WEB-APPENDIX

Table A1 List of Variables used in the analyses

| *Variable* | *Source* | *Mean* | *Std. Dev.* | *Min* | *Max* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| % empl agric. | Yearly Employment in agriculture (% of total employment) ([World Bank 2011](#_ENREF_75)) | 6.20 | 5.33 | 1.3 | 30.5 |
| % empl service | Yearly Employment in services (% of total employment) ([World Bank 2011](#_ENREF_75)) | 65.20 | 8.14 | 38.8 | 77.7 |
| Unemployment Rate | Yearly Unemployment Rate ([World Bank 2011](#_ENREF_75)) | 7.10 | 2.83 | 2.8 | 19.6 |
| Rigidity Employment Index | Yearly rigidity of employment index (0=less rigid to 100=more rigid) ([World Bank 2011](#_ENREF_75)) | 42.21 | 14.93 | 7 | 66 |
| Log GDP per cap | Yearly Log of GDP per capita, PPP (constant 2005 international $), ([World Bank 2011](#_ENREF_75)) | 10.13 | 0.40 | 9.22 | 11.21 |
| Ratio annual EU Spending | [Ratio of annual EU Spending in the country to annual Contribution from the state, EU Budget 2007-13. (Source: Open Europe Website: http://www.openeurope.org.uk/research)](http://www.openeurope.org.uk/research) | 2.21 | 1.70 | 0.35 | 5.29 |
| Vetoplayer Index | Number of Veto Players in the domestic political sphere, measured on an ordinal scale from 0 (= no veto players) to 4 (= required referendum, optional referendum initiated by existing veto player, optional referendum initiated by citizens and popular initiatives). ([Hug and Tsebelis 2002](#_ENREF_24); [Armingeon et al. 2009](#_ENREF_2))} | 1.34 | 1.12 | 0 | 3 |
| Government Left Right Position | Average proportional position of coalition partners on left-right scale (coalition party strengths in parliament), who were in executive office at the time of the vote. Left-right scale between 1 (left) -10 (right). Derived from Döring and Manow ( [2010](#_ENREF_9)) | 5.38 | 1.39 | 2.76 | 7.76 |
| Government EU Integr Position | Average proportional position of coalition partners on EU integration (coalition party strengths in parliament), who were in executive office at the time of the vote. EU Integration Scale between 1 (left) -10 (right). Derived from Döring and Manow ( [2010](#_ENREF_9)) | 8.22 | 1.27 | 3.89 | 9.82 |
| Population Left-Right Position | Average position of population on left-right scale, between 1 (left) – 10 (right), derived from Eurobarometer Survey Results May 2010 | 5.40 | 0.40 | 4.81 | 6.34 |
| EU Integration Position of Population | Percentage of survey respondents considering the EU as a good thing, derived from Eurobarometer Survey Results, half-yearly from 2004-2009 ([European Commission 2010](#_ENREF_11)) | 54.37 | 12.77 | 23 | 85 |
| Agriculture value added per worker | Yearly Agriculture value added (% of GDP) Average 2002-2007([World Bank 2011](#_ENREF_75)) | 2.73 | 1.61 | 0.36 | 10.51 |
| Log Fishery Production | Yearly total fishery Production by Country - Total all Fishing Areas, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/fisheries/data/database | 11.31 | 1.96 | 7.57 | 13.97 |
| Government pos. on environment protection | Derived from the Benoit and Laver (2006) dataset, which reports values for all relevant cabinet parties. The value for a given case represents the position of the voting cabinet (proportional to coalition party strengths in parliament) on Environmental Protection | 12.25 | 1.88 | 7.10 | 17.07 |
| Log SOx Emissions per capita | Per capita SOx emissions in 2008 own calculations, derived from  http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/air/air-emissions-data | -4.21 | 0.98 | -6.37 | -2.09 |
| Government position on tax vs. spending | Derived from the Benoit and Laver (2006) dataset, which reports values for all relevant cabinet parties. The value for a given case represents the position of the voting cabinet (proportional to coalition party strengths in parliament) on Government Spending and Taxation | 11.57 | 2.82 | 5.89 | 17.07 |
| Other No Votes | The total number of Non-Approvals of Member States on the Act. Own computation from data. | 0.18 | 0.74 | 0 | 7 |
| Commissioner | 1 if the voting country has an EU Commissioner on the topic. Derived from EULO Dataset | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0 | 1 |
| President | 1 if the voting country has the presidency at the time of the vote. Derived from EULO Dataset ([Leuffen and Hertz 2011](#_ENREF_32)) | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0 | 1 |
| QMV | Coded 1 if the voting rule of the act was Qualified Majority Vote, own coding.([Leuffen and Hertz 2011](#_ENREF_32)) | 0.83 | 0.37 | 0 | 1 |

