Codebook for EPAC_summary

Summary Version of the EPAC dataset
Editions 2011 and 2017
Mean Party Positions across Experts

Edina Szöcsik and Christina Isabel Zuber

Party selection

The logic behind the selection of political parties was detailed in Szöcsik and Zuber (2015: 155):

> "First, we selected all ethnonational parties, defined as a specific subset of ethnic parties. Ethnic parties are parties that appeal centrally to an ethnic category to the exclusion of others (Chandra, 2005). Ethnonational parties are parties that appeal centrally to a territorially based ethnic identity category to the exclusion of others. The classification of parties was based on secondary sources and party websites.
> Ethnonational parties were listed in the survey if they managed to gain at least one seat in the national parliament in the most recent parliamentary elections as of June 2011, or at least one seat and at least 3 percent of the subnational votes in at least one region in the last regional elections as of June 2011.
> Second, we selected non-ethnic parties if they had gained at least 5 percent of the national vote-share in the most recent elections as of June 2011."

For the 2017 edition and to enable time-series analysis wherever possible, we additionally included EPAC 2011 parties into the survey *even if* they no longer passed these criteria for inclusion in 2016, if we found evidence that the party was still actively competing at least regional elections within the minority region.

If parties ran as part of an electoral alliance, we tried to get information based on the parliament's website about the seats awarded to each individual party that formed part of the alliance.

We then included ethnonational parties that ran as part of an alliance if they gained at least one seat in the national parliament or if they gained at least 3% of seats in the regional parliament. This means that we applied our regional vote criterion to the seat shares instead of the vote shares, since for parties that ran as part of an electoral alliance, we do not have individual vote shares.
In cases where we could not find detailed information allowing us to break the seats allocated to the alliance down to individual parties on the parliaments' website, we included the first listed party (=most often the leader of the alliance) into the survey, if the alliance as a whole passed our criterion of relevance.

Reference for the dataset	For the 2011 edition: Szöcsik, Edina & Christina I. Zuber. 2015. EPAC – a new dataset on ethnonationalism in party competition in 22 European democracies, *Party Politics* 21(1): 153–160. For the 2017 edition: Zuber, Christina I. & Edina Szöcsik. 2018. The Second Edition of the EPAC Expert Survey on Ethnonationalism in Party Competition. Testing for Validity and Reliability. *Regional and Federal Studies.* DOI: 10.1080/13597566.2018.1512975
Number of countries	22
Number of parties	EPAC 2011: 210 political parties EPAC 2017: 222 political parties
Data source if not otherwise indicated	*EPAC Expert Survey on Ethnonationalism in Party Competition*, versions 2011 and 2017, Edina Szöcsik and Christina Isabel Zuber
Time periods of the expert surveys	EPAC 2011: June 2011 – November 2011 EPAC 2017: September 2016 – January 2017
Elections covered	EPAC 2011: Most recent elections as of 1 June 2011 EPAC 2017: Most recent elections as of 1 September 2016

round	**Identifier variable for EPAC edition (2011 or 2017)**
country_id	**Unique country identifier** (two digits, corresponding to the Comparative Manifesto Project)
country_name	**Country name in English** (string variable)
east	**Eastern European country** Dummy variable 0 = Western European country 1 = Eastern European country (Turkey coded as Eastern European)
eu	**European Union member state** Dummy variable 0 = not an EU member state 1 = EU member state

