

Acknowledgments

This data collection was supported by National Science Foundation grants to Robert Harmel at Texas A&M University (SES-9112491) and to Kenneth Janda at Northwestern University (SES-9112357).

In addition to those whose names appear on the cover of this book, the principal investigators would like to acknowledge the help of **Wes Williamson**, who was involved in the development of coding schemes for some of the variables, and **Michael Pennington**, **Lu Shen**, and **Ewa Darski**, all of whom assisted in final proofing and assembly of the issue data books at Texas A&M.

And of course, Robert Harmel wishes to acknowledge the substantial contributions of **Kenneth Janda**, whose coding schemes for the issue variables in his original ICPP Project served as the basis for several of the coding schemes used at Texas A&M, and served as models for the rest. However, Ken does not share in the responsibility for any adaptations or newly developed schemes made at Texas A&M. **Lars Svasand** also helped in the development of coding schemes for some of the variables while Harmel was a Fulbrighter at the University of Bergen in 1988. And the final coding schemes also reflect input from **Alex Tan** and several other coders of the issue data.

Introduction: Issue Data

by Robert Harmel

Purpose and Coverage

Why do parties change their issue profiles? Downs (1957) argued that parties change their ideological positions when electoral considerations make it desirable to do so, and Janda (1990) has gone so far as to argue that parties change positions dramatically only in the aftermath of poor electoral performance. Others (e.g., Harmel, Heo, Tan, and Janda, 1995), feeling that theories based only on electoral performance give too little credit to the incentives and ability of parties' leaders and/or dominant factions to alter positions without external prodding, have argued for keeping internal affairs (e.g., changes in leaders and/or dominant factions) at the center of party change theory.

Addressing these alternative theories obviously requires a cross-section of longitudinal data on parties' issue/ideological positions. The Party Manifestoes Project has provided over-time data for a large cross-section of European and Anglo-American parties, but that Project's data tap the relative *salience* of particular issues rather than relative *positions* on the issues (for a discussion of problems in using the former as a measure of the latter, see Harmel, Janda, and Tan, 1995). Various "expert opinion" projects (e.g. Castles and Mair (1984), Laver and Hunt (1992), and Huber and Inglehart (1995)) have produced placements of parties on left-right scales, but none have produced longitudinal data, and the expert opinion approach would not seem to be well suited for tapping *changes* in parties' positions over time. (This is because the experts would be required to give their opinions on precise placements of multiple parties *over a long historical period*, which would prove very taxing for many and impossible for most.) Janda's original data set included measures of parties' positions on 13 different issues, but those data covered just two time slices. Still, Janda's judgmental coding approach, based on extant literature rather than experts' memories, would seem to provide one very useful means for producing the necessary over-time data.

Hence, Harmel and Janda's Party Change Project has employed Janda's approach for coding party positions for the parties of four countries (U.S., U.K., Germany, Denmark) on an *annual* basis for the years 1950-1990. Janda and associates at Northwestern University effectively updated his original data on thirteen different issues (see Janda, 1980), adding four new issues for the Party Change Project¹. All of Janda's codes are based, as were the originals, on information from secondary literature.

¹Added for the Party Change Project are: industrial relations, environmental policy, immigration policy, rights of women.

Believing that the secondary literature tends to be too vague on parties' issue positions to allow accurate tracking of *changes* of position on specific issues, and feeling that the best source on the party's public positions is its platform/manifesto (which is, in any case, subject to alteration on a regular basis), Harmel and his associates at Texas A&M departed from the Project's normal reliance on secondary literature to base their codes on party platforms rather than secondary literature. Harmel adapted parts of Janda's original issue coding schemes and developed coding schemes for a number of additional variables; in all, the A&M team produced annual codes (changing only with new platforms, of course) for nineteen issue variables. *The data presented in this book are limited to just the data collected at Texas A&M, i.e. data based upon actual party platforms.*

Data Production

To a large extent, the data production procedures used in the Party Change Project were first developed for coding party characteristics by Kenneth Janda of Northwestern University (with the important exception noted above, i.e. that the issue data presented in this book were based upon readings of party platforms rather than secondary literature). More discussion of the specific techniques involved may be found in his 1980 book, which also includes the data from his original International Comparative Political Parties Project.

Issue data for the Party Change Project were produced at Texas A&M using judgmental coding techniques. For each issue variable, a coder who was trained in use of the relevant coding scheme (which pairs numbers with descriptions of when those numerical codes should be applied) would carefully read a party platform, identifying all passages relevant to coding that particular issue. All such passages were then read again, as a unit, and the coder then applied what he/she judged to be the most appropriate numerical code for that issue for that platform.

