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The Radical Right is the most successful party family to have emerged in the last decades. By now, research has painted a coherent picture of the characteristics and motivations of the citizens supporting these parties. In spite of these insights, one of the most consistent and universal characteristics of the Radical Right electorate has remained puzzling: the considerable overrepresentation of men among these parties’ voters in virtually all countries and at all elections. This so-called ‘gender gap’ – which can substantially constrain parties’ electoral success – could only be partially explained by typical models of Radical Right voting. Not only does this leave us puzzled about a structural pattern in the support for the Radical Right, it also suggests that conventional accounts do not fully grasp all aspects of electoral behavior.

Daring to vote right aims to systematically investigate the causes of the overrepresentation of men in the Radical Right electorate, in a range of European countries, from the point of view of various models of voting behavior. The chapters in this book demonstrate that men’s and women’s differing socio-economic conditions play a role in shaping the gap, but mainly so among those Radical Right parties that strongly cater to the needs of economically precarious voters. Furthermore, no evidence was found that suggests that men are more likely to agree with a range of central features of the Radical Right’s ideology. New data collection does show, however, that men are less likely than women to be deterred by both the social stigma and the ongoing association with prejudice that surround many Radical Right parties. Indeed, the last chapter shows that men are systematically more likely to vote for extreme or stigmatized parties of any political color.

Daring to vote right proposes that we can better comprehend gendered voting patterns and further increase our understanding of the Radical Right electorate by combining socio-structural, attitudinal and socio-psychological models. The findings suggest that a key factor constraining the size and nature of the Radical Right’s electoral fortunes is the perceived legitimacy of the messenger, rather than merely the level of public support for its message.
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