

Political data in 2010

DANIELE CARAMANI,¹ KEVIN DEEGAN-KRAUSE² &
RAINBOW MURRAY³

¹*University of St. Gallen, Switzerland;* ²*Wayne State University, USA;* ³*Queen Mary University of London, UK*

Issues in national politics in 2010

As has been the case for several years now (see Bale & Caramani 2010; Bale & Biezen 2008, 2009), the depressed state of the global economy remained a predominant theme in many countries. However, the negative influence of the economy was not universal; for some countries, a period of economic malaise was only beginning, while others reached their peak or even began to emerge from the other side. Slovenia was hit by the economic crisis later than other countries, and suffered in 2010 as unemployment and the national deficit went up. Austerity plans in countries such as Bulgaria, Cyprus, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom contributed to a downcast public mood and growing resentment of politicians and public policies. Disillusionment with incumbents led to the ousting of the Australian Prime Minister and violent strikes and protests in Greece, while the economy dominated election campaigns in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, the United Kingdom and the United States. Meanwhile, many countries kept a nervous eye on Greece as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) stepped in and sought to bail out the floundering Greek economy. Bail-outs were also provided to Ireland and Latvia, while Lithuania, whose sky-high levels of unemployment were causing talented citizens to emigrate in pursuit of work elsewhere, refused to accept help from the IMF or the European Union (EU) and instead opted for expensive bonds. Not all was doom and gloom, however. Estonia, Israel, Luxembourg and Malta all showed strong economic recoveries in 2010, with a return to growth. Meanwhile, the economies of Canada and the Scandinavian countries fared well in 2010, with Denmark even setting its sights on become one of the ten richest states in the world.

Canada's relative economic advantages did not translate into political capital due to an uncanny ability of its government to whittle away its popularity. Other governments faced with more challenging economic

circumstances found themselves embroiled in a range of scandals, with hands all too frequently being caught in the till or in someone else's trousers. Old-fashioned corruption and bribery smeared political reputations in Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Greece, Lithuania, New Zealand, Slovakia and Slovenia. A number of scandals related to party financing; in Estonia, Finland, France and Japan, notable individuals and sometimes even entire parties found themselves ousted after being found to have obtained their funds in a less than scrupulous manner. While some countries responded to these scandals with efforts to tighten anti-corruption measures and introduce stronger legislation to regulate the financing of parties, in other regimes the culprits went unpunished. In several Eastern European countries, corruption is ingrained and is treated with relative impunity. As a result, the initial enthusiasm for democracy is waning, with trust in parties and politics in Slovenia at an all-time low. Sleaze of a different kind also did nothing to bolster faith in politics. Belgium, Ireland and Luxembourg all tackled the issue of paedophilia within the Catholic Church, while Italy was affronted with alleged paedophilia inside the presidential quarters as the Rubygate scandal saw Berlusconi accused of soliciting sex with a teenage prostitute.

The elite response to the unpopularity and disillusionment caused by economic hardship and corruption has been nothing if not predictable: if in doubt, blame it on foreigners. Australia, France, Germany, Switzerland and the United Kingdom all hardened their lines on immigration, while even prosperous Denmark and Finland closed ranks against immigrant populations. Although anti-Islamic sentiment is still rife, a number of countries, including Eastern European countries such as Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia, but also France, targeted the Roma as their scapegoat of choice. Populist measures to demonise, evict or prevent the entry of certain types of population were widespread, from the banning of burqas and the deportations of Roma in France, to the anti-Swedish sentiment that is gaining a foothold in Finland.

Alongside shifting the blame onto others, another strategy that was favoured by various governments in 2010 was to seek to control the media. France and Slovenia were among those countries whose ranking fell in the World Press Freedom Index. Hungary tried to politicise the regulation of the media, while politicians in Latvia and Portugal went one further and tried to gain ownership of media outlets in order to influence their political content.

