The British
Psychological Society

Parliamentary identity and the management of the far-right: A discursive analysis of Dutch parliamentary debates

Maykel Verkuyten* and Wybren Nooitgedagt

Ercomer, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

In many Western democratic societies, the far-right has considerable popular support and is often perceived as the winner of political debates. This raises the important question of how other politicians try to manage the far-right. We use parliamentary debates to examine how politicians define the identity of Member of Parliament (MP) in response to Geert Wilders, leader of the far-right Party for Freedom in the Netherlands. The analysis shows that politicians made relevant the shared responsibility of MPs to solve societal problems, by using inclusive language, asking for concrete proposals, and emphasizing engagement in debate. These identity-related features question the parliamentary role performance of the far-right. In response, Wilders stressed the MP's responsibility of representing the ordinary people. The politicians used three strategies to challenge this defence: Questioning that the far-right actually fulfils their self-ascribed representative role; challenging the notion that only the far-right would represent the people; moving into a more populist position. Implications for social psychological research on marginal group members are discussed.

Right-wing populist politicians attract much support and are quite influential in many Western countries (Lubbers, Gijsberts, & Scheepers, 2002; Mudde, 2016). They succeed in securing an increasing number of seats in national parliaments and participate in several national coalition governments (e.g., Austria, Denmark, and Italy). An important reason for this popularity is their anti-establishment rhetoric and their strong stance against immigration, and Muslim immigrants in particular (Yılmaz, 2012). The growing success of far-right politicians has led to the question of the appropriate political response from the other politicians. For example, the far-right and its ideology can be ignored (e.g., 'cordon sanitaire') or rather challenged in political and parliamentary debates (Van Spanje & Van Der Brug, 2007). However, these strategies do not appear to be very effective because according to popular media and in the eyes of the public, far-right Members of Parliament (MPs) often outperform the other politicians in debates. For example, Geert Wilders – the leader of the Dutch far-right Party for Freedom (PVV) – was repeatedly lauded for winning parliamentary debates ('Wilders really wins on all fronts', Krouwel, 2008; 'Outdoing wilders: They can't ', Kas, 2016) and has been elected as the best parliamentary debater in 2010, 2013, and 2015. This indicates that the other politicians are not very successful in these debates, at least not in the eyes of the public and press. This raises the question of how these politicians try to address and deal with the far-right.

Correspondence should be addressed to Maykel Verkuyten, Ercomer, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Utrecht University, Padualaan 14, 3584 CH Utrecht, The Netherlands (email: m.verkuyten@uu.nl).

Discourse studies in Western countries have shown that far-right political leaders work up threatening, essentialist versions of minority cultures and Islam to justify exclusionary and discriminatory policy measures (De Castella, McGarty, & Musgrove, 2009; Lazar & Lazar, 2004; Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004; Verkuyten, 2013; Wood & Finlay, 2008), and that they position themselves in opposition to the establishment and as targets of political correctness and anti-White racism (Atton, 2006; Goodman & Johnson, 2014). In contrast to this literature, very little is known about how politicians try to respond to and deal with the language of the far-right in general, and in parliamentary debates in particular (Every & Augoustinos, 2007; Hafez, 2017; Van Dijk, 1997).

Here, we focus on the ways in which the parliamentary identity is construed and mobilized to manage the far-right in parliamentary debates. Specifically, the aim of the current study was twofold. First, we wanted to investigate how politicians in the Dutch parliament try to deal with the far-right by linking particular activities and responsibilities to being a MP in construing the far-right as marginal. Second, we aimed to consider the situational effectiveness of these strategies by looking at the ways in which the far-right tried to handle the, for them, problematic identity constructions, and how other politicians challenged these responses in turn. In doing so, we wanted to make a discursive psychological contribution to the social psychology of marginality.

Social psychology of marginality

Social psychological research has examined the perceptual and behavioural reactions of groups towards marginal group members. For example, research on the so-called black sheep effect (Marques, Abrams, & Serôdio, 2001) and on subjective group dynamics (Marques, Abrams, Páez, & Hogg, 2001) demonstrates that devaluing and excluding normatively deviant or marginal individuals help group members to maintain a sense of positive, distinctive, and cohesive group identity. Additionally, social psychologists interested in marginal group members have predominantly analysed these members' feelings and behaviour in terms of the target's perspective on stigma and exclusion, and the desire to be accepted as full group members (for reviews see, Major & O'Brien, 2005; Smart Richman & Leary, 2009). What tends to be neglected in the social psychological research are the goals of the marginal individual and the possibility that group members try to include those who do not fit the mould (Hogg, Fielding, & Darley, 2005).

The dynamic model of marginality considers both the position a marginal individual takes and the way in which the group negotiates inclusion (Ellemers & Jetten, 2013). The model concerns the interplay between individual and group inclusion goals, and these goals can be conceptualized in psychological terms (e.g., sense of belonging, behavioural accommodation), but also in terms of discursive strategies and identity constructions in an interactional context. The categories of marginality and mainstream are not self-evident, and marginality can also be a desired end-state because marginal group membership has strategic value. Discursive research has shown that by emphasizing their responsibility to and alignment with 'the mainstream of ordinary people', far-right politicians highlight their normatively marginal, and thereby independent, position in relation to the political establishment (Cheng, 2015; Finlay, 2007; Rapley, 1998; Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012; Wood & Finlay, 2008). The position of an 'independent marginal' allows them to challenge parliamentary procedures and to criticize other parliamentarians and their proposals and practices. A marginal member remains an outsider who does not have to comply with group rules and has the freedom to speak their mind and express dissent (Ellemers & Jetten, 2013).

The strategic goals of the marginal member can converge with the group not wanting to include them. Far-right politicians can distance themselves from the political establishment, and politicians can avoid debating the far-right and maintain a 'cordon sanitaire'. However, it is also possible that the larger group wants to include and socialize a marginal group member that seeks distinction. Group inclusion involves conformity pressures, commitment to group tasks, and the expectation of compliance with group rules and practices (Ellemers, 2012). Thus, trying to include a marginal group member (i.e., far-right MP) might be a strategy of 'normalization' or 'pacification' whereby it becomes more problematic to hold dissenting views, and the shared goals and shared responsibilities of all group members (i.e., to parliament and society) are emphasized. Furthermore, the strategy of inclusion might make a marginal member's failure to follow the group norms more noticeable and accountable which puts them in a more vulnerable position.