Table A2. Share of contested decisions by member state and by policy sector May 1 2004 – 31 December 2009 (2007-09 for Bulgaria and Romania).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Member** | **All proposals** | **Agriculture** | **Fisheries** | **Environment** | **Economic** |
| Belgium | 1.0 % | 1.8 % | 1.1 % | 0.9 % | 1.6 % |
| Czech | 1.0 % | 4.8 % | 1.1 % | 0.0 % | 1.2 % |
| Denmark | 2.6 % | 9.0 % | 3.2 % | 2.7 % | 2.7 % |
| Germany | 2.5 % | 3.0 % | 2.1 % | 0.0 % | 3.5 % |
| Estonia | 1.1 % | 3.6 % | 3.2 % | 0.0 % | 0.4 % |
| Greece | 1.7 % | 4.8 % | 0.0 % | 2.7 % | 1.2 % |
| Spain | 1.1 % | 1.8 % | 1.1 % | 2.7 % | 2.3 % |
| France | 1.1 % | 3.0 % | 2.1 % | 1.8 % | 0.8 % |
| Ireland | 0.8 % | 3.0 % | 0.0 % | 1.8 % | 0.0 % |
| Italy | 1.6 % | 5.4 % | 0.0 % | 2.7 % | 1.2 % |
| Cyprus | 0.7 % | 3.0 % | 0.0 % | 0.9 % | 0.8 % |
| Latvia | 1.3 % | 4.8 % | 0.0 % | 0.0 % | 1.9 % |
| Lithuania | 1.3 % | 3.6 % | 4.3 % | 0.0 % | 1.9 % |
| Luxembourg | 0.8 % | 0.6 % | 0.0 % | 0.0 % | 0.4 % |
| Hungary | 0.5 % | 1.8 % | 0.0 % | 1.8 % | 0.4 % |
| Malta | 1.3 % | 1.8 % | 0.0 % | 4.5 % | 2.7 % |
| Netherlands | 1.3 % | 3.6 % | 0.0 % | 0.0 % | 1.6 % |
| Austria | 1.9 % | 3.6 % | 2.1 % | 2.7 % | 3.1 % |
| Poland | 1.5 % | 3.6 % | 4.3 % | 1.8 % | 1.2 % |
| Portugal | 1.5 % | 3.6 % | 0.0 % | 0.9 % | 1.9 % |
| Slovenia | 0.2 % | 0.0 % | 0.0 % | 0.0 % | 0.4 % |
| Slovakia | 1.2 % | 4.8 % | 0.0 % | 0.0 % | 1.6 % |
| Finland | 1.0 % | 1.2 % | 1.1 % | 0.9 % | 2.3 % |
| Sweden | 1.9 % | 4.8 % | 2.1 % | 1.8 % | 3.1 % |
| UK | 2.7 % | 7.8 % | 2.1 % | 1.8 % | 2.7 % |
| Bulgaria | 0.5 % | 1.0 % | 1.9 % | 0.0 % | 0.6 % |
| Romania | 0.7 % | 3.9 % | 1.9 % | 1.4 % | 1.8 % |
| Total number of proposals | 960 | 167 | 94 | 111 | 258 |
| Share of contested proposals | 16 % | 36 % | 17 % | 15 % | 18 % |

In Tables A3 and A4 we calculate the same models as in the main text (Tables 4 and 5) using Gary King and Langche Zeng’s rare events logistic regression Stata programme. King and Zeng show that with rare events data standard logistical regression results can sharply underestimate the probability of rare events, such as voting against the Council majority in our data. The results do not deviate in any significant way from the results presented in Tables 3 and 4. See Gary King and Langche Zeng (2001): Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data. *Political Analysis* 9(2): 137-163.