In a climate where austerity measures and cuts to public services are biting and trust in politicians is waning, it is perhaps unsurprising that the popular response has been to shift votes away from mainstream parties. In some cases, votes have transferred to far-right parties, with the Northern League bolstering its score in Italy while the anti-Islamic Freedom Party had a major breakthrough in the Netherlands, almost trebling its seat share to become the third

largest party and a prop to the minority government. The Swedish Democrats, another populist anti-immigration party, doubled their score and now hold the balance of power in Sweden. Greece saw the election of its first far-right local councillor, while the British National Party increased its vote share by more than 50 per cent. Some new political movements have also emerged – most notably the Tea Party in the United States. In many cases, however, voters have simply stayed at home, with numerous reports of depressed turnout. Abstention was higher than usual in the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia and Spain, while Iceland recorded its lowest turnout in a national election since 1916, and Italy broke the record for low turnout in nationwide regional elections.

Environmental issues remained prominent in a number of countries. The fallout from the Copenhagen climate talks (which were not earth shattering in the sense that participants might have hoped for) led to political backlash in Australia. Energy policies were prominent, with the Finnish Greens being punished for their involvement in a coalition government that supported nuclear power, while the closure of a nuclear power station led to energy supply problems in Lithuania. Malta and Norway both faced opposition to plans to extend power production due to the damage caused by emissions and to landscapes, despite the consequent high energy bills and blackouts caused by energy shortages in Malta. Opposition to mining on conservation land also forced the New Zealand government to backtrack. The catastrophic BP oil leak off the Gulf of Mexico caused major embarrassment to the Obama administration in the United States, which was accused of handling the crisis badly.

Alongside the environment, another policy area requiring difficult decisions to be made now in order to avoid impending disaster is the issue of pensions. Increased life expectancy, coupled with declines in birth rates, has left many countries with ageing populations where the cost of supporting those who have retired cannot easily be borne by younger generations. Solutions that have been floated include raising the retirement age, eliminating early retirement, reducing pensions and making cuts in other areas of public spending in order to free up funds for pensions. In almost all cases, there has been widespread public hostility to the prospects of working longer for less. In France, an embattled government held its nerve and forced through a rise in the retirement age despite widespread protests and fierce opposition, while Lithuania took the unpopular decision to cut state pensions. These two options were proposed and defeated in a referendum in Switzerland. Governments in Denmark and Latvia bowed to public pressure and abandoned plans to reform pensions, despite the repercussions for the public purse.

Finally, marriage and sexuality made it onto the public agenda in various guises. Lithuania passed oppressive legislation banning people from even

talking about homosexuality, despite the successful staging of its first ever gay pride march. Attitudes towards homosexuals were much friendlier in some other countries, with Luxembourg legalising gay marriage, although gay couples can only adopt children singly and not jointly. Slovenia debated a liberal Family Bill that would allow gay couples to adopt. Gay marriage remains a divisive issue in the United States, with many states refusing or even revoking the right of same-sex couples to marry, yet a symbolic step forward was achieved when Obama revoked the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' legislation in favour of the right for openly gay citizens to serve in the American military. Last but not least, a private members' bill in Malta set the wheels in motion for legalising divorce, finally bringing Malta in line with the rest of the world.

The changing composition of cabinets

Data on cabinet composition form only a part of the information available in the country reports. Table 1 summarises information for the 37 countries about size of cabinets, size of coalition, type of cabinet, as well as gender representation in the executive and average age (as of 31 December 2010 unless specified otherwise).

During 2010 new cabinets were installed in 14 countries (about 38 per cent of the total number of countries). As Table 2 shows, eight of the 14 new cabinets were formed without the legislature having come to a natural end and without legislative elections: Turkish Cyprus, Finland, France, Hungary, Japan, Romania, Spain and Switzerland. On the contrary, in Australia, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom new cabinets were formed after legislative elections. The extent to which Sweden has had a new cabinet following the legislative elections of September 2010 is debatable, as the cabinet was rather a reshuffle of the incumbent centre-right coalition previously in charge.

Legislative elections were held in seven countries plus the mid-term elections in the United States, whereas in 2010 there were only three presidential elections (never in concomitance with legislative elections).

While in 2010 no elections to the European Parliament took place, in a number of federal countries, important elections at the state, *Land* or canton level took place, as in Victoria in Australia, Burgenland, Styria and Vienna in Austria, New Brunswick in Canada, North-Rhine Westphalia in Germany, in Lithuania and in seven Swiss cantons.