Being a Member of Parliament

We seek to gain a better understanding of the ways in which politicians try to manage the far-right by examining how they invoke and define the identity of being an MP. Discursive psychological research has argued and demonstrated that social categories and the related identities are flexibly produced and mobilized depending on the social actions being performed in situational interactions (Abell & Stokoe, 2001; Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Sorrentino & Augoustinos, 2016; Verkuyten, 2003). Social categories and the related identities are powerful interactional tools because they are conventionally associated with normative expectations. For example, those who do not conform to the common sense knowledge about what a particular category membership entails are typically seen as marginal and deviant and placed in an accountable position (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004; Hollander, 2013; Jayyusi, 1984). However, identities with their related attributes can also be used to include and incorporate deviants and marginals as 'one of us'. Any given social identity has various normatively associated characteristics and responsibilities with it, making it possible to flexibly use the asserted relationship between an identity and different features.

Parliamentary debates are useful for examining how politicians try to deal with the far-right because these debates presuppose adversariality (claims and challenges) as well as a spirit of cooperativeness (joint decision-making and problem-solving) (Ilie, 2003). Being a MP constitutes an identity that involves various rights, duties, and responsibilities. An MP is democratically elected and represents specific sections of the population and therefore has a responsibility to their constituency. The common sense understanding is that an MP represents the concerns of their voters and has the duty and right to control the parliament on their behalf. Additionally, MPs are considered to have responsibilities to Parliament and society at large. These include the right to participate in debates and the responsibility to address societal problems and issues of national interests ('the common good'). The responsibilities to their voters, on the one hand, and to Parliament and society, on the other, imply that what it means to be an MP can be construed differently for different interactional purposes. An emphasis on the former rights and responsibilities is useful for distancing oneself from other MPs, whereas a focus on the latter rights and responsibilities makes the shared MP identity relevant.

The political context

The 'House of Representatives' of the Dutch parliament has 150 seats which are filled through national elections based on proportional national representation (not a

constituency system). Dutch politics is known (Vos, De Beer, & De Lathouwer, 2002) for striving towards workable compromises and consensus decision-making (the 'polder model'), and the current (2018) coalition government is formed by four political parties. Geert Wilders is the undisputed leader of the far-right Party for Freedom (PVV), which has no official members other than himself. He is known for his national populism which includes an anti-establishment rhetoric and a fiercely negative position on refugees, immigrants, and Islam in particular (Verkuyten, 2013; Vossen, 2011). As a MP, Wilders has called for a complete closure of the borders for refugees, an end to immigration from Islamic countries, a prohibition against the building of new Mosques, the closing of Islamic schools, a special tax for wearing a headscarf, and a legal ban on the Koran. Because of his statements, Wilders has received various death threats and has been under constant security protection since 2004. In December 2016, he was convicted by the court for inciting discrimination against Moroccan immigrants by leading a crowd at a political rally in The Hague chanting 'fewer, fewer' to his question, 'Do you want more or fewer Moroccans in this city and in the Netherlands'. Wilders tends to dominate the political debate, and he is quite successful in gathering public support. In the most recent national election (March 2017), the PVV won 20 of the 150 seats, making it the second largest party of the 13 political parties in parliament. Together, the major political parties (e.g., Liberals, Christian Democrats, Labour party, Socialists party, and Green party) represent the majority of the population in parliament.

Material and analytical approach

We examined all parliamentary debates of 2015 and the material for the current analysis consists of the official transcripts of the three debates (April 22nd, September 19th, and November 11th) on the topics of refugees, immigration, and Islam (total of 59 pages). These transcripts are 'cleaned up' versions of the actual interactions and lack details of the speakers' talk that have potential consequences for the unfolding interactions. This means that the transcripts are not suitable for a fine-grained conversational type of analysis. Yet, they represent an official record of the debates and thereby a consequential public record of the parliamentary proceedings. Because of the media coverage of the debates, the national population forms a constant, albeit implicit, audience. Furthermore, in these public debates, MPs set forth and defend their political viewpoints, while colleagues can interrupt and ask questions. This makes parliamentary debates useful for examining the strategies that politicians use to manage the relatively successful position of the far-right.

A key characteristic of institutional talk is the particular form that it has (Drew & Heritage, 1992). In parliamentary debates, the types of contributions that can be made are regulated and constrained (Ilie, 2003). This is evident in the specific turn-taking system, length of turns, in the right to ask questions, in the procedure for making interruptions (e.g., allocated time and place in the hall), in the right and normative expectation to engage in debate, and the need to address the Speaker of the House rather than each other directly. References to these institutional features display one's alignments with the parliamentary identity. And the rules and norms define what is normal and what is subversive and therefore may be important for examining how the category of 'marginal', and its contrast 'mainstream', are constituted in debate.

The aim of the present analysis was to explicate instances of parliamentary debate in which being a MP was made a relevant and consequential membership category (Sacks, 1992). We analysed the data using an approach (Burford-Rice & Augoustinos, 2018;

Stokoe & Wallwork, 2003) that draws upon the method of membership categorization analysis (Sacks, 1992), and principles and tools derived from discursive psychology (Edwards, 2005; Edwards & Potter, 1992) and rhetorical psychology (Billig, 1996). Following membership categorization analyses, we focus on the ways in which politicians evoked the category of MP and drew upon recognized category-bound features (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Lepper, 2000; Sacks, 1992) to address Wilders' (anti-immigrant) statements. In addition, we consider the situational effectiveness of the categorizations by looking at some of Wilders' accounts and how, in turn, the other politicians tried to challenge these. A discursive psychological approach is primarily concerned with how versions of the social world are mobilized to accomplish an interactional end (Edwards & Potter, 1992). And the rhetorical nature of discourse and debate implies a focus on how different common sense notions are used to work up particular identities and versions of reality in opposition to potential alternative ones (Billig, 1996). A discursive and rhetorical approach has successfully been used for analysing political debates in relation, for example, to fact-based (counter)claims (Demasi, 2018), social citizenship and immigration (Gibson, Crossland, & Hamilton, 2018), anti-establishment rhetoric (Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012), and the discursive construction of 'otherness' in political blogs (Sakki & Pettersson, 2016). The approach allows us to examine how controversy and contestation unfold as situated practices and the implications that this has for political identities and marginality.

The analysis of the debates proceeded according to several interpretative steps. First, the entire corpus was read and reread to identify the discussions between Wilders and other MPs. Second, we organized these data around all instances in which politicians addressed Wilders and situationally linked specific obligations, responsibilities, and rights to the category of MP. Third, we identified those instances where Wilders tried to handle the (for him) potentially problematic MP category-bound features. Thus, only data that contained interactions with Wilders pertaining to the MP identity were included for the analysis. This ensured that the analysis focused on how the speakers themselves made being a parliamentarian a relevant and consequential membership category and how they themselves orient to the categories of marginality and mainstream. Subsequently, a more detailed discursive analysis was undertaken in which we examined these texts to identify some of the discursive and rhetorical strategies used to define and problematize the MP identity in different contributions and accounts. The various ways in which politicians asserted their own identity as an MP and depicted the corresponding responsibilities and obligations of Wilders were identified. We ground the interpretation of the extracts by focusing on the speakers' interactional concerns and the strategies used in construing and accounting for the contrasting common sense meanings of being an MP.

