Turn out and party choice in the local elections in the Netherlands Anja van Heelsum



Instituut voor Migratie- en Etnische Studies

http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/imes University of Amsterdam

Voting of immigrants

- Electoral representation
 - municipal or national councils / >8 parties/ governing coalitions
 - since 1986 non nationals vote in local elections
- Types of immigrants in the Netherlands
 - EU citizens
 - Citizens from the former colonies
 - Former guest workers and their offspring

Table 1: Largest immigrant groups to the Netherlands, Jan 1st 2006

2000										
	Total	1 st Generation	2 nd Generation							
Western countrie	s									
Germany	383 941	101 718	282 223							
Belgium	112 222	35 887	76 335							
United Kingdom	76 270	43 755	32 515							
Non Western cou	ıntries									
Indonesia	393 175	128 823	264 352							
Turkey	364 608	195 947	168 661							
Surinam	331 953	187 630	144 323							
Morocco	323 272	168 566	154 706							
Dutch Antilles	129 730	79 944	49 926							
F. Yugoslavia	76 382	53 612	22 720							
F. Soviet U.	46 058	35 343	10 715							
China	45 862	32 332	13 530							
Poland	45 568	29 731	15 833							
Refugees										
Iraq	43 778	35 268	8 510							
Iran	28 781	23 638	5 143							
Afghanistan	37 307	32 049	5 258							
Somalia	19 875	13 667	6 208							

Research on municipal elections from IMES

- 1986, 1990: Rath & Buijs: Rotterdam
- 1994 Tillie: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag, Utrecht, Arnhem, Tilburg, Enschede
- 1998 Van Heelsum & Tillie: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag, Utrecht, Arnhem,
- 2002 Michon & Tillie: Amsterdam
- 2006 Van Heelsum & Tillie: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Arnhem, Breda.

Central Question in this paper

How does the turn out, the party choice and the percentage of 'ethnic votes' develop through the last elections, and what is the influence of the current polarised setting in the Netherlands?

Three issues:

- 1. Turn out rates: civic community perspective
- 2. Party choice: ideological or strategic
- 'Ethnic voting': chosing a candidate of ones own group

Method of data collections

- Exit polls
- Choice of 22 polling stations
- Questionaire in 5 languages
- 80 interviewers in 5 languages
- 7134 questionnaires in 2006, of which 4443 of immigrant voters and 2693 of Dutch voters
- 1073 Turks, 843 Moroccans and 823 Surinamese but also more than 30 other ethnic groups.

1.Turn out rates 1994 - 2006

Table 1 Turn out of ethnic minorities at local elections in Amsterdam and Rotterdam from 1994 to 2006 *

******		_			Rotterdam						
		Amster	dam								
	1994	1998	2002	2006	1994	1998	2002 **	2006			
Turkey	67	39	30	51	28	42	53	56			
Morocco	49	23	22	37	23	33	39	58			
Suriname/ Antilles	30	21	26	26	24	25	27	41			
Cape <u>Verdians</u>	-	-	-	-	34	33	33	39			
Total per city	56,8	45,7	47,8	50,8	56,9	48,4	55	57,8			

^{**} data from COS

2a. Party choice Amsterdam

Table 2. Party choice of ethnic groups at municipal elections in Amsterdam in 1998 and 2006 (%)

	PvdA	D66	GRL	SP	CDA	VVD	CU	Leef- baar	A'dam Anders	Hum. partij	Ov.	n (100%)
									/de Groenen			
Dutch 1998	30	8	19	9	5	15	1	-	-	-	12	1588
Dutch 2006	35	5	20	18	3	11	2	1	3	0	2	1671
Turks 1998	47	7	18	1	18	1	9	-				336
Turks 2006	87	1	4	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	503
Moroccans 1998	55	3	35	0	2	1	0				2	258
Moroccans 2006	77	1	12	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	575
Surinamese 1998	56	3	20	4	2	4	0				2	318
Surinamese 2006	82	0	4	6	0	4	2	0	0	1	1	530
Antilleans 1998	57	2	22	3	7	7	0				2	60
Antilleans 2006	58	0	10	10	5	8	6	0	1	0	1	78

2b. Party choice Rotterdam

Table 3. Party choice of ethnic groups at municipal elections in Rotterdam in 1998 and 2006 (%).

	PvdA	D66	GRL	SP	CDA	WD	CU/	Leef-	Stads	Ov.	n
							SGP	baar	partij R'd		(100%)
Dutch 1998	32	4	14	16	7	12	3	-	-	11	799
Dutch 2006	37	1	8	12	4	3	1	31	2	2	340
Turks 1998	30	1	13	1	53	1	0	-	-	1	582
Turks 2006	83	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	335
Moroccans 1998	39	0	41	1	4	2	0	-	-	1	187
Moroccans 2006	88	0	5	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	188
Surinamese 1998	71	10	5	7	2	1	1	-	-	0	338
Surinamese 2006	87	0	3	2	1	0	1	1	0	4	248
Antilleans 1998	56	0	7	15	7	2	2	-	-	11	41
Antilleans 2006	75	0	6	6	4	0	0	6	0	2	47
Cape Verdians 1998	73	0	2	1	24	1	0	-	-	0	211
Cape Verdians 2006	86	0	4	4	1	0	0	0	3	3	76

3a. Ethnic voting 1998

Table 4 Voting on candidates from the different ethnic groups in 1998 (%).

candidate votes\ from	Dutch	Turkish	Moroc can	Surina mese	Antil lean	Gha naian	Cape Verdian	other	total (100%)
Turks	8	83	2	1	0	-	0	6	1740
Moroccans	42	5	47	2	-	-	0	4	720
Surinamese	47	2	1	47	-	0	0	3	994
Antilleans	84	1	3	6	-	-	2	3	118
Ghanaians	39	4	-	4	-	49	-	5	57
Cape Verdians	31	1	1	1	-	-	67	-	186

3b. Ethnic voting 2006

Table 5 Voting on candidates from the different ethnic groups in 2006 (%).

candidate votes\ from	Dutch	Turkish	Moroccan	Surina mese.	Antil.	Cape Verd.	Chine se	other	n (100%)
Turks	40	56	3	0	0	0	0	0	1073
Moroccans	54	4	40	1	0	0	0	0	843
Surinamese	64	2	13	19	1	0	0	0	823
Antilleans	78	3	6	9	2	0	1	0	145
Cape Verdians	52	0	1	4	3	38	0	0	77
Chinese (H.K.)	71	8	8	0	0	0	13	0	24

Conclusions

Influence of the polarised setting in 2006 on these subjects:

- 1. Increased turn out rates
- Party choice towards one single party (PvdA)
- 3. Less 'ethnic voting'

Further reading

the paper

http://users.fmg.uva.nl/avanheelsum