Because of the heavy reliance of judgmental procedures on the ability of the coder to make wise judgments, judgmental coding always involves risk of human error. It is, therefore, incumbent upon anyone using judgmental coding to take great care in producing coding schemes and instructions for the coder and in applying the coding scheme. (If these things are done well, it is at least debatable whether the risks of error are substantially greater than for other, more widely used techniques for collecting social science data.)

The coding schemes/instructions used for the Party Change Project at Texas A&M are provided as the next section of this book. It should be noted that for coding issue positions, a coder relied upon all statements pertaining to a particular issue *in a given party manifesto*. Hence, a party's code for a particular issue remains unchanged at least until the year of adoption of the next manifesto.

For the parties of the U.S. and U.K., two graduate student coders independently coded all platforms for all issues. Pearson correlation coefficients between the two coders' data averaged .72 across the nineteen issues. For instances where the two coders assigned different codes, final judgments were made jointly by Harmel and the two coders after re-reading and discussing the relevant passages and the coding instructions.

Because coding from Danish- and German-language platforms required soliciting the help of parties' experts in Scandinavia and Germany, it was not practical to have multiple, independent

coders for the parties of those countries. For the principle party programs of Denmark,² codes were produced by Lars Svasand (University of Bergen) working with Harmel, by Lars Svasand working alone, by Lars Bille (University of Copenhagen) working with Harmel, and, for one Liberal Party platform, Niels Wammen-Jensen (University of Copenhagen) working with Harmel. For the parties of Germany, coding was done by Birgit Zahn (University of Mannheim) under the supervision of Thomas Poguntke. Tan and Harmel reviewed a sample of the German data codes (with supporting statements translated to English) and verified that the coding procedures were applied in a fashion consistent with the U.S./U.K. coding.

Though the German data were provided to the project in the German language, some of the supporting textual information was translated into English by Susan Swanson at Texas A&M in 1996. When English translations were available, those translations are included with the numerical data in our German issue data book. When English translations were not available, only the numerical data are provided, though anyone wishing to obtain a copy of the German-language supporting statements may do so by contacting Harmel at Texas A&M. For all other countries, full supporting documentation is included with the numerical data.

References

- Castles, Frances and Peter Mair (1984) "Left-Right Political Scales: Some 'Expert' Judgments." *European Journal of Political Research* 12: 73-88.
- Downs, Anthony (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Harmel, Robert and Lars Svasand. (1997) "The Influence of New Parties on Old Parties' Platforms: the Cases of the Progress Parties and Conservative Parties of Denmark and Norway." *Party Politics Journal*, 3 (No. 3): 315-340.
- Harmel, Robert, Uk Heo, Alexander Tan, and Kenneth Janda (1995) "Performance, Leadership, Factions, and Party Change: An Empirical Analysis." *West European Politics*, 18 (January 1995): 1-33.

²In Denmark, there are four types of programs: principle programs, working programs, programs for specific policy areas, and election programs. Not all Danish parties issue all kinds of programs, and not all parties produce programs with equal regularity. Nevertheless, it is generally the case that the election programs are used to (re)state a party's positions on the issues that are most relevant to that campaign, and are not likely to take positions that are appreciably different from those taken in the more authoritative principle and working programs. (from Harmel and Svasand, 1997, endnote #3)

For the Party Change Project, only the principle programs have been coded. We thank Lars Bille for his information and advice on this matter.

- Harmel, Robert, Kenneth Janda, and Alexander Tan (1995) Substance vs. Packaging: An Empirical Analysis of Parties' Issue Profiles. Paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, August 31-September 3.
- Huber, John and Ronald Inglehart (1995) Expert Interpretations of Party Space and Party Locations in 42 Societies." *Party Politics* 1: 73-111.
- Janda, Kenneth (1980) *Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey*. New York: Free Press.
- Laver, Michael J. and W. Ben Hunt (1992) *Policy and Party Competition*. New York: Routledge.

Caution to Users Concerning Quotations in Supporting Documentation

Supporting information is provided with each numerical code. The original purpose for recording the textual information was to provide a record to support the numerical coding; the supporting information is provided here only as background for understanding (and checking) the codes that were given. In many instances, quotations from the platform/manifesto are used as (or in) the supporting documentation, and coders were instructed to be careful in assigning quotation marks as appropriate. However, some slippage may have occurred in the usage of quotation marks, and hence users who wish to quote from a manifesto are cautioned to check the original party document rather than relying on what is recorded here. By the same token, it is possible that language from a party document was erroneously and accidentally recorded here without quotation marks. Quotations from Danish and German documents have been translated into English; users are advised to recheck our translations before using these “quotations” elsewhere.

Note on Variable H03C

Variable H03C, which is computed as an index based on codes for several other variables, has not been computed by us for the Danish and German parties. Users may compute this variable themselves by using the instructions which are included in the Coding Scheme reproduced in this book.