Table A3 Voting against the majority in the Council. All legislative proposals 2004-09, rare events logistic regression

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sector Model | | Structural Model | | Redistribution Model | | Institutional-Ideological Model | |
| % employment in agriculture | 0.02 | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % employment in services | 0.04\*\* | 0.04\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDP per cap (log) |  |  | 0.49\*\*\* | 0.50\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.21) | (0.21) |  |  |  |  |
| Rigidity of Employment Index |  |  | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment Rate |  |  | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.02) | (0.02) |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio EU Spend./Contrib. (log) |  |  |  |  | -0.31\*\*\* | -0.33\*\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.09) | (0.09) |  |  |
| Veto-player Index |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.06 | -0.07 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.05) | (0.09) |
| Left-Right Position of Government |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.09\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| EU Integration Position of Government |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.03 | -0.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| EU Integration Position of Population |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.01 | -0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Left-Right Position of Population |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.41\*\* | -0.44\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.17) | (0.18) |
| QMV |  | 1.18\*\*\* |  | 1.22\*\*\* |  | 1.18\*\*\* |  | 1.17\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.39) |  | (0.42) |  | (0.39) |  | (0.39) |
| President |  | -0.87\* |  | -0.86\*\* |  | -0.98\* |  | -1.03\*\* |
|  |  | (0.51) |  | (0.50) |  | (0.51) |  | (0.51) |
| Commissioner |  | 0.12 |  | 0.24 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.17 |
|  |  | (0.31) |  | (0.31) |  | (0.31) |  | (0.30) |
| Other dissenting votes | 0.86\*\*\* | 0.83\*\*\* | 0.86\*\*\* | 0.83\*\*\* | 0.86\*\*\* | 0.83\*\*\* | 0.85\*\*\* | 0.83 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| Constant | -7.84\*\*\* | -8.86\*\*\* | -9.61\*\*\* | -10.87\*\*\* | -4.88\*\*\* | -5.90\*\*\* | -2.46\*\* | -3.30\*\*\* |
|  | (1.22) | (0.07) | (2.30) | (2.3) | (0.08) | (0.37) | (1.10) | (1.23) |
| Observations | 25174 | 25174 | 23173 | 23173 | 25174 | 25174 | 25174 | 25174 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* *p* < .10, \*\* *p* < .05, \*\*\* *p* < .01

Table A4 Voting against the majority in the Council by policy sector 2004-09, rare events logistic regression

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Agriculture | | | Fishery | | | Environmental | | | Economic | |
| Ratio EU Spend./Contrib. (log) | -0.18 | | -0.18 | 0.27 | |  | -0.66\*\*\* | | -0.66\*\*\* | -0.67\*\*\* | | -0.69\*\*\* |
|  | (0.14) | | (0.07) | (0.19) | |  | (0.22) | | (0.22) | (0.04) | | (0.21) |
| Left-Right Position | 0.09 | | 0.08 | 0.03 | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
|  | (0.07) | | (0.07) | (0.16) | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Agriculture value added per worker | -0.01 | | -0.01 |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
|  | (0.07) | | (0.07) |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Fishery Production (log) |  | |  | 0.26 | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | (0.17) | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Gov. position on tax vs. spending |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  | 0.00 | | -0.00 |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  | (0.04) | | (0.04) |
| Government Debt |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Gov. pos. on environment protection |  | |  |  | |  | 0.17\*\*\* | | 0.17\*\*\* |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |  | |  | (0.06) | | (0.06) |  | |  |
| SOx emissions per cap (log) |  | |  |  | |  | 0.51\* | | 0.51\* |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |  | |  | (0.30) | | (0.30) |  | |  |
| GDP per cap (log) |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  | -0.98\* | | -1.0\* |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  | (0.50) | | (0.50) |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| QMV |  | | 0.21 |  | |  |  | | -1.08 |  | | 1.12 |
|  |  | | (0.70) |  | |  |  | | (0.89) |  | | (0.99) |
| President |  | | -0.57 |  | |  |  | |  |  | | -0.96 |
|  |  | | (0.64) |  | |  |  | |  |  | | (1.04) |
| Commissioner |  | | 0.41 |  | |  |  | |  |  | | 0.65 |
|  |  | | (0.42) |  | |  |  | |  |  | | (0.45) |
| Other dissenting votes | 0.70\*\*\* | | 0.69\*\*\* | 0.64\*\*\* | |  | 1.07\*\*\* | | 1.09 \*\*\* | 0.76\*\*\* | | 0.75\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | | (0.07) | (0.07) | |  | (0.09) | | (0.09) | (0.06) | | (0.06) |
| Constant | -4.6\*\*\* | | -4.75\*\*\* | -8.13\*\*\* | |  | -4.99\*\*\* | | -3.94\*\*\* | 5.22 | | 4.44 |
|  | (0.48) | | (0.83) | (1.95) | |  | (1.08) | | (1.32) | (4.89) | | (4.97) |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Observations | 4379 | | 4379 | 2360 | | 2454 | 2919 | | 2919 | 6786 | | 6786 |

