

Online appendix to “EPAC – a new dataset on ethnonationalism in party competition in 22 European democracies”, Edina Szöcsik and Christina Isabel Zuber. *Party Politics*. Published online before print on November 1, 2012, doi: 10.1177/1354068812462927.

Appendix A

EPAC data collection (June – November 2011)

	Country	Parties surveyed	Surveys sent out	Surveys returned	Response rate
1	Belgium	9	22	8	36.36%
2	BiH	16	24	10	41.67%
3	Bulgaria	6	23	9	39.13%
4	Croatia	14	26	5	19.23%
5	Denmark ¹	15	12	2	16.67%
6	Estonia	5	15	8	53.33%
7	Finland	8	16	6	37.50%
8	France	8	25	6	24.00%
9	Italy	15	25	7	28.00%
10	Kosovo	13	18	6	33.33%
11	Latvia	12	19	4	21.05%
12	Lithuania	7	25	6	24.00%
13	Macedonia	7	21	6	28.57%
14	Moldova	5	19	6	31.58%
15	Montenegro	10	15	5	33.33%
16	Poland	6	22	9	40.91%
17	Romania	7	17	5	29.41%
18	Serbia	14	21	8	38.10%
19	Slovakia	7	19	8	42.11%
20	Spain	15	23	10	43.48%
21	Turkey	4	25	8	32.00%
22	UK	14	24	6	25.00%
23	Ukraine	8	19	5	26.32%
	East	141	328	108	32.93%
	West	84	147	45	30.61%
	Overall	225	475	153	32.21%

¹ We excluded Denmark from all analyses due to the low response rate.

Appendix B

Analysis of the influence of experts' own policy positions on the placement of political parties

We estimated the following linear regression model:

$$Score_{ij} = \alpha_j + \beta_j (Policy_j - \overline{Score}_i) + \varepsilon_i$$

We evaluated whether experts' preferences distort their judgements regressing the position of party i as rated by expert j ($Score_{ij}$) on the distance between the mean expert rating of the position of party i (\overline{Score}_i) and the policy position of expert j ($Policy_j$). The distance between $Score_i$ and $Policy_j$ can be expected to be proportional to the bias (Curini 2006: 312). If the coefficient β_j is significant, $Score_{ij}$ is distorted by the expert's own policy preference. The model has to be estimated for each party individually.

Parties were included into the analysis if a sufficient number of expert-party ratings were available. Estimates are derived from OLS regressions. Standard errors are given in parentheses. *Relative expert position* is the name of our variable for the term ($Policy_j - \overline{Score}_i$).

Belgium

	CD&V	MR	N-VA	ProDG	PS	SP.A	UF	VB	VLD
Relative expert position	0.083 (0.184)	0.557* (0.264)	0.458 (0.111)	-0.418 (0.316)	0.0255 (0.285)	-0.1 (0.1345)	0.912*** (0.238)	-0.082 (0.137)	0.235 (0.181)
Constant	7.748*** (0.524)	5.468*** (0.458)	10.4915*** (0.483)	8.579*** (0.802)	5.498*** (0.409)	6.535*** (0.214)	5.532*** (0.514)	10.016*** (0.607)	6.692*** (0.374)
N	24	23	24	23	24	23	21	24	24

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Bosnia and Herzegovina

	HDZ BIH	HDZ1990	HSP-BIH	NSRZB	PDP	SBB BIH	SBiH	SDA	SDP	SDS	SNSD	SRS RS
Relative expert position	0.487* (0.15)	0.457*** (0.127)	0.294 (0.144)	-0.186* (0.088)	0.261 (0.136)	-0.061 (0.3)	-0.189 (0.199)	-0.102 (0.203)	-0.356 (0.187)	0.609* (0.187)	0.552** (0.193)	0.596** (0.207)
Constant	7.096*** (0.583)	7.225*** (0.509)	7.1855*** (0.54)	5.71*** (0.212)	7.142*** (0.442)	3.182* (0.96)	1.385 (0.888)	3.387*** (0.682)	2.813*** (0.643)	6.677*** (0.736)	6.8455*** (0.748)	6.679*** (0.802)
N	26	26	23	21	24	21	24	26	26	24	26	20

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Bulgaria

	Ataka	BSP	DPS	DSB	GERB	SDS
Relative expert position	0.019 (0.041)	0.252 (0.185)	0.175 (0.222)	0.017 (0.205)	0.13 (0.205)	0.151 (0.227)
Constant	0.297 (0.245)	3.806*** (0.644)	6.298*** (0.573)	3.455*** (0.689)	3.17*** (0.773)	4.055*** (0.722)
N	25	24	24	24	24	23

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Estonia

	EK	IRL	RE	SDE	VEE
Relative expert position	-0.306 (0.377)	-0.326 (0.254)	-0.2415 (0.272)	0.189 (0.367)	-0.024 (0.27)
Constant	4.304*** (0.631)	0.682 (0.873)	1.7555* (0.756)	0.367*** (0.6665)	7.541*** (0.881)
N	22	23	23	22	21

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Italy

	LN	PdL
Relative expert position	0.434 (0.335)	0.007 (0.265)
Constant	7.522*** (0.528)	3.262** (0.942)
N	21	21

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Poland

	PiS	RAS	SLD
Relative expert position	0.026 (0.124)	0.079 (0.29)	-0.064 (0.21)
Constant	1.919 ** (0.6465)	8.41 (0.751)	5.782*** (0.3735)
N	24	23	24