Results

During the analytical process, it became evident that the main and recurrent accusation directed at Wilders was that he does not cooperate and contribute to solving societal problems and therefore does not live up to his duty and responsibility as an MP. In making this accusation, speakers were found to draw upon and made relevant three identity-defining features of an MP: (1) having a shared responsibility, (2) providing meaningful suggestions for solutions, and (3) contributing to the debate. We will discuss each of these three in turn. At the same time, we discuss Wilders' management of the challenges that these three issues pose to his identity as a democratically elected MP. This management

mainly involved an emphasis on the key responsibility of an MP to represent the people, and we consider how, in turn, other politicians responded to this.

Shared responsibility

By definition, an MP has an alignment with this political institution, and in the debates, all speakers acknowledge that they themselves and the others, including Wilders, are democratically elected and equal MPs. The alignment with parliament is verbalized explicitly (e.g., 'representative', 'politician', and 'MP'), indicated by modes of address such as 'honourable Mrs/Mr' and 'colleague', and implied by making references to the parliamentary procedures for debate and interruptions. This institutional language and these rules make relevant the speakers' shared membership of the category parliamentarian, as a standardized relational pair of categories that carry duties and moral obligations in relation to each other (Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2005).

There also are many examples in which the inclusive pronouns of 'we' and 'us' are used. These pronouns do not only index the common institutional identity (Drew & Sorjonen, 1997), but also define a common in-group with a shared duty and obligation to each other and the functioning of society. Speakers use those inclusive pronouns to define a shared responsibility and to appeal to Wilders to jointly address societal problems. The following extracts are from two separate debates about the so-called refugee crisis and concern interactions between Wilders and Klaver, the leader of the Green Party (Extract 1: 16 September, 2015; Extract 2: 14 November, 2015).[1]

Extract 1

1. *Klaver*: Asylum seeker centers will be formed and it is the task of us politicians to
2. make sure that we can continue to live here in peace.

Extract 2

1. *Klaver*: I am very worried about the distance that develops between groups of
2. people in the Netherlands, between your and my voters. We together have the
3. responsibility to make sure that the differences do not become larger.

In the first extract, Klaver defines the continuation of peaceful co-existence as the task of 'us politicians', which in the context of the parliamentary debate implies his MP colleagues. And in extract 2, he uses psychological language ('I am very worried': line 1, extract 2) to express his concerns which defines him as a responsible MP, and formulates a shared responsibility to prevent increasing differences between groups of voters. The institutional role of an MP implies not only a responsibility for the functioning of society but also to one's voters, and Klaver orients to this latter interpretation by recognizing that MPs' have their own voters (line 2). However, he emphasizes the seriousness of the situation ('I am very worried': line 1; see also line 3–4, extract 3) and makes an appeal on Wilders to work together. This strategy of inclusion draws upon the common sense understanding that democratically elected MPs have the task to work towards a unified and cohesive society, especially in difficult times. Klaver uses this category-bound obligation to challenge Wilders' role as

---

an MP. The next extract is from the same interaction between Klaver and Wilders as extract 2.

Extract 3

1. *Klaver*: Mister Wilders, as politicians we have the responsibility to not make the
2. differences in society too large. We have the responsibility to take the lead in
3. order to get through these difficult times. What you are doing is trying to turn
4. people against each other, then you cannot call yourself a leader, can you?
5. *Wilders*: We do not turn anyone against each other at all. Let me say that first.
6. What we do, is standing up for all those people who do not feel represented here,
7. for all those people who think that 13,000 asylum seekers each month is quite
8. enough . . .. We have not been elected by people from Syria, the people from Iraq
9. or the people from, Mali, Ethiopia or Eritrea. We have been elected by the Dutch
10. People. If we are a genuine MP–the PVV claims to be that–then
11. we stand up for these people.
12. *Klaver*: The role that you could also take as a MP is trying to
13. make the differences smaller and thinking about how you can handle taking in
14. people who flee from war and violence. That is a choice mister Wilders. You
15. do not choose that. You choose to turn people against each other. You state that
16. you do not do this, but you do. If you call for resistance against asylum seeker
17. centers, while you know that the borders will not be closed, even when the PVV
18. comes into power, then you turn people against each other, instead of finding real
19. solutions for a problem that we are all facing. Mister Wilders we are all in the
20. same boat. It would behoove you to be part of that. That would really
21. require a stronger sense of responsibility than what you demonstrate now.
22. *Wilders*: Again, Madam Speaker, we do not turn anyone against each other. It is
23. too ridiculous for words that Mister Klaver even suggests this. We stand up for
24. millions of Dutchmen that he abandons.

In lines 1–5, Klaver uses inclusive language and explicitly defines a shared responsibility of political leaders for the social cohesion in society, especially when times are difficult. Subsequently, he poses a rhetorical question to make the point that Wilders is not a political leader because he deliberately tries to turn people against each other (lines 3–4). This questioning of his motives and his failure in his job as an MP puts Wilders in a disadvantaged and accountable position. Wilders reacts by, first, providing an explicit denial of the accusation followed by a discursive closure ('Let me say that first': line 5). Second, the denial allows Wilders to introduce the common sense understanding that MPs are democratically elected and therefore have a primary responsibility towards the Dutch people who elected them. He portrays his party as the only one which represents the many people (lines 23–24) who do not feel represented in Parliament. Representing the Dutch population is defined as the central responsibility of a 'genuine' MP (lines 10–11), a responsibility that other politicians would fail to fulfil. In this way, Wilders distances himself from the other MPs and defines an alliance with the Dutch people which would make him more 'mainstream' than the others (Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012). In his next contribution, Klaver (line 12) does not deny the representative role of an MP but explicitly uses a contrast structure (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986) for formulating a choice that MPs can make between either trying to make differences smaller or turning people against each other. In doing so, he draws upon two key understandings of MPs' societal

responsibilities to define Wilders approach as a deliberate strategy. He further substantiates his claim that Wilders is turning people against each other by questioning the sincerity of his motives and thereby his genuine commitment to working for the nation's best interests (lines 15–19; Edwards & Potter, 1992). Additionally, he uses a figurative expression to formulate a shared societal problem that concerns everyone ('we are all in the same boat': lines 19–20). Thus, he summarizes his complaint about Wilders' lack of commitment idiomatically in a way that invites Wilders to sympathize with his complaint (Drew & Holt, 1988), and also explicitly asks Wilders to show moral character and work together to solve the issue (lines 19–20). Wilders repeats his denial ('Again') and presents Klaver's claim as being extremely ridiculous, even as a suggestion (lines 22–24).