Finally, national referendums took place in only four countries: Iceland (on the Icesave affair), Slovenia (two referendums on arbitrage and telecommunications) and Switzerland (eight referendums).

Table 1. Number of parties in cabinets, type of cabinet and age and gender of cabinet members on 31 December 2010

Country	Total number of members in cabinet	Total number of parties in cabinet	Type of cabinet	Number and percentage of women in cabinet	Average age of members in cabinet
Australia	20	1	SPMI	4 (20.0)	50.9
Austria	14	2	MWC	6 (42.9)	48.7
Belgium	23 ¹	5	OC	5 (21.7)	49.0
Bulgaria	18	1	SPMI	2 (11.1)	48.0
Canada	27	1	SPMI	8 (29.6)	52.2
Cyprus: Greek ⁷	13	2 ⁸	MWC ⁹	2 (15.4)	57.5
Cyprus: TRNC	11	1	SPMA	0 (0.0)	51.3
Czech Republic	15	3	OC	0 (0.0)	48.9
Denmark	19	2	MC	9 (47.4)	48.1
Estonia	13 ⁵	2	MWC	1 (7.7)	46.8
Finland	20	4	OC	11 (55.0)	48.1
France	31	1 ¹¹	SPMA	11 (35.4)	51.0
Germany	16	3 ¹⁰	MWC	5 (31.3)	50.9
Greece	18	1	SPMA	3 (16.7)	55.4
Hungary	10	2	OC	0 (0.0)	55.0
Iceland	10	2	MWC	4 (40.0)	52.9
Ireland	15	2	MC	3 (20.0)	58.8
Israel	30	6	OC	2 (6.7)	58.6
Italy	24 ²	2 ⁶	MWC	2 (8.3)	56.6
Japan	17	2	OC	2 (11.8)	59.8
Latvia	14	2	MWC	3 (21.4)	44.9
Lithuania	15	4	MWC	2 (13.3)	46.9
Luxembourg	15	2	MWC	4 (26.7)	55.1
Malta	8	1	SPMA	2 (25.0)	52.0
The Netherlands	12	2	MC	3 (25.0)	53.8
New Zealand ³	20	1	SPMI	6 (30.0)	52.0
Norway	20	3	MWC	10 (50.0)	51.1
Poland	19	2	MWC	5 (26.3)	52.5
Portugal	17	1 ⁴	SPMI	5 (29.4)	52.4
Romania	17	3	MC	2 (11.8)	46.6
Slovakia	15	4	OC	2 (13.3)	46.9
Slovenia	19	4	MWC	5 (26.3)	48.0
Spain	15	1	SPMI	7 (46.6)	51.7
Sweden ¹²	22	4	MWC	10 (45.0)	49.6
Switzerland	7	5	OC	4 (57.1)	54.9
United Kingdom	23	2	MWC	4 (17.4)	50.6
United States	23	1		5 (21.7)	56.2

Notes: Data relevant to 31 December of 2010.¹ There are 15 full ministers, seven secretaries of state (deputy/junior ministers) and one government commissioner composing the government. The proportion of women in cabinet is 33.3 per cent if one only counts the full ministers (the five female members of cabinet are all full ministers – the same proportion can be found in the ‘inner cabinet’ consisting in the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime

Table 1. Continued.