Harmel, NSF, February 15, 1993 (revised; revised again on 11/20/94, 12/3/94, 12/22/94, and 8/8/95; final revisions 7/13/96; 12/22/94 revisions are in italics; 8/8/95 revisions are in bold; 7/13/96 revisions are in bold italics; 12/14/96 revisions are incorporated in the bold italics of H02B and H03; 12/29/96 changes nearly all 0 values and involve replacing the old language: "Ambiguous and/or contradictory positions.")

Final Revised Version 12/29/96

CODING SCHEMES FOR ISSUE VARIABLES

The following coding schemes allow for 11 valid codes for each variable. It should be noted that this differs slightly from Janda's coding scheme, where the even values (other than zero) are applied only if the program differs from actual practice. We employ all 11 values as basic values, based on what the program says, and will note separately what code would have been given to actual practice in those instances where practice differs from program.

Also unlike Janda's coding, NO POSITION is always to be coded as 98, not 0. NO POSITION = 98 [Note that silence may mean the acceptance of the status quo, which is not necessarily the position between -1 and +1, and hence should not be assumed to be 0.]

For descriptions of some codes, several possible indicators are listed. It is not necessary that all such indicators be present in order for the code to apply; make the best possible judgement on the basis of the available information.

Though changes in the numbers of words or sentences devoted to a particular subject do not in themselves indicate a change in position (and hence, a change in codes), changes in "tone" or choice of wording may be deemed so substantial and significant as to justify a change in codes from one program to the next. In these instances, be sure that the codes are consistent with the coding scheme, and be certain to make the justification very clear in the text supporting the codes.

H01 LIMITATION OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS

(developed with Wes Williamson)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Advocates strict governmental control over what would normally be considered private affairs, regulating behavior in a wide variety of personal matters; strict enforcement and severe penalties are favored in at least some areas.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates governmental control over many personal matters, but recognizes individual sovereignty in certain areas; favors moderate levels of enforcement and penalties.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Generally favors a low level of government involvement in personal matters, but does advocate maintenance of some regulation already in place plus extension in one or more specific areas seen as having special affect on society.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts necessity of intrusions into personal matters in some areas where they may affect others than those directly involved (**sometimes justifying such as a necessity for social responsibility**), but opposes most attempts to extend such areas.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Accepts necessity of intrusions in very limited number of areas, but generally is strongly opposed to extension of such intrusions.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Advocates no governmental intervention in personal matters, and gives broad scope to "personal matters; favors what are generally considered extremely libertarian positions with regard to private affairs; those behaviors considered "victimless crimes" should be legalized

H02 INCOME/PERSONAL TAXES
(with Wes Williamson)

Special instructions: Personal taxes would include such as individual property tax or a tax on personal wealth, but would not include sales or value added taxes.

- 5 (PRO-strong) Strongly favors a heavy tax on personal income and/or property or wealth, as the primary means of paying for government programs; though different groups in society may be taxed at different rates, all rates would be considered heavy; advocates very strict enforcement and major penalties for violators.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors a generally high level of personal taxation, but does advocate lower tax rates for certain groups in society, may advocate alternative forms of revenue as well, so as to avoid increasing personal taxes much further.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Favors a personal tax, but advocates that **the range** be kept **low-to-moderate** generally; may favor slight increase in current rate(s), though emphasizing need to minimize the increase; may have a pattern of favoring only very limited increases.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts need for a low level of personal taxation, but generally urges small reductions from current levels, at least for some segments of society; has a tendency to oppose increases beyond current rates, with few exceptions.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Accepts need for just a very low level of personal taxation, and may generally urge major reductions from current levels; advocates developing alternative sources **(to personal taxes of any kinds)** of revenue so as to limit or reduce personal taxes.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes any income or other personal tax; strongly advocates funding government

through other means.

H02B TOTAL TAXATION

Special instructions: To code this variable, it is necessary to consider the material used also in coding H02; that is, "total taxes" obviously includes "income tax" as an important component. However, since "total taxes" will normally include more than just personal taxes, information on H02 alone (i.e. in the absence of statements on other taxes or taxes more generally) may be insufficient for coding H02B. (last altered on 12-14-96)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors heavy taxation of many types to pay for massive government spending; does not advocate reduction in the overall level of taxation, though may occasionally endorse shifting of burdens among categories of taxes or taxpayers.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors a high level and many types of taxation, though does see limits to growth in tax revenues, and may advocate planning for alternative, additional types of revenue; generally supports current taxes and levels, and regularly endorses increases, but occasionally resists.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Favors a moderately high level and several types of taxation, but strongly advocates planning for alternative sources of revenue so as to avoid continual increases in the future; expresses the need to be cautious about over-taxing; does not generally support decreasing the current overall level of taxation (unless in situations where objective observers would judge the current level to be higher than "moderately high").
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts a substantial role for taxes as one source of revenue, but tends to favor modest reductions to ease the overall burden; regularly cautions about over-taxing, and sees the latter as something of a current problem rather than just

something to be avoided in the future; regularly opposes increases that would result in an a greater overall tax burden.