Solving problems

In lines 18–19 of the previous extract, the obligation of an MP to address societal problems is not only presented as requiring the acceptance of a shared responsibility, but also in terms of finding real solutions. Various speakers argued that an MP has the duty to provide concrete suggestions and proposals for addressing societal problems. The accusation that Wilders does not make such contributions and therefore does not live up to his responsibility as an MP was a recurrent one in the debates. The next extract (16 September 2015) is from an interaction between the leader of the socialist party (Roemer) and Wilders. Roemer has previously given several examples of alleged statements made by Wilders and then continues with the following.

Extract 4

1. *Roemer*: The only thing that you do, Mister Wilders, with this speech in the past
2. half hour, is to turn people enormously against each other, turn villages against
3. each other, turn neighbourhoods against each other, far removed from a solution to
4. a problem which you yourself are guilty of.
5. *Wilders*: I have to say that Mister Roemer is a very big liar. He summarizes all
6. sorts of things that I would have said. I say that and I stand by every word I have
7. said, no matter how much you will start to talk in the microphone. He says things
8. to me which I have never said, about Afghans who have lived here for 25 years
9. and are no good. You are a very big liar. Let me leave it at that.
10. *Speaker*: This is exactly the reason why we like to address the Speaker.
11. *Roemer*: This says enough about Mister Wilders. It is telling that he not only
12. offends the people in the country, but also offend everybody here. It is his only
13. point, his unique selling point. He wants to exploit this. That is allowed, but then
14. do come up with concrete proposals that are useful for the country and do not
15. turn everyone against each other.

In lines 3–4, Roemer acknowledges that there is a societal problem that politicians can solve. This allows him to deploy a contrastive structure between only turning people against each other and the preferred position of finding a solution to the problem (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). He uses the three-part list of people, villages, and neighbourhoods to strengthen his claim about the divisive effect of Wilders' talk (Jefferson, 1990; Rapley, 1998). And he defines Wilders as having the moral responsibility to find a solution because he himself is guilty of increasing divisions. In his response, Wilders reacts to the examples given by Roemer earlier. He states that he cannot draw a

different conclusion and uses the same extreme case formulation twice ('a very big': lines 5, 9; Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986) to brand Roemer a liar which questions Roemer's prerequisite to participate in the debate (Ilie, 2004). Such an explicit negative personal characterization is rather unusual and the intervention of the Speaker of the House indicates that it is considered a normative breach of the parliamentary rules. This normative breach makes it possible for Roemer to argue that the talk 'says enough' about Wilders as a person and his role as an MP. Roemer recognizes that politicians are allowed to exploit their unique selling points, but with the use of extreme case formulations, he questions the generality ('everybody here') and nature of this particular one ('only offending and insulting the people and his colleagues'). This serves to position Wilders as a marginal and extreme MP who fails to meet the responsibility to come up with concrete propositions. The failure of Wilders to provide such propositions, and therefore to do his job, was also brought forward by other MPs. The next extract is from a representative of the labour party (22 April 2015).

Extract 5

1. *Kuiken*: I have been in this House long enough to know that Mister Wilders, when
2. it gets difficult, likes to put people down. I simply conclude: many big words, we
3. can talk about solutions and I do want to help with that. But when I ask for *one*
4. single concrete measure to prevent that people are forced to flee, I get no reply
5. from Mister Wilders, as always. I very much regret that.

Kuiken draws upon the familiar and rhetorically useful distinction between '(just) talking' ('many big words', line 2) versus 'doing' (a concrete proposal), which is similar to the distinction between 'in principle and in practice' (Wetherell, Stiven, & Potter, 1987). She uses various discursive devices (Edwards & Potter, 1992) to present herself as an experienced MP ('long enough in the House', line 1) who is reasonable and committed to making a contribution to finding solutions (wanting to talk and to help, asking questions; lines 3–4), also with Wilders ('I very much regret that', line 5). In contrast, with the use of extreme case formulations (Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986), Wilders is presented as an MP who shows a recurrent pattern ('as always', line 5) of not providing even *one* single concrete measure which underlines his marginality, unreasonableness, and common failure to fulfil his parliamentarian role.

The next extract (14 November 2015) is the reaction of Samson, the leader of the labour party, to Wilders' use of vivid images (Wooffitt, 1992) by reading aloud several letters from Dutch people voicing their concern about refugees coming to the Netherlands. In doing so, Wilders presents himself as the spokesperson of the 'ordinary people'. Samson has asked what he will write back to these people and Wilders replied that he will point out that Samson together with other political leaders ('his left-wing friends of the Socialist party and unfortunately also the liberal party') are responsible for the open borders and do not listen to the Dutch people. Samson continues with the following.

Extract 6

1. *Samson*: I already feared that Mister Wilders would reply that someone else is to
2. blame for the problem. That is the PVV in true form: scaring people and blaming
3. others. That is the only thing the PVV does when there is a problem, while you

4. should solve the problem. Mister Wilders should be prepared to work
5. together to that end. He scares people and he blames others. He has to stop
6. doing that. He can continue sending all these people mails until he is blue, but he
7. should think about the question what is really needed. The problem simply has to
8. be solved.

The expression of fear (line 1) functions to make Samson's position reasonable and problem-focused and that of Wilders as irresponsible and extreme ('only thing', line 3). Samson acknowledges that the arrival of many refugees is a societal problem that 'simply has to be solved' (lines 7–8). This 'technical' representation of the issue allows him to argue that Wilders is not willing to work together to find a solution. According to Samson, the PVV, in true form, does not take its responsibility but rather blames others and scares people. The mentioning of the obligation to solve societal problems implies the relevance of the MP identity (Lepper, 2000; Sacks, 1992). The PVV fails to do what is needed and expected of an MP: thinking about what is really necessary for finding a solution (lines 2–3). In marking the solution of societal problems as the main responsibility of an MP, Wilders is construed as falling short.

Engaging in debate
In their reactions to Wilders, mainstream politicians draw upon the common understanding that MPs have a shared responsibility and have to cooperate to come up with solutions for societal problems. Jointly finding solutions requires that MPs listen to each other and answer questions during debates and failing to do so makes it impossible to work together as MPs. In the next extract (14 November 2015), the leader of the socialist party (Roemer) addresses Wilders after he did not answer a colleague's question.

Extract 7
1. *Roemer*: By not answering a correct question from a colleague, you suggest a lot.
2. That's not what I think we should do. I try to solve problems with you together,
3. to make sure that people in the streets and neighbourhoods are listened too, that
4. people will be involved, and that people who do wrong are dealt with. We get a lot
5. further if that is the shared message, However, like this we do not make any
6. progress.

Roemer makes a link between the need to engage in debate to jointly solve problems, and he blames Wilders for not doing so. He uses inclusive language ('we', 'colleague') and states that he tries to solve problems together with Wilders (lines 2–3) which he makes more concrete with a three-part list of examples (lines 3–4; Jefferson, 1990). In contrast, he argues that Wilders fails to answer a 'correct' question from a colleague (line 1) which frustrates a reasonable debate and makes Wilders a marginal member who is to blame and falls short.