elecyear	**Election year** Identifies the reference election used to select parties to be included into the survey and to code vote shares, seat shares and subsequent government participation
party_id	**Unique party identifier** (four digits, first two=country_id, last two=count of parties. Parties that were included in both rounds keep their id) Note: If an EPAC 2017 party is a direct successor of an EPAC 2011 party, (we define direct successor as having the same party leader), we assigned the same party_id to the EPAC 2011 and the EPAC 2017 parties, even if the party now has a different name.
party_accr	**Party accronym** as most commonly used in the respective country
party_name	**Full vernacular party name**
party_name_en	**Full party name in English** as provided in the English *Wikipedia* entry for the party
natstrength	**Percentage of votes gained by the party in the most recent nation-wide parliamentary election** EPAC 2011: most recent election as of June 2011 EPAC 2017: most recent election as of September 2016 See variable *elecyear* for reference election used. If a party ran as part of an electoral alliance/electoral coalition, the overall result of the electoral alliance is entered for all member parties. See also next variable *pec*. Source: National electoral commissions and Wikipedia for Ukraine. If EPAC includes a party that was founded after the most recent election, or if a party did not run at the national level, but only at the regional level (see variable *regonly* below), natstrength is coded missing (not zero) to indicate that the party did not compete.
pec	**Pre-electoral coalition** Dummy to identify parties that contested the most recent parliamentary elections as members of a pre-electoral coalition. 0 = electoral result under natstrength refers to a single party 1 = electoral result under natstrength refers to an electoral coalition

seat	**Percentage of seats gained by the party in the national parliament in the most recent national election**
	EPAC 2011: most recent election as of June 2011 EPAC 2017: most recent election as of September 2016
	See variable *elecyear* for the respective reference election used.
	Source: Election reports published in *Electoral Studies* and national electoral commissions, parliamentary and party websites and Wikipedia. If the party is only regionally active (see variable *regonly*), and consequently cannot and does not hold a seat in the national parliament, then *seat* = 0.
gov	**Party in government** Dummy variable indicating whether the party became a cabinet party following the most recent parliamentary election as of 1 June 2011 (EPAC 2011) and as of September 2016 (EPAC 2017). 0= party was not a cabinet party 1= party was a cabinet party
	Source 2011: ParlGov (Döring and Manow 2011), except for Bosnia[1], Croatia[2], Kosovo[3], Macedonia[4], Moldova[5], Montenegro[6], Serbia[7], Ukraine[8] Source 2017: ParlGov (Döring and Manow 2016), except for Bosnia[9], Kosovo[10], Macedonia[11], Moldova[12], Montenegro[13], Serbia[14], Ukraine[15]
regonly	**Party only regionally active** 0 = party competes in state-wide elections (and maybe also regional elections) 1 = party competes *only* in regional elections

---

[1] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2010–12_Bosnia_and_Herzegovina_government_formation

[2] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Croatian_parliamentary_election,_2007#Government_formation

[3] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kosovan_parliamentary_election,_2010#Government_formation

[4] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macedonian_parliamentary_election,_2011

[5] Freedom House: https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2010/moldova

[6] Inter-Parliamentary Union: http://archive.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/arc/2385_09.htm

[7] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serbian_parliamentary_election,_2008#Government_formation

[8] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ukrainian_parliamentary_election,_2007

[9] Auswärtiges Amt: http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/Laender/Laenderinfos/01-Nodes_Uebersichtsseiten/BosnienUndHerzegowina_node.html.

[10] Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isa_Mustafa#Government, cross-checked with http://www.kryeministri-ks.net/?page=2,43.

[11] Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cabinet_of_Nikola_Gruevski_IV

[12] Auswärtiges Amt: https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/Laender/Laenderinfos/01-Nodes_Uebersichtsseiten/Moldau_node.html.

[13] Balkaninsight: http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/montenegro-country-profile-10-08-2016.

[14] Auswärtiges Amt: http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/Laender/Laenderinfos/01-Laender/Serbien.html?nnm=383178.

[15] Ukraine: Wikipedia: https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Другий_уряд_Арсенія_Яценюка.