+3 (ANTI-moderate) Opposes a high level of overall taxation on grounds of principle; accepts the need for some taxes but strongly advocates keeping the overall level low; opposes most increases and regularly advocates reductions in various specific taxes and in the overall level.

+5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes all forms of taxes on principle; strongly advocates abolishment of all existing forms of taxation; opposes any proposals for new forms or higher levels of taxes.

H03 SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT (Size of Public Sector)
(with Wes Williamson)

Note 1: For this variable, all levels of government (national, state, local) are included in "public sector." This variable is not about federalism; it is about the role of government in toto.

Note 2: Coding of this variable is based as much as possible on program statements specifically referring to governmental scope. When such statements do not exist, then -- even more so than for other variables -- coding of H03 depends heavily on coders' general impressions based on overall tone and content of the document as regards size of the public sector. A separate variable, H03C, is based on precise computations reflecting governmental involvement in several areas covered by other issue variables. See instructions for coding H03C, following the presentation of the coding scheme for H03. It should be noted, however, that the stricter requirements for H03C result in more "missing data" than is true for H03. (last altered 12-14-96)

-5 (PRO-strong) Favors a very broad range of governmental programs, including in defense, foreign affairs, and social and economic programs; includes not just direct governmental provision of programs and ownership of means of production, but

widespread regulation of private sector and personal behavior as well.

- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors a broad range of governmental programs, but also sees the needs for some limits on governmental involvement in certain areas; may favor regulation rather than direct governmental action or ownership in some areas, for instance; even identifies some areas as off-limits to government involvement of any kind.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Favors small to medium public sector, but identifies a large number of areas where government involvement should be limited or forbidden; in areas where it feels government is legitimately involved, tends not to oppose expansion of the government's role.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts the need for a small public sector, but tends to oppose substantial expansions even in those areas where government is currently and legitimately involved.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Accepts the need for a very small public sector, the range for which should be clearly stated in the constitution; tends to favor reductions in governmental roles in all but a few activities.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Prefers no public sector at all, but may recognize that government is necessary for one or a very few activities (e.g. defense); where government is bigger than that now, tends to favor major reductions to bring about the minimal state.

H03C SCOPE (COMPUTED)

[Substantially revised on 7/13/96]

While the coding for the original H03 is based solely on program statements referring to governmental scope, H03C is based on a computation reflecting the roles of government in a number of designated areas. Those areas are covered in this data set by eleven variables dealing with specific governmental

responsibilities: H01, H04 through H11, H14, and H15. In fact, H03C can be determined only after those other variables have been coded. Then a composite "guidepost" score (H03GP, which is only a temporary variable) is computed as follows:

H03GP=sum of X01,X04 through X11, X14, and X15, where

X04 = 2 if H04 eq -4 or -5
1 if H04 eq -1 to -3
0 otherwise,

and similarly for X14 and X15.

X10 = 1 if H10 eq +1 to +5
0 otherwise.

X01 = 1 if H01 eq -1 to -5
0 otherwise,

and similarly for all others.

For this summing procedure, any missing values in the H variables are coded as 0.0 in the X variables.

Then, H03GP is converted to the appropriate value for H03C, using the following scale:

<u>H03GP</u>	<u>H03C value</u>
11 and up	-5
10	-4
9	-3
8	-2
7	-1
6	0
5	+1
4	+2
3	+3
2	+4
0 or 1	+5

However, any missing datum on a component issue variable renders H03C "missing" as well, resulting in a missing value score of 98. For each case of a missing value on H03C, however, the data set reports both the H03GP summary score and the number of non-missing component values, thus allowing others to relax our rule that one missing component renders H03C missing.

H04 SOCIAL SERVICES: RANGE (excludes education)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors a very broad range of governmental provision of social services, covering health care, social welfare for the needy, care for the aged/infirm, family (parent/child) assistance, pensions, unemployment benefits, and more; tends to favor expansion of such programs, even where the range is already very broad.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates a "middle" range of social services provided by the government, seeing some areas as more appropriately provided for in the private sector, where some regulation may still be necessary; will include favoring governmental provision of many, but not all, of the programs listed under -5 above.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Strongly advocates direct government provision of a few of the items listed under -5 above, but also sees many areas in which the government's direct role should be nil or limited; tends to favor governmental regulation to assure good treatment of citizens rather than direct government provision/ownership of the programs.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts the need for government to be engaged in directly providing for one or a few of the items above, but would clearly see the government's role in providing social services as a very limited one; strongly prefers regulation to direct provision when a governmental role is necessary; tends to support incremental reductions in many social services.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) May grudgingly accept the need for government to directly provide just one of the items listed under -5 above, but tends not to support increases even in that area; prefers regulation to direct provision, but prefers that even the regulatory role be used sparingly; tends

to oppose any expansion of the range of social services already provided.