In Tables A5 and A6 we calculate the same models as in the main text (Tables 4 and 5) but with all the ideological variables in their squared form to test whether ideology is related to the outcome variable in a more complex non-linear way.

Table A5 Voting against the majority in the Council. All legislative proposals 2004-09, multilevel logistic regression, ideological variables squared

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sector Model |  | Structural Model |  | Redistribution Model |  | Institutional-Ideological Model |  |
| % employment in agriculture | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % employment in services | 0.04\*\* | 0.04\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDP per cap (log) |  |  | 0.42\*\* | 0.44\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.2) | (0.21) |  |  |  |  |
| Rigidity of Employment Index |  |  | -0.02\*\*\* | -0.01\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.01) |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment Rate |  |  | 0.05\*\* | 0.05\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.03) | (0.03) |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio EU Spend./Contrib. (log) |  |  |  |  | -0.29\*\*\* | -0.31\*\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.09) | (0.09) |  |  |
| Veto-player Index |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.04 | -0.06 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Left-Right Position of Government2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| EU Integration Position of Government2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| EU Integration Position of Population2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Left-Right Position of Population2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.03 | -0.04\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.02) | (0.21) |
| QMV |  | 1.10\*\*\* |  | 1.16\*\*\* |  | 1.09\*\*\* |  | 1.09\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.35) |  | (0.36) |  | (0.35) |  | (0.34) |
| President |  | -1.00\*\* |  | -0.99\*\* |  | -1.04\*\* |  | -1.05\*\* |
|  |  | (0.47) |  | (0.48) |  | (0.47) |  | (0.48) |
| Commissioner |  | 0.01 |  | 0.07 |  | 0.01 |  | 0.02 |
|  |  | (0.31) |  | (0.32) |  | (0.31) |  | (0.31) |
| Other dissenting votes | 1.13\*\*\* | 1.08\*\*\* | 1.13\*\*\* | 1.07\*\*\* | 1.13\*\*\* | 1.08\*\*\* | 1.13\*\*\* | 1.08\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| Constant | -8.28\*\*\* | -9.15\*\*\* | -9.59\*\*\* | -10.76\*\*\* | -5.52\*\*\* | -6.41\*\*\* | -4.57\*\* | -5.39\*\*\* |
|  | (1.37) | (1.43) | (2.17) | (2.23) | (0.17) | (0.36) | (0.70) | (0.78) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Random effects parameters* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Country-level variance | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Proposal-level variance | 0.76 | 0.65 | 0.77 | 0.65 | 0.78 | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.66 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Log likelihood | -1360 | -1351 | -1271 | -1261 | -1359 | -1349 | -1362 | -1352 |
| Observations | 25174 | 25174 | 23254 | 23254 | 25174 | 25174 | 25174 | 25174 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* *p* < .10, \*\* *p* < .05, \*\*\* *p* < .01

Table A6 Voting against the majority in the Council by policy sector 2004-09, multilevel logistic regression, ideological variables squared