Ministers; lower-level executive seats are therefore exclusively held by men), and 22.7 per cent if one excludes only the government commissioner. The average age among full ministers is 47.7, but it goes up to 48.7 when one also counts secretaries of state (it further increases when one counts the government commissioner).² Of which, ten without portfolio.³ The number of members of cabinet refers to cabinet only, not executive council. The government is a 'minority supported' government. The National Party (with a minority of 58 seats out of 122 in parliament) is the only party with ministers in cabinet, but it has confidence-and-supply agreements with three other minor parties – all of which supplied ministers for senior portfolios that were placed outside of cabinet.⁴ Plus seven independents.⁵ Including a nominally independent MP who switched to the Reform Party in 2010 (according to Estonian law, MPs cannot officially change parliamentary party groups).⁶ A new parliamentary group – I Responsabili (The Responsibles) – emerged in December to support the government after the split from the PDL of the new party Futuro e Libertà (Future and Freedom).⁷ The first set of figures for Cyprus refers to the Greek Cypriot cabinet, the second to the cabinet of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.⁸ Plus two independents. One minister is from the Epalxis Movement, which is seen by some as a political party and the new government can therefore also be considered as a four-party coalition. It allied itself with AKEL in the 2006 parliamentary and 2008 presidential elections.⁹ The Republic of Cyprus has a presidential system. The categorisation refers to the strength of the supporting parties of the government coalition in parliament.¹⁰ In Germany the CDU and CSU have been counted as separate parties.¹¹ Plus one independent and two allied.¹² The cabinet Reinfeldt I, which assumed office in October 2006, never formally resigned in connection with the 2010 election, although there was a major reshuffle. Strictly speaking, therefore, the cabinet after the 2010 election is still 'Reinfeldt I'.
Legend: SPMA (single-party majority), SPMI (single-party minority), MWC (minimum-winning coalition), MC (minority coalition), or OC (oversized coalition).

In a number of countries the type of coalition has been altered. Following legislative elections we find a minimum-winning coalition between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats in the United Kingdom after many decades in which cabinets were single-party majority ones. Also, following legislative elections, changes in the type of cabinet took place in Australia with the change from single-party majority to single-party minority cabinet, and in Latvia with the change from an oversized to a minimum-winning coalition. In a number of countries the form of cabinet changed without legislative elections: first, in the Republic of Cyprus (from oversized to minimum-winning coalition); second, in Estonia (from minority to minimum-winning coalition); third, in Hungary (from oversized coalition to single-party minority cabinet); fourth, in Romania (from minimum-winning to minority coalition); and, finally, in Slovakia (from minimum-winning to oversized coalition). In total, there are eight such changes in the form of cabinets either following legislative elections or not.

At the end of 2010, as in 2009, the most frequent type of cabinet was the minimum-winning coalition with 13 out of 37 countries having this type of

cabinet, although not the same ones as during the year before. In other words, about a third of the countries have minimum-winning coalitions (as in previous years, we do not count the Republic of Cyprus and the United States in the calculation of the percentages of the types of cabinet as both have a presidential system). Only four countries, about 11 per cent of the total number of countries, had minority coalitions in 2010 (Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, as in 2009, plus Romania; in 2008 there was only one such cabinet), whereas in six countries we have single-party minority cabinets as in 2010 (the same number as in the previous year). On the other hand, the number of oversized coalitions passed from seven to eight – about 24 per cent of the total number of cabinets. These types of cabinets can be based on diverse constellations: from two parties such as in Japan, to six as is the case in Israel. Sometimes, therefore, they really disguise grand coalitions as a different type of cabinet. The number of single-party majority governments passed from five to four with respect to 2009. The most significant change is that the United Kingdom does not have a single-party majority cabinet for the first time in decades. Other changes include France, which passed to single-party majority, and Australia, which became single-party minority.

There is fundamentally no change in the number of parties in cabinet, with an average of 2.4 parties in cabinet at the end of 2010, practically identical to the ‘two and a half parties’ figure in 2009. The most relevant novelty is the number of cabinet parties in the United Kingdom where after many decades a coalition between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats is in power. The number of parties also increased in other countries such as Hungary, Romania and Slovakia. In several other countries, on the other hand, the number of parties in the governmental coalition diminished, as in Greek Cyprus, France, Japan, Latvia and the Netherlands. In all other countries the number of cabinet parties remained unchanged.

The share of women in cabinet remains about one-quarter, on average, for the 37 countries considered. The average proportion of women in cabinets in 2010 was 24.5 per cent, slightly down from 25.4 per cent at the end of 2009. For the first time in Switzerland an absolute majority of women in cabinet has been reached, with 57.1 per cent or four out of the seven ministers of the Swiss Federal Council being female. In 2009 there were several countries in which women were the majority in the cabinet (Finland, Iceland, Norway and Spain). In 2010 only Switzerland has a female majority. Beside the already mentioned case of Switzerland, in four countries the proportion of women in the cabinet increased significantly: Greek Cyprus, Malta, Romania and Slovenia.