+5 (ANTI-strong) Advocates that government provide no social services; prefers that these areas be handled completely by the private sector, without government regulation.

H05 HEALTH CARE: GOVERNMENT ROLE

-5 (PRO-strong) Advocates that government should be the sole provider of professional health care, including the government being the owner of hospitals and employer of health care providers.

-3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates that government should be a provider, but not the sole provider, of health care (including owning some hospitals and employing some health care givers); accepts or advocates a limited role for the private sector in providing some health care, though the private sector should be heavily regulated in doing so.

-1 (PRO-weak) Advocates just a minor role for the government as direct health care provider (and would oppose moves to make it the sole health care provider); sees the major role of health care provider being played by the private sector, but under substantial regulation by government.

0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.

+1 (ANTI-weak) Opposes any role for the government as direct health care provider, though accepting a regulatory role over the provision of health care by the private sector.

+3 (ANTI-moderate) Accepts (and may advocate) a very limited role for government in regulating private health care delivery; rejects any attempts to involve the government in providing health care itself.

+5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes any involvement of the government

in the health care sector, whether as provider or regulator.

H06 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: GOVERNMENT ROLE

- 5 (PRO-strong) Advocates extensive direct governmental involvement (including extensive expenditures) in environmental protection/improvements; also advocates governmental regulation of the private sector to prevent environmental problems and governmental incentive programs to encourage environmental improvements, but does not see such indirect programs as a replacement for direct governmental involvement.

- 3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates some (*broader than for -1*) direct governmental involvement in environmental protection/improvement, but limited to specific areas of concern; also advocates substantial, relevant (see -5 above) regulation and incentive programs.

- 1 (PRO-weak) Would accept (and possibly advocate) just a very limited direct role for government in environmental protection/improvement, but advocates substantial regulation of the private sector and relevant incentive programs to accomplish the same objectives indirectly; clearly prefers the primary responsibility to rest with the private sector, but under the watchful eye of government. **(This code should be used, in preference over +1, when there is at least tacit agreement to some regulation and/or direct government role.)**

- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.

- +1 (ANTI-weak) Opposes all but very limited conservation programs that would involve the government directly in environmental protection/improvement, but does accept a limited regulatory role; would oppose moves to make the regulatory role a

substantial/extensive one. (Scores on the + side, including +1, should be assigned only when there is some opposition to a government role.)

- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Opposes any direct involvement of the government, and all but a very limited regulatory role; tends to seek reductions in governmental involvement where it is now more than minimal and regulatory.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes any involvement of the government in programs related to environmental protection/improvement, whether direct or regulatory.

H07 EDUCATION: GOVERNMENT ROLE (primary and secondary) [rev2-1]

Note: Negative values should be applied in cases where it is unchallenged that government should be/remain the dominant provider of education, and where it is advocated that private education should be subject to substantial regulation and/or restriction resulting in significant governmental "control." Positive scores should be applied only when it is clear that the party advocates having the private sector play the majority role as a provider of education. Please note: this is not about local vs. federal roles in education (all of which would be governmental), but rather governmental vs. private roles.

- 5 (PRO-strong) Advocates a policy of public education only; all educational facilities and equipment should be owned publicly; all professional educators should be employees of the state.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates policies that make or keep the government the major provider of basic education, but with some specialized areas left to the private sector, probably under strict governmental supervision/regulation (note: some language intentionally deleted here on 8/95)
- 1 (PRO-weak) Accepts (or even advocates) a "mix" of public and private basic education, but advocates policies that will probably keep public education the larger provider, perhaps by making it the option of choice; the latter may include

maintaining/improving conditions of public education and/or restrictions/regulations on private schools that would make them less attractive options; probably favors heavy governmental supervision/regulation of private education providers.

- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts a major role for government in providing public education, but prefers a mix of public and private, where the private sector is allowed or even encouraged to develop schools, under just limited restriction/regulation by the government; there is no assumption that it is best for the government to be the larger education provider or that private education must be "controlled" and heavily regulated by government.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Accepts that the government should provide an educational system for those who cannot afford private education, but advocates programs and policies that will encourage more families to avail themselves of private education; tends to advocate incentive programs (perhaps including tax incentives) aimed at private school developers and/or families who may wish to attend such schools.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Advocates a completely private educational system; may accept the need for policies (including limited financial support) to make it possible for all or most children to attend.