predec1	**First predecessor party** If a party included in 2017 is the result of a merger of parties included in 2011, but *not* its direct successor, this variable provides the party_id of the predecessor party included in EPAC 2011. Otherwise missing. (Note that if a party *is* a direct successor, which is given it it has the same party leader, it receives the same party_id).
predec2	**Second predecessor party** If there is more than one predecessor party of an EPAC 2017 party included in EPAC 2011, this variable gives the ID of the second predecessor party. Otherwise missing.
ethno_m	**Party position on ethnonationalism** Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions on the status of ethno-national groups and the nature of the state. At one end of the spectrum (0), majority nationalists seek hegemony within the current state they define as their nation-state. At the other end of the spectrum (10), minority nationalists seek to become the hegemonic majority in a new nation-state. Moderate parties of the middle ground (5) seek a common state in which no single ethno-national group dominates over another.* Scale ranges from 0 (majority nationalism) to 10 (minority nationalism) Mean expert rating
ethnosal_m	**Salience of ethnonationalism for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating
cul_m	**Party position on cultural autonomy** Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions on cultural autonomy for national minorities, defined as the right to establish institutions of self-government in the fields of education and culture. At one end of the spectrum (0), parties are strongly against granting cultural autonomy to national minorities. At the other end of the spectrum (10), parties are strongly in favor of granting cultural autonomy to national minorities.* Scale ranges from 0 (strongly against) to 10 (strongly in favour) Mean expert rating
culsal_m	**Salience of the issue of cultural autonomy for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating

`edu_m`	**Party position on education in and of the languages of national minorities** Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions regarding education in and of the languages of national minorities. At one end of the spectrum (0), parties do not want the state to provide any education in and of the minority languages at all. At the other end of the spectrum (10), parties want the state to provide education in the minority languages up to the tertiary level* Scale ranges from 0 (no education in and of the minority languages) to 10 (up to the tertiary level) Mean expert rating Note: this question was not included in the 2016 edition.
`edusal_m`	**Salience of the issue of education in and of the minority languages for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating Note: this question was not included in the 2016 edition.
`lan_m`	**Party position on use of the minority language(s)** Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions regarding the use of the languages of national minorities. At one end of the spectrum (0), parties oppose the use of minority languages in public life. At the other end of the spectrum (10), parties favor the introduction of minority languages as official state languages.* Scale ranges from 0 (no public use) to 10 (official state languages) Mean expert rating Note: this question was not included in the 2017 edition.
`lansal_m`	**Salience of the issue of use of the minority languages for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating Note: this question was not included in the 2016 edition.

ter_m	**Party position on territorial autonomy** Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions on territorial autonomy for national minorities, defined as the right to establish their own institutions of regional self-government within their traditional homeland territories. At one end of the spectrum (0), parties are strongly against granting national minorities territorial autonomy. At the other end of the spectrum (10), parties are strongly in favor of granting national minorities territorial autonomy.* Scale ranges from 0 (strongly against territorial autonomy) to 10 (strongly in favour of territorial autonomy) Mean expert rating
tersal_m	**Salience of the issue of territorial autonomy for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating
dom_mod	**Territorial model, dominant answer category across experts** Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions on which territorial model best suits a multinational society. Please indicate with an "x" whether any of the parties explicitly support any of the following territorial models (A-G), or use the free writing space provided under "any other model" if a party explicitly supports any other territorial model not included in the list.* 1 = unitary state 2 = decentralization 3 = decentralization on ethnic basis 4 = symmetrical federalism, where all regions have equal rights 5 = asymmetrical federalism, where a national minority region has more rights than other regions 6 = Independence for a national minority region 7 = Annexation of the national minority region by another state 66 = other model (answer category only in EPAC 2011) 77 = no position The variable represents the answer category ticked by a simple majority of experts, excluding those that ticked no answer. If no answer category was dominant, *dom_mod* was set to missing. (But see *dom_modmax* and *dom_modmin*) EPAC 2017: other model (66) no longer provided as an answer category.