The institutional setting of parliament makes the MP identity relevant and MPs can be expected to display an awareness of the sorts of activities which are attached to being a MP, including the obligation to give answers and engage in debate. Parliamentary debate requires that one listens to each other, respond to interruptions, and answer questions of colleagues. Unwillingness to answer a question in a debate can be

construed as a breach of the normatively bound obligation of being an MP (Jayyusi, 1984). In the debates, there are several examples in which speakers draw upon this obligation to accuse Wilders of not doing his job as an MP and thereby being deficient. The next extract is from an interaction (14 November 2015) between the leader of the Christian Democrats (Buma) and Wilders. It relates to the fact that Wilders had recently voted in *favour* of a piece of legislation ('Crisis and Repair Act') that makes it more easy to establish asylum seeker centres for the reception of refugees. Buma has asked Wilders whether he knows how he voted ('Does mister Wilders know what he himself voted'?) and this rhetorical question puts Wilders in a disadvantaged and accountable position. As a strategy for gaining control, Wilders avoided giving an answer by changing the topic (Greatbatch, 1998) and by stating that he – in contrast to Buma – is in favour of closing the borders. The interaction continued a little bit later with Buma asking whether Wilders has had time to check what he actually voted.

Extract 8

1. *Buma*: Now that Mister Wilders is going on about things like this again, I am
2. curious whether he has already had time to reflect a little on the fact that he did not
3. do what he should have done, that is judging the proposals that make the reception
4. of refugees possible.
5. *Wilders*: I have given that answer in the first term
6. *Buma*: No, because you didn't know it at that time. So I wonder whether, in the
7. meantime, you have checked what has happened. You use many big words now and
8. I will not let you say them when you do not also indicate what you actually did.
9. *Wilders*: I have already given my answer in the first term, no matter how often you
10. ask it again.
11. *Buma*: This is the well-known Wilders' method again. The debate stops as soon as
12. there is a single question, and Wilders does not answer anymore. I pose a very
13. normal question.
14. *Wilders*: I just gave my answer. I keep repeating this, no matter how often you ask
15. *Buma*: No, that is not true, because you cannot say that you answered in the first
16. term when I now ask you whether you have reflected upon it since then. The
17. answer is yes or no.
18. *Wilders*: I have already given my answer.
19. *Buma*: No, that is impossible.
20. *Wilders*: I will resume my speech.
21. *Buma*: No, I simply ask a question and a normal MP answers a
22. question of a colleague. That is the debate.
23. *Wilders*: I just did that. You do not like that and there will be nothing more. I am
24. sorry.
25. *Buma*: So you keep insisting that what you said in the first term is an answer to a
26. normal question of a colleague in the second term. The House does not have to
27. accept this from you at all. We ask you normal questions. You should be glad that I
28. have this debate with you. You do not have a debate at all. I ask you *one* more time:
29. since the first term did you reflect upon the fact that you simply did not do that
30. which is your key task, namely controlling the government: yes or no?
31. *Wilders*: We do that. We always do that. We also did that in this case.
32. I have just answered this to the representative of the Christian Democrats. And
33. yes, that will have to be enough for you.

In the first four lines, Buma refers to the fact that Wilders failed to do his job of parliamentary control (see below), and in line 8, he pressures Wilders to provide an answer to his earlier question. After receiving no answer, Buma continues with the word 'again' (line 11) which defines Wilders failure to give an answer as a recurrent pattern. And the addition of 'the well-known Wilders' method' suggests that it is a familiar and deliberate strategy, rather than an exceptional event. Wilders' breach of the parliamentary debating rule is further highlighted by emphasizing that he fails to give an answer as soon as a 'single' question is asked by a colleague (lines 22, 25), and by stating that the question is not strange or exceptional but rather 'a very normal' one (see also the use of the word 'correct' in line 1, extract 7). In lines 21–22, Buma makes Wilders breach explicit by stating that giving an answer to a simple question from a colleague constitutes the debate. This is invoked as a normatively bound obligation of a 'normal' MP, and in line 27, Buma concludes that Wilders does not conduct 'the debate at all'. In lines 25–26, the non-exceptional nature of the question asked is again emphasized and made more general by the use of the inclusive 'we'. Additionally, Buma places Wilders in a disadvantaged position; a deficient and marginal MP who should be glad that others debate him (line 27). Furthermore, in line 17, Buma uses a closed 'yes–no' question that makes relevant a categorical answer, and the lack of an answer a noticeable breach of the normative obligation to answer a colleague (Harris, 1991). In line 30, he repeats his yes–no question and makes it even more noticeable by stating that he will ask it 'one more time' (line 28). The failure to answer normal questions by colleagues implies that Wilders does not behave in accordance with the normative expectations of being an MP and therefore that the House does not have to accept his actions (lines 26–27).

These different conversational strategies problematize Wilders' role as an MP and put him into an accountable position. In his replies, Wilders does not reject an MP's democratic obligation to answer questions in parliamentary debates ('I am sorry', in line 23–24; and in other parts, he explicitly states that he always participates in debates and he emphasizes that he is a real Democrat). Rather, he does not engage in a debate but provides minimal responses which display that he has a problem with what Buma said (Drew, 2005). In extract 8, he repeats his claim (lines 5, 9, 13, 18, and 23) that he already provided an answer, even when this, according to Buma, is logically impossible (lines 6, 16, 19). Furthermore, stating that he has 'just' given an answer (line 3, 13, 23) implies that Buma has not been listening, and stating that Buma does not like the answer (line 13) suggests that Buma rather than he himself is the unreasonable debater. So Wilders adopts different discursive strategies to limit his disadvantaged and marginal position imposed by the institutional rule to answer questions of a colleague. In these ways, he tries to gain control, maintains his identity of being a responsible MP, and tries to avoid the accountable position he is put into.

Representing the people

In the various debates, Wilders consistently draws upon the common sense understanding that MPs are democratically elected and therefore have to represent their voters by being their spokesperson and engaging on their behalf in parliamentary control. As in extract 3, he repeatedly works up a position of being such a responsible parliamentarian: 'the one who stands up for the people'. By representing his voters and the 'silent majority' more generally, he would do what a genuine, mainstream MP should do. This is in contrast to the other MPs who would ignore, be dismissive, or are out of touch with the lives of 'the

people' and therefore would be the actual marginal ones (Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012). The main responsibility of an MP would be towards the ordinary citizens and not towards parliament and the establishment. This populist rhetoric is quite powerful and taps into the public feeling and complaint that there is an increasing gap between the political elite and the people (Bos & Brants, 2014; Bovens & Wille, 2008; Mudde, 2007). Not only Wilders but also the other politicians are democratically elected and cannot challenge the representative role that an MP has. However, there are three other strategies that they used in response to Wilders' claim about what constitutes 'mainstream': (1) Questioning that Wilders fulfils his self-ascribed representative role, (2) challenging the notion that only Wilders would represent the people, and (3) moving into a more populist position.