H08 AGRICULTURAL SUPPORTS

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors/advocates a broad and deep program of supporting agriculture through a variety of direct subsidies and tax incentives; includes a broad range of substantial, direct subsidies to producers; regardless of current level of such subsidies, tends to advocate more

rather than less. *This stops short of requiring that the party advocates complete government ownership and operation of the agricultural sector.*

- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors/advocates a moderate range of direct subsidies, with some products specifically excluded; while tending to support moves to increase or maintain subsidies, will occasionally oppose extension to some production considered "frivolous;" tends to favor tax incentives for those involved in agriculture.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Favors/advocates only a limited range of direct subsidies, specifically identifying products for which such subsidies should apply; may favor broader range of tax incentives for those involved in agriculture generally, as an alternative to most direct subsidies.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Opposes any direct subsidies for agriculture, though favors tax incentives for all or most who are involved in agriculture. *(Note that price supports and availing of credit facilities are "indirect subsidies," such that a party could receive a + score even while endorsing limited price supports or credit facilities. On the other hand, "supply management" implies direct payments for non-production.)*
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Opposes any direct subsidies, but favors a very limited program of tax incentives, especially for those involved in producing "essential items."
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes any agricultural supports from the government, whether in the form of direct subsidies or tax incentives.

H09 CULTURAL SUPPORTS

(Note: if a program advocates funding the arts "through" a governmental agency, where it is assumed that the source of the funding is governmental, such funding should be considered a "direct" subsidy.)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors/advocates substantial direct subsidies and incentives to a broad range of the arts; the latter includes direct subsidies to producers of the arts and may also include tax incentives to producers, performers, and/or patrons; generally favors increases.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors/advocates substantial direct subsidies to a specified subset of arts and/or producers felt to be particularly important and/or especially in need of help; also tends to favor tax incentives aimed at producers, performers, and/or patrons of the arts more generally.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Favors/advocates only small direct subsidies, limited to a small subset of arts and/or producers where such subsidies are deemed "critical;" favors a broader range of tax incentives to producers, performers, and/or patrons.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Opposes any direct subsidies to the arts, though accepts (or even advocates) substantial tax incentives for producers, performers, and/or patrons.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Opposes any direct subsidies; accepts (or even advocates) a very limited program of tax incentives.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes any governmental support of the arts, whether in the form of direct subsidies or tax incentives.

H10 LIMITS ON DEFENSE SPENDING

- 5 (PRO-strong) Opposes all defense spending by the government.
- 3 (PRO-strong) Favors a minimal defense expenditure by the government, perhaps aided by mostly unpaid volunteers and private sector investment; though accepting the need for a low level of spending, tends to advocate less rather than more public spending on defense.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Accepts the need for government to play a major role in defense, but tends to advocate careful review of defense expenditures, **though it** is cautious about supporting **deep reductions**.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Advocates a strong military, well supported by public funds; while tending to support incremental spending increases, does not advocate (and may oppose) substantial increases in systems and/or expenditures. (Used for parties that don't want to dismantle current defense structure, but don't want increase beyond "cost of living" increases.)
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Advocates substantial public expenditure for strong defense, but **might** tend to weigh proposals for increases against needs in other areas; generally supports incremental increases, and occasionally supports or even advocates substantial increases in systems and/or spending.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Advocates very substantial public expenditures for defense, as the most important function of government; hardly ever opposes, and normally advocates, substantial increases in military spending.

H11 FOREIGN AID

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors extensive government foreign aid program; tends to favor regular increases; tends to oppose attempts to limit or cut foreign aid from present level.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors modest (i.e. "moderately sized") government foreign aid program, though sees some need to place limits on expansion; tends to support incremental increases.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Advocates a **small** government foreign aid program; steadfastly supports certain specific foreign aid programs, but also advocates keeping the overall package small; tends to support maintenance of present level (if currently low) and at least occasionally supports small increases.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Generally opposes government foreign aid, but grudgingly accepts need/inevitability of minimal program; tends to oppose increases; may favor reductions if foreign aid is now a major expenditure.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Strongly opposes government foreign aid beyond a very "bare bones" approach; opposes any increases and may advocate major reductions to get to the "bare bones" level.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Opposes any government foreign aid; any foreign aid should be provided by the private sector only.

H12 REHABILITATION OF LAWBREAKERS (vs. punishment)

Special instructions: For this variable, try to ascertain the relative extents to which the party would emphasize rehabilitation (first) vs. punishment (second) in the government's treatment of proven criminals. Note that for the negative values, the party would tend to favor even more emphasis on rehabilitation than is currently the case; for the

positive values, the party would tend to favor even more emphasis on punishment than is currently the case.