dom_modmax	**Territorial model, dominant maximum answer category across experts** If there are several most frequent answer categories in *dom_mod*, this variable gives the highest by rank order most frequent answer category. For example, if three experts opted for independence (7) and three chose asymmetrical federalism (6), then *dom_modmax* is set to independence (7) for the party.
dom_modmin	**Territorial model, dominant minimum answer category across experts** If there are several most frequent answer categories in *dom_mod*, this variable gives the lowest by rank order most frequent answer category. For example, if three experts opted for independence (7) and three chose asymmetrical federalism (6), then *dom_modmax* is set to asymmetrical federalism (6) for the party.
sec	**Secessionist party** Dummy generated on the basis of *dom_mod*, coding pro-independence (dom_mod=6) and pro-annexation (dom_mod =7) parties as 1, 0 otherwise. Set to missing if no dominant answer category under *dom_mod*.
sec2	**Secessionist party, including ambiguous cases** Dummy generated on the basis of *dom_modmax*, coding pro-independence (dom_modmax=6) and pro-annexation (dom_modmax =7) parties as 1, 0 otherwise. Set to missing if *dom_modmax* = missing.
eco_m	**Party position on economic issues** Survey question: *Parties can be classified in terms of their stance on economic issues. Parties at one end of the spectrum want government to play an active role in the economy. Parties at the other end of the spectrum emphasize a reduced economic role for government: privatization, lower taxes, less regulation, less government spending, and a leaner welfare state.*[16] Scale ranges from 0 (state interventionism) to 10 (free market/lean state) Mean expert rating
ecosal_m	**Salience of economic issues for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating

---

[16] This question is based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey of 2006 (Liesbet Hooghe, Ryan Bakker, Anna Brigevich, Catherine de Vries, Erica Edwards, Gary Marks, Jan Rovny, Marco Steenbergen (2010), Reliability and Validity of Measuring Party Positions: The Chapel Hill Expert Surveys of 2002 and 2006, *European Journal of Political Research* (4): 684-703.). The questionnaire was downloaded from http://chesdata.eu.

`dem_m`	**Party position on democratic freedoms and rights (Cultural dimension)** Survey question: *Parties can be classified in terms of their views on democratic freedoms and rights. "Libertarian" or "postmaterialist" parties favor expanded personal freedoms, for example, access to abortion, active euthanasia, same-sex marriage, or greater democratic participation. "Traditional" or "authoritarian" parties often reject these ideas; they value order, tradition, and stability, and believe that the government should be a firm moral authority on social and cultural issues.* [17] Scale ranges from 0 (libertarian/postmaterialist) to 10 (traditional/authoritarian) Mean expert rating
`demsal_m`	**Salience of cultural dimension for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating
`eu_m`	**Party position on European integration** Survey question: *Parties differ in their views on how much authority the European Union should have in relation to the nation state. EU-sceptical, desintegrationist parties at one end of the spectrum (0) are in favour of increasing the competencies of the nation state at the expense of the European Union. Integrationist parties at the other end of the spectrum (10) are in favour of increasing the competencies of the supranational European level at the expense of the nation state. Parties of the middle ground are in favour of maintaining the status quo (5) concerning the distribution of competencies.* Scale ranges from 0 (desintegrationist) to 10 (integrationist) Mean expert rating Not included in 2011 edition.
`eusal_m`	**Salience of European integration for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating Not included in 2011 edition.

---

[17] This question is based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey of 2006 (Liesbet Hooghe, Ryan Bakker, Anna Brigevich, Catherine de Vries, Erica Edwards, Gary Marks, Jan Rovny, Marco Steenbergen (2010), Reliability and Validity of Measuring Party Positions: The Chapel Hill Expert Surveys of 2002 and 2006, *European Journal of Political Research* (4): 684-703.). The questionnaire was downloaded from http://chesdata.eu.

`im_m`	**Party position on immigration** Survey question: Parties can be classified in terms of their views on immigration. At one end of the spectrum (0) parties are fully opposed to a restrictive policy on immigration. At the other end of the spectrum (10), parties are fully in favour of a restrictive policy on immigration.[18] Scale ranges from 0 (fully opposed to a restrictive policy on immigration) to 10 (fully in favour of a restrictive policy on immigration) Mean expert rating Not included in 2011 edition.
`imsal_m`	**Salience of immigration for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating Not included in 2011 edition.
`repgroup`	**Represented ethno-national group(s)** Survey question: *Does the party seek to represent a particular (ethno-)national group/groups?* If *ethparty_ex1*=1, string variable with the name of the represented group as stated by a majority of experts in English. Coded missing if ethparty_ex1=0. Note that "ethno-" was bracketed in the question only in the 2017 edition.
`ethparty_ex1`	**Ethnic party** Dummy variable, ethparty_ex1 takes the value of 1 if at least 2/3 of the experts that gave substantial answers to repgroup, *excluding* those that gave no answers from the total count, say that the party appeals to a specific ethnonational group. Takes the value of 0 otherwise