First, in the debates, there are examples of MPs accusing Wilders of actually not doing his parliamentary job of representing his voters. The following interaction is from the same debate as the previous one and starts with Buma giving himself an answer to his rhetorical question about whether Wilders knows how he voted in case of the 'Crisis and Repair Act'.

Extract 9

1. *Buma*: The big problem is that the PVV *did* support it. Mister Wilders has been to
2. all sorts of places, such as Purmerend and Almere. He went there with flyers, as if
3. those help against the influx of refugees. He tells the people there that they have to
4. resist the construction of asylum seekers centers in their region. And what does
5. Mister Wilders do himself? Probably he simply does not pay attention here. He
6. stands on the street, but he fails to do the job he is being paid for by all these
7. people. What Mister Wilders does is agreeing with what we will get soon: the
8. construction of large asylum seeker centers in the provinces. I know that when
9. these are built, Mister Wilders will be the first one to be there holding his flyers.
10. *Wilders*: Certainly
11. *Buma*: I hope that all these people will then realize that such an asylum seeker
12. Center is there also on behalf of Mister Wilders, who did not do his job. Mister
13. Wilders, you can bleat as much as you like, but you are being paid to do your job.
14. Your job is control of parliament. You do not do that. [..]. You simply should do
15. your job as a MP. You call this a fake parliament, but there is
16. only one fake party, namely yours.

In line 15, Buma makes the task of parliamentary control a defining activity of an MP (see also lines 1–4 and line 29 in extract 8). Being an MP is presented as a normal job and he concludes (lines 13–15) that Wilders fails to do the job for which he is paid 'by all those people' (line 6). He fails to represent his voters in parliament when decisions are being made but rather prefers to hand out flyers in the streets. Earlier, Wilders had called the House a fake parliament because they would not represent the people, and here, Buma defines the PVV as the only 'fake party' in parliament (lines 15–16).

A second strategy is to argue that not only Wilders but also all MPs represent their voters, and therefore part of the public. In the debates, Wilders repeatedly presents himself as the only one who gives a voice to the opinion of the silent majority that would be against 'open borders' and the influx of refugees. And because the other MPs do not voice this mainstream opinion, he argues that they are a 'fake parliament' as in the previous extract (line 16). The next extract (14 November, 2015) contains Klaver's

reaction to this characterization and follows after having stated that he rejects Wilders remarks about immigrants.

Extract 10

1. *Klaver*:But what I find much worse is that Mister Wilders has spoken about a fake
2. parliament, that he has said that we do not represent the Dutch population and that
3. the only one who does so is the PVV party. . . but then what about children at
4. schools making straps and selling them to collect money for refugees? How about
5. the inhabitants of Oranje who organize a barbecue? How about the people who do
6. voluntary work in asylum seeker centers to receive refugees? These people also
7. have to be represented, Mister Wilders. You may have the floor here and you can
8. speak for all the people who are worried. But that you truly dare, now again, to
9. almost silence your colleagues by stating that they do not speak on behalf of the
10. Dutch population. Where do you get the nerve? When you say that this is a fake
11. parliament, you are actually also saying that all these people who do that voluntary
12. work, are fake citizens. That's bad.
13. (*five lines further*) I will repeat it once more: then you are a fake democrat as far
14. as I am concerned.

In line 1, Klaver draws upon the democratically elected nature of MPs to explain why he finds Wilders' statement particularly deplorable. He subsequently uses a three-part list of examples of people who support refugees and who also need to be represented in parliament, because they are obviously not represented by Wilders (lines 3–7). In contrast to Klaver who states that Wilders has the right to speak on behalf of all the people who have concerns (line 7–8), it is Wilders who is presented as breaching parliamentary rules and procedures. He would try to silence other MPs who, according to him, would not represent the Dutch people. This is presented by Klaver as a strong ('truly dare') and regular ('again', line 8) normative breach of democratic principles. It is a breach that is an insult to his colleagues and more importantly to the many people that these colleagues represent. So it is not Klaver and the other politicians but rather Wilders who does not meet the democratic duties and obligations of an MP and who is, therefore, a marginal member and fake Democrat (see also lines 15–16, extract 9).

   Third, Wilders regularly talks about the ordinary, hardworking people ('Henk and Ingrid; the Dutch version of 'Joe the plumber') and how he is the only one representing this silent majority (Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012). Stating that one represents ordinary hardworking people is rhetorically powerful because this group is difficult to define and positively characterized (e.g., hardworking instead of lazy, normal instead of deviant, silent instead of loudmouthed). Further, it makes the speaker a representative of the mainstream, and it is admirable to be concerned about and work for ordinary, normal people (in contrast to 'the elite'). In response to these claims, other politicians have increasingly adopted the language of having to represent and representing the ordinary people. For example, the central theme in a public speech by the leader of the Christian Democrats (Buma) was 'The ordinary Dutchman' who was mentioned in the speech 13 times, and who was portrayed as feeling neglected and being understandably angry about how society is changing, mainly because of immigration (H.J. Schoo-Lezing, 4 September 2017). Similarly, leaders of other political parties have started to talk regularly about 'normal, ordinary Dutchmen' and the need for politicians to listen to their concerns and

work with them and for them. So other politicians are increasingly moving in the direction of a more populist position, and the concept of 'ordinary Dutchmen' has become so popular that a major national newspaper ('De Volkskrant') elected the 'ordinary Dutchmen' as media personality of 2017.

Discussion

Across Europe, the language of the far-right appears to be quite effective in setting the agenda, drawing public interest, attracting votes, and winning political debates (Yılmaz, 2012). This raises the important question of how other politicians try to deal with far-right MPs. This question has largely been ignored in discourse-oriented research (but see Every & Augoustinos, 2007; Hafez, 2017) which has mainly focused on the ways in which far-right politicians deny and justify racist beliefs, and work up essentialist group representations for racist ends (Finlay, 2007; Sakki & Pettersson, 2016; Verkuyten, 2013).