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Agriculture | | Fishery | | Environmental | | Economic | |
| Ratio EU Spend./Contrib. (log) | -0.70\*\*\* | -0.71\*\*\* | 0.25 | 0.21 | -0.72\*\* | -0.76\*\* | -0.68\*\*\* | -0.69\*\*\* |
|  | (0.22) | (0.21) | (0.29) | (0.16) | (0.33) | (0.32) | (0.22) | (0.22) |
| Left-Right Position2 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.22) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.02) |  |  |  |  |
| Agriculture value added per worker | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.09\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fishery Production (log) |  |  | 0.28\* | 0.30\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.15) | (0.15) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gov. pos. on environment protection2 |  |  |  |  | 0.01\*\* | 0.01\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |  |  |
| SOx emissions per cap (log) |  |  |  |  | 0.55\* | 0.55\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.30) | (0.29) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gov. position on tax vs. spending2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | -0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| GDP per cap (log) |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.91\* | -0.92\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.50) | (0.50) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| QMV |  | 0.31 |  |  |  | -0.76 |  | 1.37 |
|  |  | (0.61) |  |  |  | (1.11) |  | (1.03) |
| President |  | -0.74 |  | -11.8 |  | -16.1 |  | -1.52 |
|  |  | (0.63) |  | (235.57) |  | (971.9) |  | (1.04) |
| Commissioner |  | 0.21 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.57 |
|  |  | (0.50) |  |  |  |  |  | (0.48) |
| Other dissenting votes | 0.75\*\*\* | 0.75\*\*\* | 0.88\*\*\* | 0.88\*\*\* | 1.26\*\*\* | 1.28 \*\*\* | 1.02\*\*\* | 0.98\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.20) | (0.19) | (0.22) | (0.22) | (0.12) | (0.11) |
| Constant | -3.56\*\*\* | -3.85\*\*\* | -9.3\*\*\* | -9.36\*\*\* | -4.22\*\*\* | -3.46\*\* | 3.79 | 2.74 |
|  | (0.43) | (0.72) | (1.90) | (1.93) | (1.40) | (1.67) | (5.02) | (5.16) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Random effects parameters* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Country-level variance | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.20 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
| Proposal-level variance | 0.11 | 0.09 | 1.12 | 1.05 | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.86 | 0.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 4045 | 4045 | 2454 | 2454 | 2919 | 2919 | 6786 | 6786 |
| Log likelihood | -498.67 | -497.63 | -124.12 | -122.68 | -145.45 | -143.60 | -418.93 | -415.33 |

In table A7 we tested whether governments’ ideological positions on environmental protection and tax vs. spending are interacted with SOx emissions and GDP per capita respectively. The results are not statistically significant.

Table A7 Voting against the majority in the Council by policy sector 2004-09, multilevel logistic regression

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Environmental | Economic |
| Ratio EU Spend./Contrib. (log) | -0.69\*\* | -0.70\*\*\* |
|  | (0.35) | (0.22) |
| Gov. pos. on environment protection | -0.04 |  |
|  | (0.60) |  |
| SOx emissions per cap (log) | 1.18 |  |
|  | (1.73) |  |
| SOx emission x gov. pos. environment | -0.05 |  |
|  | (0.14) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Gov. position on tax vs. spending |  | 0.87 |
|  |  | (1.11) |
| GDP per cap (log) |  | 0.06 |
|  |  | (1.38) |
| Gov. pos. on tax vs. spending x GDP per cap (log) |  | -0.09 |
|  |  | (0.11) |
| QMV | -0.76 | 1.36 |
|  | (1.11) | (1.03) |
| President |  | -1.52 |
|  |  | (1.03) |
| Commissioner |  | 0.57 |
|  |  | (0.48) |
| Other dissenting votes | 1.28 \*\*\* | 0.98\*\*\* |
|  | (0.22) | (0.11) |
| Constant | -2.02\*\* | -7.21 |
|  | (7.36) | (14.00) |
|  |  |  |
| *Random effects parameters* |  |  |
| Country-level variance | 0.20 | 0.06 |
| Proposal-level variance | 0.43 | 0.76 |
| Observations | 2919 | 6786 |
| Log likelihood | -145.02 | -415.02 |