---

[18] Scale end points are based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2014 (Polk, Jonathan, Jan Rovny, Ryan Bakker, Erica Edwards, Liesbet Hooghe, Seth Jolly, Jelle Koedam, Filip Kostelka, Gary Marks, Gijs Schumacher, Marco Steenbergen, Milada Vachudova and Marko Zilovic. 2017. Explaining the salience of anti-elitism and reducing political corruption for political parties in Europe with the 2014 Chapel Hill Expert Survey data, *Research & Politics* (January-March): 1-9). The questionnaire was downloaded from http://chesdata.eu.

`ethparty_ex2`	**Ethnic party** Dummy variable, ethparty_ex2 takes the value of 1 if at least 2/3 of the experts that gave substantial answers to repgroup, *including* those that gave no answers in the total count, say that the party appeals to a specific ethnonational group (see EPAC_comprehensive data for individual expert answers). Takes the value of 0 otherwise. Note that *ethparty_ex2* is a subset of *ethparty_ex1*.
`calc_ethpex1`	**Percentage of experts pro ethnic party version 1** Percentage of experts stating that the party seeks to represent a particular (ethno-)national group, excluding those that gave no answer from the total count. Not included for EPAC 2011
`calc_ethpex2`	**Percentage of experts pro ethnic party version 2** Percentage of experts stating that the party seeks to represent a particular (ethno-)national group, including those that gave no answer into the total count Not included for EPAC 2011
`repreg`	**Represented regions** Survey question: *Does the party seek to represent a particular region/regions?* If regparty_ex1 =1, string variable with the name of the region the party seeks to represent in English. Coded missing if regparty_ex1 = 0.
`regparty_ex1`	**Regionalist party** Dummy variable, regparty_ex1 takes the value of 1 if 2/3 of the experts that gave substantial answers to repreg (*excluding* those that gave no answers) say that the party appeals to a specific region. Takes the value of 0 otherwise.
`regparty_ex2`	**Regionalist party** Dummy variable, regparty_ex2 takes the value of 1 if 2/3 of the experts that gave substantial answers to repreg (*including* those that gave no answers) say that the party appeals to a specific region. Takes the value of 0 otherwise.

dom_inc	**Minority inclusion into the party** Survey question: *Please indicate to what extent the parties include individuals who identify themselves with a national minority group among their candidates for elections (hereafter: minority candidates). If the parties include to some extent minority candidates, please specify in the grey cells to what minority groups these candidates belong.* 1 = No inclusion (The party does not field any minority candidates). 2 = Some minority candidates (The party fields some minority candidates). 3 = Mostly minority candidates (The party predominantly fields minority candidates for all elections). 4 = Only minority candidates (All candidates fielded by the party identify with a national minority group). Dominant answer category across experts for each party. If no unique dominant answer category, coded missing. Missing by design due to a different question wording for Bosnia and Belgium, see variable *dom_inc2* below Question not included in 2017 edition
dom_inc2	*dom_inc* **Belgium and BiH** 1 = mononational candidates 2 = multinational candidates (since there is no clear-cut majority-minority constellation in these two countries) Dominant answer category across experts for each party. If no unique dominant answer category, coded missing. Question not included in 2017 edition