Focusing on Dutch parliamentary debates and applying principles of discursive and rhetorical psychological analysis and the method of membership categorization analysis, our findings show, first, that the speakers' orient their talk to the different common sense understandings of the duties and responsibility of an MP. The various category-bound features form the continuing background of the contributions to these institutional debates. These features mainly relate to the responsibility to represent one's voters, on the one hand, and jointly addressing urgent societal problems, on the other (Ilie, 2003). In their debates with Wilders, politicians invoked the MP category to actively proffer the latter responsibility. They used inclusive language ('we', 'colleague'), explicitly defined a shared responsibility, and made an appeal to Wilders to join them in solving important societal problems. This shared responsibility was presented as requiring a willingness to work together, a commitment to consider and present concrete solutions, and an engagement in debate. Thus, the politicians tried to include the far-right MP which can be seen as a strategy of 'normalization' with the related commitments to achieve shared goals and to follow group rules, norms, and practices. Invoking a shared societal and parliamentary responsibility in defining what it means to be an MP makes it possible to criticize far-right MPs for failing to their job. The use of these identity-defining features makes dissenting practices noticeable and places the far-right in an accountable position.

However, proffered identity features can be resisted and other common understandings can be made relevant. For a populist politician, mobilizing the population means contesting the political elite and stressing differences (Finlay, 2007; Wood & Finlay, 2008). If an alignment with 'the people' is created, far-right politicians can enhance their influence by highlighting their marginal position in relation to the political establishment (Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012). Wilders emphasizes that the main responsibility of an MP is to represent the people who elected them, and he argues that he is the only one doing so. His marginality in parliament allows him to work up a position of being mainstream in relation to the people and therefore the one real democrat.

The other politicians cannot, and did not, deny voter representation as a central aspect of what it means to be an MP. Rather, they tried to deal with Wilders' claim of representing the mainstream in various ways, such as presenting political leadership as making a choice for the common good rather than the interests of specific groups of voters. Furthermore, politicians were found to challenge Wilders' self-positioning as 'the only one standing up for the ordinary people' in three ways. They tried to demonstrate that Wilders was, in fact, not doing his job of democratic representation and parliamentary control. Second, they

disputed the claim that only Wilders represents his electorate by arguing that all MPs are democratically elected and therefore represent the voice of parts of the people. Third, politicians are increasingly moving into a more populist position by talking about 'ordinary people' and claiming to take their concerns and grievances seriously.

Social psychological research has primarily examined how group members perceive and evaluate marginal and deviant members (Marques, Abrams, Páez, *et al.*, 2001) and how marginality affects a person's well-being and behaviour (Major & O'Brien, 2005). However, what is considered much less is the situation in which the group tries to include the marginal, while the marginal seeks distinction. Whereas the dynamic social psychological model of marginality (Ellemers & Jetten, 2013) does consider this possibility, little research has examined its implications. Furthermore, existing social psychological research on marginality is mainly concerned with perceptions and inner feelings, and not with the ways in which marginality is discursively construed and managed in social interactions (Verkuyten, 2001). Yet, in the social and the political world, categories and the related normative expectations are defined, mobilized, and challenged in processes of debate and argumentation (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). Social categories and their meanings are not simply given, reflecting the world as it is, but rather are made and remade in, and through, discourse (Edwards, 1991; Hopkins & Reicher, 2011).

Our analysis indicates that the dynamic between mainstream and marginality is complex and depends on situational negotiations about the relevance, nature, and importance of specific identity features. The categories of 'marginal' and 'mainstream' are not self-evident but can be presented and used in different, interlinked ways. Defining populists as marginal within the group of MPs can be used to challenge populist claims of representing the mainstream of the people. But defining oneself as marginal in relation to the former group can also be used to construe a mainstream position in relation to the latter. The ways in which the categories of 'marginal' and 'mainstream' are situationally defined and understood have implications for the claims and arguments that can be made. The approach we adopted has demonstrated how, at the level of parliamentary debate, politicians evoked various responsibilities of MPs, as an attempt to manage the populist far-right. Explicating MPs' own orientations and how they make the parliamentary identity relevant in the context of these important institutional debates affords detailed insights into the strategies that politicians adopt to try to manage the populist right. Furthermore, we showed how a populist politician tried to resist and rework what it means to be a MP, and how, in turn, other politicians oriented to this reworking.

In conclusion, the present study is the first to demonstrate how the membership category of 'parliamentarian' and the categories of 'marginal and mainstream' are explicitly used, negotiated, and resisted in debates with the populist right. The analysis indicates that politicians made specific features of being an MP relevant (i.e., shared societal responsibility) for trying to include and thereby normalize and 'pacify' the far-right. And when the far-right breaches the normative expectations, these same features were used to question their responsible parliamentary role. Our analysis makes a contribution to the social psychology of marginality and helps to understand why, according to the public and the media, politicians are not very successful in countering the far-right. Future discourse studies could examine other ways of construing and mobilizing marginality, such as the 'abnormalization' of group members (Verkuyten, 2001). Furthermore, future studies should examine how politicians in other countries try to deal with the populist right. For example, compared to a constituency system (e.g., the

UK), the Dutch system of proportional national representation might make it easier to emphasize the duty and responsibility of an MP to the public interest and common good.

References

Abell, J., & Stokoe, E. H. (2001). Broadcasting the royal role: Constructing culturally situated identities in the Princess Diana *Panorama* interview. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164902

Atton, C. (2006). Far-right media on the internet: Culture, discourse and power. *New Media & Society*, *8*, 573–587. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444806065653

Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bos, L., & Brants, K. (2014). Populist rhetoric in politics and media: A longitudinal study of the Netherlands. *European Journal of Communication*, *29*, 703–719. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323114545709

Bovens, M., & Wille, A. (2008). Deciphering the Dutch drop: Ten explanations for decreasing political trust in the Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *74*, 283–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852308091135

Burford-Rice, R., & Augoustinos, M. (2018). "I didn't mean that: It was just a slip of the tongue": Racial slips and gaffes in the public arena. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*, 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12211

Cheng, J. E. (2015). Islamophobia, Muslimophobia or racism? Parliamentary discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the minaret ban in Switzerland. *Discourse & Society*, *26*, 562–586. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926515581157

De Castella, K., McGarty, C., & Musgrove, L. (2009). Fear appeals in political rhetoric about terrorism: An analysis of speeches by Australian prime minister Howard. *Political Psychology*, *30*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00678.x

Demasi, M. (2018). Facts as social action in political debates about the European Union. *Political Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12496

Drew, P. (2005). Is confusion a state of mind? In H. F. M. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 161–183). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511489990

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1988). Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems*, *35*, 398–417. https://doi.org/10.2307/800594

Drew, P., & Sorjonen, M. (1997). Institutional dialogue. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 92–118). London, UK: Sage.

Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identity. *Discourse & Society*, *8*, 203–217. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008002004

Edwards, D. (1991). Categories are for talking: On the cognitive and discursive bases of categorization. *Theory and Psychology*, *1*, 515–542. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354391014007

Edwards, D. (2000). Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*, 347–373. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3304_01

Edwards, D. (2005). Discursive psychology. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 257–273). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology* (Vol. 8). London, UK: Sage.

