

Supporting information

The alignment of parties and interest groups in EU legislative politics

A tale of two different worlds?

Overview descriptive data

This overview gives the descriptive data for the variables used in the analyses plus a description of the coding. The data was organized at the level of group-party alignments which means that each combination of a party group's and interest group's position on a legislative proposal represents one unit of analysis in the dataset (n=1,318).

| Function | Variable name | Variable description |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Identification variables | proposal_id | Identification number per proposal in the sample; since multiple actors made statements about each proposal, this id-number does not take on unique values within the dataset. In total this variable takes on 54 unique values. |
| | actor_id | Identification number per interest group in the sample; since some interest groups made statements about multiple proposals and since for some proposals multiple party groups made a statement, this id-number does not take on unique values within the dataset. In total this variable takes on 274 unique values. |
| | partygroup | Identification number per European party group in the sample; since all party groups made statements about multiple proposals and since for some proposals multiple interest groups made a statement, this id-number does not take on unique values within the dataset. The regression analyses were ran separately for each party group. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. ECR (n=126)2. ALDE (n=251)3. EPP (n=329)4. S&D (n=263)5. GREENS (n=258)6. GUE/NGL (n=91) |
| Variables used to construct tables | mode | This variable consists of the modal position of the interest group in the party-interest dyad towards the legislative proposal. For the position of the party group, see 'pmode'. See article for the exact coding procedure. |

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|---|
| and figures | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'seeking major changes or blocking the proposal' (n=575) 2. 'supporting the proposal, but asking for changes' (n=432) 3. 'supporting the proposal without changing it' (n=311) |
| | pmode | <p>This variable consists of the modal position of the party group in the party-interest dyad towards the legislative proposal. For the position of the interest group, see 'mode'. See article for the exact coding procedure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'seeking major changes or blocking the proposal' (n=311) 2. 'supporting the proposal, but asking for changes' (n=738) 3. 'supporting the proposal without changing it' (n=269) |
| | mepgroup | <p>This categorical variable captures in one variable which value partygroup and grouptype2 have for this case. In total this variable takes on 18 unique values.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ECR-NGO 2. ECR-Business 3. ECR-Other 4. ALDE-NGO 5. ALDE-Business 6. ALDE-Other 7. EPP-NGO 8. EPP-Business 9. EPP-Other 10. S&D-NGO 11. S&D-Business 12. S&D-Other 13. Greens-NGO 14. Greens-Business 15. Greens-Other 16. GUE/NGL-NGO 17. GUE/NGL-Business 18. GUE/NGL-Other |
| | distance9 | <p>This categorical variable gauges the extent to which party groups and interest organizations agree on a legislative proposal in terms of (1) seeking to block or change major parts of the proposal, (2) seeking minor changes or (3) supporting it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. party group=1 interest group=2 (n=91) |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. pg=1 ig=3 (n=80) 3. pg=2 ig=3 (n=178) 4. pg=1 ig=1 (n=140) 5. pg=2 ig=2 (n=242) 6. pg=3 ig=3 (n=53) 7. pg=2 ig=1 (n=318) 8. pg=3 ig=2 (n=99) 9. pg=3 ig=1 (n=117) |
| | mepgtig | <p>This categorical variable is a recoded duplicate of distance9, but only containing valid values for those cases where the party group and the interest group completely agreed or disagreed (see distance9). In total this variable takes on 5 unique values.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. pg=1 ig=3 2. pg=3 ig=1 3. pg=1 ig=1 4. pg=3 ig=3 5. pg=2 ig=2 |
| Dependent variable in the regression analysis | distance3 | <p>This variable gauges the extent to which party groups and interest organizations agree on a legislative proposal in terms of supporting it, seeking minor changes or seeking to block or change major parts of the proposal in the form of a three-point scale. If the party group and interest organization expressed the same position, the value 0 was assigned. If the party group and interest organization expressed a different but 'adjacent' position, the value 1 was assigned (i.e. a combination of 'support and minor changes' or 'minor changes and block/change major parts'). If the party group and interest organization expressed opposing positions (i.e. supporting and blocking/changing major parts of the proposal), the value 2 was assigned.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. Identical position (n=435) 1. Deviant positions (n=686) 2. Opposing positions (n= 197) |
| Explanatory variables in the regression analysis | DG friendliness (dg_coded) | <p>This variable indicates whether a DG can be seen as business friendly, NGO friendly or other. This categorization was drawn from Bernhagen, Dür, and Marshall (2015).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NGO friendly DG (n= 390) 2. Business friendly DG (n= 670) 3. Other (n=258) |
| | grouptype2 | <p>Information was coded by the authors, based on the organizations website. Is the interest organization:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An NGO (n= 360) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A business interest (n= 803) 3. Other (n=155) |
| | Codecision | <p>Whether the legislative proposal fell under the codecision procedure in which the European Parliament has the right to amend and block the proposal. See Beyers et al. (2014) for more information on the sample of proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No (n=122) 1. Yes (n= 1,196) |
| | Party affiliation of Commissioner (COM_party_new) | <p>Party affiliation of the Commissioner responsible for the DG drafting the proposal at the time the proposal was submitted. This information was coded by the authors based on the European Commission's official website and the Commission's online Prelex platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ALDE (n=486) 2. EPP (n=290) 3. ALDE-EPP¹ (n=208) 4. SD (n=195) 5. INDEP (n=139) |

Bernhagen, P., Dür, A., and Marshall, D. (2015) 'Information or context: what accounts for positional proximity between the European Commission and lobbyists?'. *Journal of European Public Policy*:1-18. doi: 10.1080/13501763.2015.1008556.

Beyers, J., Dür, A., Marshall, D., and Wonka, A. (2014) 'Policy-centred sampling in interest group research: Lessons from the INTEREURO-project'. *Interest groups & Advocacy* 3(2):160-73. doi:10.1057/iga.2014.10.

¹ For DG Transport and Energy, the two responsible Commissioners stemmed from EPP and ALDE. This is why we included the category ALDE-EPP as a dummy for party group of the Commissioner responsible for a DG in the multivariate analysis.