Minus scores generally indicate desire for more rehabilitation, while positive scores indicate desire for more punishment.

If the platform does not directly address this issue, per se, then a code of -0 is appropriate.

	% Rehabilitation/	% Punishment
-5 (PRO-strong)	100% Rehabilitation/	0% Punishment
-3 (PRO-moderate)	80% Rehabilitation/	20% Punishment
-1 (PRO-weak)	60% Rehabilitation/	40% Punishment
0 (NEUTRAL)	50% Rehabilitation/	50% Punishment
+1 (ANTI-weak)	40% Rehabilitation/	60% Punishment
+3 (ANTI-moderate)	20% Rehabilitation/	80% Punishment
+5 (ANTI-strong)	0% Rehabilitation/	100% Punishment

H13 CENTRALIZED POWER (national vs. local)

Special instructions: This variable deals with the party's position on the proper distribution of power between the national government and more local levels of government (including all levels below the national level, taken together). In addition to the textual explanations for the codes, fractions are provided in parentheses. The fractions are meant to indicate rough numerical equivalents of the textual explanations, with the numerator indicating % of total power preferred for the **national** level, and the denominator indicating the % preferred for the combined **local** levels. When unclear whether +1 or -1 should be used, use the negative to indicate that the party advocates more centralization; the positive to indicate that it advocates more decentralization.

(The case of national grants to local governments presents an interesting problem for coding of this variable. If it appears that the national government is making all of the important policy decisions, and depending on the lower levels for administration only, then this should not be taken as evidence of much "power" being exercised at the lower levels. On the other hand, if it appears that the local governmental units are given great latitude in how the moneys are to be

spent, then the national governmental grants to the lower levels could be a source of some power. It is always important to determine, though, whether the pursestrings are ultimately in the hands of the giver rather than the recipient of the grants.)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Advocates unitary government; the national level should exercise all decision-making authority, with local levels performing only secondary, administrative tasks. (100/0)
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates a much stronger national than local governments, though local governments would exercise some power. (80/20)
- 1 (PRO-weak) Advocates a stronger national than local governments, but local level(s) would exercise substantial power. (60/40)
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Advocates equal division of power; alternatively, there may be ambiguous and/or contradictory statements which effectively mean equal division of power. (50/50)
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Advocates stronger local than national levels, but national level would exercise substantial power. (40/60)
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Advocates much stronger local than national levels, though national level would exercise some power. (20/80)
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Advocates confederal government, where local levels exercise all decision-making authority, and national level is always in a secondary, subordinate role. (0/100)

H14 STATE OWNERSHIP OF MEANS OF PRODUCTION

(adapted from Janda's ICPP)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Strongly favors government ownership; advocates governmental ownership of all

- basic industries; advocates government ownership of means of production generally.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors government ownership, but with some limitation; advocates government ownership of some basic industries but not all; may advocate acquiring some industry not currently under government ownership, while it could oppose acquiring something else.
 - 1 (PRO-weak) Advocates very limited government ownership, with the limitations clearly stated; would oppose moves to have government take over **most** basic industries, for instance, but tends to base its preferences in this regard on practicality rather than principle
 - 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
 - +1 (ANTI-weak) May grudgingly accept very limited government ownership, but tends to oppose extension to additional industries, and certainly opposes the idea of governmental ownership of **all** basic industries; may advocate returning some government-owned industry to private ownership, while stopping short of advocating that **all** government industries should be returned.
 - +3 (ANTI-moderate) Opposes government ownership generally, on principle; may advocate returning one or more government-owned industries to private ownership as a short-term measure, while **probably** holding return of all remaining state-owned industries as a long-term goal; would oppose government assuming ownership of any industry now in private hands.
 - +5 (ANTI-strong) Strongly opposes government ownership as intolerable; would advocate immediate return of any government-owned industry to private ownership.

H15 REGULATION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR (capitalism)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Advocates extensive regulation across the board; favors government "control" through regulation of those businesses not owned outright by the government; favors any regulation that is proposed; opposes any reductions.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors regulation of many sectors and/or potential problem areas of the economy, but does identify some specific sectors for little or no regulation; generally favors increases and opposes reductions.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Strongly advocates heavy regulation of a few specific sectors and/or problem areas of the economy, but tends to favor only limited or no regulation in other sectors; does not oppose regulation on principle, but may recognize practical problems of over-regulation; favors some proposals for new regulation but opposes others.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Opposes most regulation on principle, but does accept a low level of regulation over *just a few* specific sectors of the economy or to deal with specific problems (e.g. monopolies); may advocate reduction in some types of regulation, while supporting maintaining or *slightly* increasing regulation in its *few* specific areas of concern.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Opposes most regulation, but does accept (and may in some cases advocate) very limited regulation for health or safety or environmental reasons; may support increased regulation for those specific objectives, but tends to oppose all other new or existing regulation.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Strongly opposes any regulation of capitalism, on principle; advocates elimination of all existing regulations; opposes any new regulations.