Edwards, D., & Stokoe, E. (2004). Discursive psychology, focus group interviews and participants' categories. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 499–507. https://doi.org/10.1348/0261510042378209

Ellemers, N. (2012). The group self. *Science*, *336*, 848–852. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1220987

Ellemers, N., & Jetten, J. (2013). The many ways to be marginal in a group. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *17*(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868312453086

Every, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2007). Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse & Society*, *18*, 411–436. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507077427

Finlay, W. M. L. (2007). The propaganda of extreme hostility: Denunciation and the regulation of the group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*, 323–341. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466606X113615

Gibson, S., Crossland, M., & Hamilton, J. (2018). Social citizenship and immigration: Employment, welfare, and effortfulness in online discourse concerning migration to the United Kingdom. *Qualitative Psychology*, *5*(1), 99–116. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000078

Goodman, S., & Johnson, A. J. (2014). Strategies used by the far-right to counter accusations of racism. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, *6*, 97–113.

Greatbatch, D. (1998). Conversation analysis: Neutralism in British news interviews. In A. Bell & P. Garret (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 163–185). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Hafez, F. (2017). Debating the 2015 Islam law in Austrian Parliament: Between legal recognition and Islamophobic populism. *Discourse & Society*, *28*, 392–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926517703223

Harris, S. (1991). Evasive action: How politicians respond to questions in political interviews. In P. Scannell (Ed.), *Broadcast talk* (pp. 76–99). London, UK: Sage.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Sociological Review*, *92*, 110–157. https://doi.org/10.1086/228465

Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (Eds.) (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Boston, MA: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and University Press America.

Hogg, M. A., Fielding, K. S., & Darley, J. (2005). Fringe dwellers: Processes of deviance and marginalization in groups. In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (Vol. 191–210). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Hollander, J. A. (2013). 'I demand more of people': Accountability, interaction, and gender change. *Gender & Society*, *27*, 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243212464301

Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. (2011). Identity, culture and contestation: Social identity as cross-cultural theory. *Psychological Studies*, *56*(1), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-011-0068-z

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversational analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Ilie, C. (2003). Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *2*(1), 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp

Ilie, C. (2004). Insulting as (un)parlimentary practice in British and Swedish parliaments. In P. Bayley (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives on parliamentary discourse* (pp. 45–82). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Jayyusi, G. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order*. London, UK: Routledge.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and resource. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction competence*, pp. 63–92. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Kas, A. (2016). *Wilders overtroeven, dat lukt ze niet [Outdoing wilders: They can't]*. nrc.nl. Retrieved from http://www.nrc.nl/next/2016/01/16/wilders-overtroeven-dat-lukt-ze-niet-1577221

Krouwel, A. (2008). *Wilders wint echt op alle fronten [Wilders really wins on all fronts]*. Trouw. Retrieved from http://www.trouw.nl/tr/nl/4324/Nieuws/article/detail/1235355/2008/04/04/Wilders-wint-echt-op-alle-fronten-opinie.dhtml

Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2004). The discourse of the new world order: 'Out-casting' the double face of threat. *Discourse & Society*, *15*, 223–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504041018

Lepper, G. (2000). *Categories in text and talk*. London, UK: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208727

Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: 'Us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, *15*, 243–266. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504041019

Lubbers, M., Gijsberts, M., & Scheepers, P. (2002). Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, *41*, 345–378. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.00015

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 393–421. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070137

Marques, J. M., Abrams, D., Páez, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2001). Social categorization, social identification, and rejection of deviant group members. In M. A. Hogg & R. S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes* (pp. 400–424). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Marques, J. M., Abrams, D., & Serôdio, R. G. (2001). Being better by being right: Subjective group dynamics and derogation of in-group deviants when generic norms are undermined. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 436–447. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.3.436

Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist radical right parties in Europe* (Vol. 22). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511492037

Mudde, C. (2016). Europe's populist surge: A long time in the making. *Foreign Affairs*, *95*(6), 25–30.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A new way of legitimating claims. *Human Studies*, *9*, 219–230. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00148128

Pomerantz, A., & Mandelbaum, J. (2005). Conversation analytic approaches to the relevance and uses of relationship categories in interaction. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 149–171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rapley, M. (1998). 'Just an ordinary Australian': Self-categorization and the discursive construction of facticity in 'new racist' political rhetoric. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 325–344. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1998.tb01175.x

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London, UK: Sage.

Rooyackers, I., & Verkuyten, M. (2012). Mobilizing support for the extreme right: A discursive analysis of minority leadership. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*, 130–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02008.x

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. 1). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Sakki, I., & Pettersson, K. (2016). Discursive constructions of otherness in populist radical right political blogs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*, 156–170. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2142

Smart Richman, L., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review*, *116*, 365–383. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015250

Sorrentino, J., & Augoustinos, M. (2016). "I don't view myself as a women politician, I view myself as a politician who's a woman": The discursive management of gender identity in political leadership. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *55*, 385–406. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12138

Stokoe, E. H., & Wallwork, J. (2003). Space invaders: The moral-spatial order in neighbour dispute discourse. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*, 551–569. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603322595275

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Political discourse and racism: Describing others in Western parliaments. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse*, pp. 31–64. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Van Spanje, J., & Van Der Brug, W. (2007). The party as pariah: The exclusion of anti-immigration parties and its effect on their ideological positions. *West European Politics*, *30*, 1022–1040. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380701617431

Verkuyten, M. (2001). 'Abnormalization' of ethnic minorities in conversation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 257–297. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164849

Verkuyten, M. (2003). Discourses about ethnic group (de-)essentialism: Oppressive and progressive aspects. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*, 371–391. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603322438215

Verkuyten, M. (2013). Justifying discrimination against Muslim immigrants: Out-group ideology and the five-step social identity model. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *52*, 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02081.x

Vos, K., De Beer, P., & De Lathouwer, L. (2002). Verleden en toekomst van het poldermodel [Past and future of the polder model]. *Tijdschrift Voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, *18*, 403–410.

Vossen, K. (2011). Classifying Wilders: The ideological development of Geert Wilders and his Party for Freedom. *Politics*, *31*, 179–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9256.2011.01417.x

Wetherell, M., Stiven, H., & Potter, J. (1987). Unequal egalitarianism: A preliminary study of discourses concerning gender and employment opportunities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*(1), 59–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1987.tb00761.x

Wood, C., & Finlay, W. M. L. (2008). British National Party representations of Muslims in the month after the London bombings: Homogeneity, threat, and the conspiracy tradition. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*, 707–726. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466607X264103

Wooffitt, R. (1992). *Telling tales of the unexpected: The organization of factual accounts*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Yılmaz, F. (2012). Right-wing hegemony and immigration: How the populist far-right achieved hegemony through the immigration debate in Europe. *Current Sociology*, *60*, 368–381. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392111426192

Supporting Information

The following supporting information may be found in the online edition of the article:

Appendix S1. Original Dutch text of the extracts.