Appendix 1: Italian Expert Survey Policy Dimensions

1. TAXES vs. SPENDING
Promotes raising taxes to increase public services. (1)
Promotes cutting public services to cut taxes. (20)

2. DEREGULATION
Favours high levels of state regulation and control of the market. (1)
Favours deregulation of markets at every opportunity. (20)

3. SOCIAL POLICY
Favours liberal policies on matters such as abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia. (1)
Opposes liberal policies on matters such as abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia. (20)

4. IMMIGRATION
Favours policies designed to help asylum-seekers and immigrants integrate into Italy’s society. (1)
Favours policies designed to help asylum-seekers and immigrants return to their country of origin. (20)

5. ENVIRONMENT
Supports protection of the environment, even at the cost of economic growth. (1)
Supports economic growth, even at the cost of damage to the environment. (20)

6. DECENTRALIZATION
Promotes decentralization of all administration and decision-making. (1)
Opposes any decentralization of administration and decision-making. (20)

7. EU AUTHORITY
Favours increasing the range of areas in which the EU can set policy. (1)
Favours reducing the range of areas in which the EU can set policy. (20)
8. EU SECURITY
Favours Italy’s involvement in European security and peacekeeping missions. (1)
Opposes any Italy’s involvement in European military affairs. (20)

9. EU ACCOUNTABILITY
Promotes the direct accountability of the EU to citizens via institutions such as the European Parliament. (1)
Promotes the indirect accountability of the EU to citizens via their own national governments. (20)

10. THE GENERAL LEFT-RIGHT DIMENSION
Please locate each party on a general left-right dimension, taking all aspects of party policy into account.
Left. (1) Right. (20)

Appendix 2: Cross-Validation

First, we compare party positions in the three selected elections with the party positions on comparable policy scales provided by the Chapel Hill Expert Survey dataset: EU (EU_POSITION), Immigration (IMMIGRATE_POLICY), and Taxes vs Spending (SPENDVTAX) (Bakker et al. 2020). Although expert surveys are a valuable tool for cross-validating party positions (Gabel and Huber 2000), we further seek to test our data’s validity by comparing them with party positions derived using a different method, namely hand-coding. To this end, we cross-validate party positions on the selected issues with what we assume to be two comparable policy dimensions in the Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP): European Community/Union: Positive (108) vs. Negative (110) and Immigration: Negative (601.2) vs. Positive (602.2) (Volkens et al. 2020). CMP does not provide a comparable policy dimension for Taxes vs. Spending.

Table 1 presents the correlation estimates between the party positions in the dataset employed in this study and the other two datasets. The correlation coefficients with the CHES dataset range from 0.89 to 0.98, indicating a high degree of similarity between the party positions on the three selected dimensions. The correlations with the hand-coded CMP data on EU authority and immigration issues support this finding, albeit the correlation coefficients for the EU dimension indicate a slightly lower degree of association.
Table 1. Correlation between Italian Party Position Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU authority</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>Taxes vs. spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHES EU_POSITION (n=18, 2008-2018)</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRATE_POLICY (n=18, 2008-2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDVTAX (n=18, 2008-2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP European Community/Union (n=22, 2008-2018)</td>
<td>-0.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration (n=8, 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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