dom_illeg	**Illegal action** Survey question: *Please indicate whether any of the parties currently use illegal means to achieve their goals:* 1 = No illegal action (the party's actions are in line with the legal rules of the state. 2 = Non-violent illegal action (some of the party's actions breach the legal rules of the state, but they are not connected to violence, for example the party sets-up and maintains parallel institutions that are not-recognized by official state authorities, or organises an unofficial referendum on independence of a minority region). 3 = Violent illegal action (some of the party's actions breach the legal rules of the state and are connected to violence, for example the party supports para-military organizations that fight for the interests of an ethno-national group with the use of force). 4 = Non-violent and violent illegal action (the party combines non-violent illegal action and violent illegal action). Dominant answer category across experts for each party. If no unique dominant answer category, coded missing. Question not included in 2017 edition
illegal	**Illegal action, dummy** Dummy indicating whether party engaged in any illegal action (*dom_illeg* = 2, 3 or 4). Set to missing if *dom_illeg* is missing.
pa_m	**Stance on peace agreement** **Survey** Question: *Does the party oppose or support the "xxxx Agreement"?* Survey question: Does the party oppose or support the xxxx peace agreement? 1 = strong opposition 2 = moderate opposition 3 = neutral 4 = moderate support 5 = strong support Note: Question was only asked in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and the UK. Missing by design for parties in all other countries. Question not included in 2017 edition

cit_m	Party position on citizenship Survey question: *In multinational states, parties may have different positions on the naturalization process of non-citizens of other former Soviet republics. On the one end of the spectrum (0), parties deny the naturalization of non- citizens of other former Soviet republics. On the other end of the spectrum (10), parties support an easy and almost automatic naturalization process for non- citizens of other former Soviet republics.* Scale ranges from 0 (no naturalization) to 10 (easy naturalization) Mean expert rating Note: Question was only asked in Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia. Missing by design for parties in all other countries. Question not included in 2017 edition
citsal_m	**Salience of the issue of citizenship for the party** Scale ranges from 0 (not important at all) to 10 (extremely important) Mean expert rating Note: Question was only asked in Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia. Missing by design for parties in all other countries. Question not included in 2017 edition
numethno	**Number of expert ratings by party on ethnonationalism**
ethno77	**Percentage of experts stating that party has no position on ethnonationalism** Note: For each scale, experts had the option to state explicitly that the party has no position (originally coded 77), in addition to the option of no answer (originally coded 99). To be able to calculate party means, 77 and 99 were both recoded as missing (.a). All variables with the suffix 77 preserve information on the share of experts that had originally given the substantively important answer that the party has no position on a given issue. In no case did all experts converge in their judgment that a party has no position on a given issue.
numcul	**Number of expert ratings by party on cultural autonomy**
cul77	**Percentage of experts stating that party has no position on cultural autonomy**
numedu	**Number of expert ratings by party on education in and of the minority languages**

edu77	**Percentage of experts stating that party has no position on education in and of the minority languages**
numlan	Analogous
lan77	Analogous
numter	Analogous
ter77	Analogous
numeco	Analogous
eco77	Analogous
numdem	Analogous
dem77	Analogous
numcit	Analogous
cit77	Analogous
numeu	Analogous
eu77	Analogous
numim	Analogous
im77	Analogous
ethno_sd	**Standard deviation of expert ratings by party on ethnonationalism**
cul_sd	Analogous
edu_sd	Analogous
lan_sd	Analogous
ter_sd	Analogous
eco_sd	Analogous
dem_sd	Analogous
cit_sd	Analogous
eu_sd	Analogous
im_sd	Analogous
ethnosal_sd	Analogous
culsal_sd	Analogous
edusal_sd	Analogous
lansal_sd	Analogous
tersal_sd	Analogous
ecosal_sd	Analogous
demsal_sd	Analogous
citsal_sd	Analogous
eusal_sd	Analogous
imsal_sd	Analogous
ethno_se	Benoit and Laver standard errors calculated following Benoit and Laver (2006: 176) as the standard deviation (see set of _sd variables) divided by the square root of (the no of expert placements minus one). [19]
cul_se	Analogous

---

[19] Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2006). *Party Policy in Modern Democracies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

`edu_se`	Analogous
`lan_se`	Analogous
`ter_se`	Analogous
`eco_se`	Analogous
`dem_se`	Analogous
`cit_se`	Analogous
`eu_se`	Analogous
`im_se`	Analogous
`ethnosal_se`	Analogous
`culsal_se`	Analogous
`edusal_se`	Analogous
`lansal_se`	Analogous
`tersal_se`	Analogous
`ecosal_se`	Analogous
`demsal_se`	Analogous
`citsal_se`	Analogous
`eusal_se`	Analogous
`imsal_se`	Analogous