, & D. Farlie (eds.), *Party Identification and Beyond: Representations of Voting and Party Competition*, London: Wiley.
- Thomassen, J., & Rosema, M., in press. Party identification revisited. In J. Bartle, & P. Bellucci, (eds.), *Partisanship: Party Identification, Social Identities and Political Experiences*, London: Routledge.
- Van der Eijk, C. & Franklin, M. N. (eds.), 1996. *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of the Union*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wallace, W. & Smith, J., 1995. Democracy or technocracy? European integration and the problem of popular consent. *West European Politics*, 18 (3), 137-57.
- Weiler, J. H. H., Haltern, U., & Mayer, F., 1995. European democracy and its critique. *West European Politics*, 18 (3), 4-39.
- Worre, T., 1996. Denmark: Second-order containment. In C. van der Eijk & M. N. Franklin (eds.), *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of the Union* (pp. 97-114). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Zweifel, T. D., 2002. Who is without sin cast the first stone: The EU's democratic deficit in comparison. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9 (5), 812-840.