H16 MINORITY RIGHTS
(with Wes Williamson)

Special instructions: When providing text to support the code on this variable, include information on which minority group(s) are involved. Examples: racial, linguistic, regional. (Note that there is a separate variable on Women's Rights; see H17.)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors extensive government action which promotes rights of minorities in all areas of concern, even at the expense of the rights of the dominant group in the population; favors strict enforcement of the policies with severe penalties for non-compliance.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors government action to promote rights of minorities, but only if the dominant group will not be affected negatively (or only minimally so); may advocate policies directed at many areas of concern (*more than for a code of -1*), but not all.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Favors only limited measures to promote opportunities for minorities; tends to oppose policies that would significantly advantage the minority at the expense of the dominant group.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Favors a small number of programs that would clearly have a negative impact on minority rights, even though may pay lip service to advocating minority rights; supports no concrete programs that would clearly enhance minority rights; clearly opposes any policies that would enhance minority rights at the expense of the dominant group.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Favors a number of policies that would clearly have a negative impact on minority rights; may couple this with language that is anti-minority in tone; rights of the dominant group are clearly to be favored when in conflict with minority rights.

+5 (ANTI-strong) Favors exclusionary government policies which promote the interests of the dominant group at the expense of minority rights; opposes any policies designed to single out rights of minorities for protection; may favor legislation to keep or reduce rights of minorities to a level below that of the dominant group.

H17 WOMEN'S RIGHTS

(Note: "Equal work for equal pay" normally implies support for women's rights; i.e., not a position of neutrality on the issue.)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Advocates strong government action to promote social, economic, and political status of women, even when such policies may be detrimental to men's rights or treatment; strict enforcement is advocated, with harsh penalties for non-compliance.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Advocates action in many areas of concern for women's rights, but opposes some policies which would enhance women's rights or opportunities at the expense of men's, or where other justification is accepted for maintaining inequality.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Advocates only limited action in promotion of women's rights; may tend to oppose policies that would clearly have a negative impact on men's rights and/or treatment.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.
- +1 (ANTI-weak) Advocates few, if any, policies that would clearly discriminate against women, but statements make clear that the party holds a negative view of special protections for women's rights; may tend to oppose women's rights legislation, but without making a major issue of it.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Advocates a number of policies which would be exclusionary or in other ways

discriminatory against women; justifications tend to be ad hoc rather than based on a general principle; tends to consistently oppose new women's rights legislation.

- +5 (ANTI-strong) Advocates a broad range of policies which are discriminatory against women; may do so on the basis of general principle; opposes any legislation designed to give special protection to women's rights.

H18 OPEN IMMIGRATION
(with Wes Williamson)

(To the extent that it is possible to distinguish between pledges and rhetoric on this variable, focus should be placed on the pledges.)

- 5 (PRO-strong) Favors an open immigration policy, with only very minimal restrictions; would effectively allow all applicants (both asylum seekers and others) to immigrate; may base the position on a general principle of openness and/or extreme libertatianism.
- 3 (PRO-moderate) Favors a policy that is generally open, but with significant restrictions and/or exceptions; may advocate very open policy with regard to applicants seeking asylum, while placing some restrictions on others; restrictions/limitations tend to involve very general quotas, and do not seem to be designed to discriminate against particular racial or ethnic groups.
- 1 (PRO-weak) Advocates a very open policy with regard to asylum seekers, while favoring a much more restrictive policy for others; the restrictions/limitations tend to be based on general rules of practicality, rather than designed to discriminate against particular racial or ethnic groups.
- 0 (NEUTRAL) Has contradictory positions that seemingly offset one another, and/or is truly "centrist" on the issue.

- +1 (ANTI-weak) Accepts a policy for asylum seekers that exceeds the minimums set by international organizations, but advocates a very restrictive policy with regard to others; may (but not necessarily) favor restrictions that seem to discriminate against one or more particular racial or ethnic groups.
- +3 (ANTI-moderate) Advocates (**at most**) a policy that would give immigrant status to only the minimum of asylum seekers established by international organizations, and a very few others; restrictions/limitations on the latter would be very severe; may favor particularly harsh limitations on specific racial or ethnic groups.
- +5 (ANTI-strong) Favors an extremely "closed" immigration policy, effectively closing the borders to immigrants; may even favor ignoring minimums for asylum seekers set by international organizations; may advocate expulsion of all or some recent immigrants.

Coders are also asked to note positions (if any) on:

FOREIGN BASES ON SOIL

EC

REFERENDA/DIRECT DEMOCRACY

Coding schemes have not been developed for those issues, however.