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Serbia

	DS	DSS	DSVM	LDP	PDD	SDA	SNS	SPS	SRS	SVM
Relative expert position	0.317 (0.263)	0.033 (0.169)	-0.434* (0.181)	-0.364 (0.369)	-0.178 (0.102)	-0.74*** (0.189)	-0.0704 (0.239)	0.135 (0.221)	-0.06 (0.114)	-0.573* (0.249)
Constant	5.307 *** (0.727)	1.738 (0.925)	9.857*** (0.523)	6.707*** (0.58)	9.751*** (0.332)	9.931*** (0.492)	2.64* (0.984)	3.781*** (0.878)	0.509 (0.695)	9.426 *** (0.608)
N	22	21	20	22	21	21	20	21	21	22

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Slovakia

	KDH	Most-Hid	SDKÚ-DS	SMER-SD	SMK-MKP	SNS	SaS
Relative expert position	-0.32 (0.306)	0.298 (0.244)	0.105 (0.332)	-0.384 (0.222)	0.023 (0.2285)	-0.007 (0.11)	-0.145 (0.316)
Constant	2.093* (0.627)	6.154*** (0.667)	3.496 *** (0.487)	0.769 (0.635)	8.529*** (0.9945)	0.362 (0.456)	4.246*** (0.341)
N	24	24	23	24	24	23	22

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Spain

	Aralar	BNG	Bildu	CiU	EA	ERC	NAI-BAI	PNV	PP	PP(CA)	PSOE
Relative expert position	-0.041 (0.058)	-0.124 (0.085)	-0.0104 (0.038)	0.023 (0.1125)	-0.016 (0.040)	-0.043 (0.039)	-0.01 (0.093)	-0.0523 (0.084)	0.109 (0.199)	0.391 (0.263)	0.33 (0.184)
Constant	9.734*** (0.188)	9.49*** (0.247)	9.861*** (0.133)	8.959*** (0.308)	9.843 *** (0.139)	9.81*** (0.13)	9.186 *** (0.2695)	9.341*** (0.245)	3.783*** (0.868)	5.682*** (1.028)	6.12*** (0.504)
N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	21	22	29

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Spain continued

	SI	UPN	UPyD
Relative expert position	-0.011 (0.0262)	0.395 (0.206)	-0.051 (0.17)
Constant	9.918*** (0.094)	6.693*** (0.484)	1.878 (0.933)
N	27	29	30

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Turkey

	AKP	BDP	CHP	MHP
Relative expert position	0.192 (0.166)	-0.063 (0.147)	0.159 (0.143)	0.033 (0.043)
Constant	4.351*** (0.75)	9.491*** (0.451)	2.989*** (0.776)	0.417 (0.322)
N	22	20	22	22

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)

Appendix C

Variance components analysis

We evaluated the variance across experts by calculating a variance components analysis following Steenbergen and Marks (2007). We denote $y_{(ij)k}$ as expert i 's judgment of party j in country k . The parentheses of the subscripts of parties and experts indicate that they are cross-classified. While experts and parties are cross-classified at the lowest level, experts and parties are nested in countries. This cross-classified variance components model (Goldstein, 1995) with two levels is given by:

$$y_{(ij)k} = \mu + \delta_k + \varepsilon_{ik} + \varepsilon_{jk}$$

The mean position of the parties across parties, experts and countries is denoted by μ . While the mean is the fixed part of the model, ε_{jk} , ε_{ik} and δ_k are the effect of parties, experts and countries and are the random components of the model. The variance of $y_{(ij)k}$ can be decomposed as long as those components are uncorrelated with each other in the following way:

$$V(y_{(ij)k}) = \sigma_{\delta}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2$$

The cross-national variance of party placements is σ_{δ}^2 ; $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$ is the cross-party variance and the variance across experts is $\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2$. We estimate this cross-classified variance component model with Stata 11 using the raw version of the EPAC data.

Cross-classified variance components analysis of the variables “eco” (party position on economic issues), “dem” (party position on democratic freedoms and rights), “ecosal” (salience of economic issues) and “demsal” (salience of democratic freedoms and rights): Inter-expert correlation and reliability.

	ECO	DEM	ECOSAL	DEMSAL
<i>Fixed Effects</i>				
Grand mean μ	4.953*** (0.1355)	6.084*** (0.206)	6.595*** (0.188)	5.934*** (0.152)
<i>Variance components</i>				
National σ_{δ}^2	2.21e-19*** (2.35e-18)	0.359 (0.256)	0.238 (0.235)	2.76e-16 (5.71e-13)
Party $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$	2.4605*** (0.288)	3.472*** (0.393)	2.058*** (0.254)	0.413*** (0.106)
Experts $\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2$	0.504*** (0.099)	0.851 (0.144)	1.619** (0.240)	2.381*** (0.35)
Inter-expert correlation	0.83	0.818	0.586	0.148
Reliability	0.962	0.961	0.89	0.47
N	1092	1164	1201	1074
-2ll	4362.975	4740.845	4990.464	4587.602
N: number of country-party expert opinions, -2ll: -2 log likelihood. Standard errors are given in parentheses. * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-sided)				

References

- Curini, L. (2010). Experts' political preferences and their impact on ideological bias. An unfolding analysis based on a Benoit-Laver expert survey. *Party Politics*, 16(3), 299-321.
- Goldstein, H. (1995). *Multilevel statistical models*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Steenbergen, M. R. & Marks, G. (2007). Evaluating expert judgments. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(3), 347-366.