By way of contrast, in three countries there were no female members of cabinet at the end of 2010: Northern Cyprus and Hungary as in 2009, with the addition of the Czech Republic. Also, in Estonia, Israel and Italy, the

proportion of women among cabinet members is below 10 per cent. In a large number of countries (eight) the proportion of women in cabinet declined since the previous year – most significantly in the Czech Republic (from 17.7 to 0.0 per cent), Greece (from 29.0 to 16.7 per cent) and Italy (from 25.0 to 8.3 per cent). Once again, therefore, there was no significant advance in gender equality in the executive branch.

The average age of cabinet members was 51.7 years in 2010, slightly up from 51.2 in 2009. Out of 37 countries, in only two did the average age come down significantly: the Czech Republic and France. More generally there is a pattern of young members of cabinet in the East European countries (with average ages of about 48 years), especially in the three Baltic states. As was already the case in 2009, Japan has the oldest cabinet with an average age of almost 60 years, followed closely by Ireland and Israel. Ireland, together with Greece and Italy, is the country in which the increase in average age has been highest.

The format of the *Yearbook*

The data on issues and on the composition of cabinets form only a part of the information gathered in this *Yearbook*, covering the period from 1 January 2010 to 31 December 2010. As in the earlier editions, each country report is broken down into a number of sections, with an emphasis on the inclusion of comparable, systematic data.

What is new in this edition of the *Yearbook* is that Table 2 has been compiled on the basis of a detailed questionnaire handed out to all country contributors in order to double check whether or not changes have taken place even if not reported in the text. What is also new in Table 2 is the addition of a column on *Land*, cantonal and state elections (which applies to federal countries only, and therefore excludes countries with strong institutional regionalism such as Italy or Spain). This column does not consider local elections either.

In preparing each volume, a detailed outline of the headings under which material was to be gathered was provided to each of the authors of the country reports. This outline can be summarised as follows:

1. National election results

- 1.1 General elections to the (Lower House of) Parliament
- 1.2 Presidential elections (popular elections only)
- 1.3 Elections to the European Parliament
- 1.4 Changes in the composition of the Upper House
- 1.5 Analysis of the election(s)

2. Cabinets

- 2.1 Cabinet composition
 - 2.1.1 Party composition
 - 2.1.2 Cabinet members
- 2.2 Changes in the cabinet
 - 2.2.1 Resignation, or end of cabinet
 - 2.2.2 New cabinet
- 2.3 Changes in the cabinet (personnel changes, etc.)
- 2.4 Analysis of cabinet changes

3. Results of national referenda

4. Institutional changes

5. Issues in national politics

At the same time, it is obviously the case that not all of these headings will necessarily be relevant to every country in every year. In any one year, for example, it is likely that only a minority of countries will have held general elections, while an even smaller set of countries will be likely to have held national referenda or to have undergone major institutional changes. Elections to the European Parliament obviously only occur in Member States of the EU. In the subsequent reports, therefore, the absence of a heading simply indicates the lack of relevance of that particular topic. On the other hand, there are some headings that are always relevant, and will always be included. Finally, for ease of presentation, reports under some of the headings have sometimes been collapsed together, as, for instance, when the report of a general election also incorporates an analysis of the formation of a new government as well as a discussion of the issues in national politics.

As far as developments in 2010 are concerned, all of the country reports include information regarding *cabinet composition* and *issues in national politics*. Relevant data under the more ‘variable’ headings, on the other hand – that is, under those headings that are not necessarily relevant to each country – are reported for the following countries:

General elections to the Lower House of Parliament:

Australia, Belgium, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States

Presidential elections:

Austria, Cyprus (TRNC), Poland

Elections to the European Parliament:

None

Land, cantonal, state elections (federal countries only):

Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Switzerland, United States

Changes in the composition of the Upper House of Parliament:

Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Japan, Lithuania,
Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States

New cabinets:

Australia, Cyprus (TRNC), Czech Republic, Finland, France, Hungary, Japan,
Latvia, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom

Results of national referenda:

Iceland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland

Institutional changes:

Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Spain, Sweden

The digitisation of historical *Yearbook* data

Over the past two decades, the *European Journal of Political Research's* (*EJPR*) *Political Data Yearbook* has produced a continuous record of information and analysis about the political events in dozens of countries. It has also supplied scholars with a massive amount of data: the full run of the *Yearbook* encompasses more than 600 distinct country chapters which include data for nearly every party, government, minister, president and referendum, along with tables quantifying many other country-specific political developments. The *Yearbook* has thus provided nearly a million individual points of data, but the task of connecting the dots has fallen to our readers. Now, thanks to improved technology, a forward-looking institutional commitment from the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), the journal's owners, and financial and logistical support from Wiley-Blackwell, publisher of the *EJPR* and its *Yearbook*, the editors are completing the complex process of disassembling the 600 country chapters into their million discrete pieces of data and re-integrating these into a comprehensive database that will be available on the Internet in the form of the *Political Data Yearbook Interactive*.

The process of producing this database from the *Yearbook* originals has been a challenging one, beginning with the extraction of the alphanumeric data from files in multiple formats (some already archaic, and some mere graphic images that first required transforming through optical character recognition). The data then underwent proofreading to ensure that the electronic copy matched the original. The most difficult, and intellectually most interesting, task has been the transformation of the data points into a database that links data points from each year with their predecessors and successors. Regular elections reflect only a small portion of the actual change in

most political systems, and the editors have developed preliminary procedures to account for ministerial resignations, changes in ministerial portfolios, party splits and mergers and a host of other subtle but important changes. Finally, the reintegrated data faced another round of verification by country experts – in most cases the authors of the current country chapters, who generously donated time to this effort over and above their yearly chapter duties.

At the same time, the editors worked closely with the ECPR and Wiley-Blackwell to develop a web interface that is intuitive and easy-to-use and provides scholars, political practitioners and students with the information they need most. Beginning with the hundreds of comments offered by *Yearbook* readers in the 2010 online survey and interview and focus-group methods at the 2011 ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops in St Gallen, the project team assembled a wish list of features for the online interface and used these to develop a prototype website and tested it in interviews with individual scholars which produced additional recommendations. At this writing, the project is in the hands of software developers who are putting the finishing touches on the website. (For continuous updates on the site status, check www.ecprnet.eu/pdy_online). The site, which will debut in 2012, will offer an easy-to-use interface for producing graphs and tables of election results, government composition and referendum results, and for downloading these in the most frequently used data formats. Each new publication of the *Yearbook* will automatically keep this online database up-to-date.

Nor is this likely to be the *final* step in the process. Pending available resources, the ECPR and Wiley-Blackwell are considering additional development of the online database that will satisfy the needs of potential users. In particular, the editors hope to allow a flexible configuration which lets users themselves decide how to treat splits and mergers of political parties (and ministries) and which party (or ministry) to treat as successor or predecessor in such cases. Finally, in the process of developing the *Yearbook's* database, the editors have assembled a roster of dozens of other databases that also contain data points for particular political parties, ministries and governments during particular years and that contain information which is not included in the *Yearbook*. The editors have therefore begun preliminary discussions about the possibility of extending the project to include linkages with other compatible datasets and possibly even the potential for hosting other micro-databases on parties and governments, hundreds of which are now buried in book chapters and on scholars' hard drives. How these opportunities develop will depend on further developments in funding and technology, but we have a strong reason to believe that the next generation of the *Yearbook* will allow it to remain the premier political data resource on European politics.

References

- Bale, T. & Biezen, I. Van (2008). Political data in 2007. *European Journal of Political Research* 47(7–8): 877–891.
- Bale, T. & Biezen, I. Van (2009). Political data in 2008. *European Journal of Political Research* 48(7–8): 859–873.
- Biezen, I. Van & Katz, R.S. (2004). Political data in 2003. *European Journal of Political Research* 43(7–8): 919–926.
- Biezen, I. Van & Katz, R.S. (2005). Political data in 2004. *European Journal of Political Research* 44(7–8): 919–928.
- Biezen, I. Van & Katz, R.S. (2006). Political data in 2005. *European Journal of Political Research* 45(7–8): 1023–1034.
- Katz, R.S. (2003). Political data in 2002. *European Journal of Political Research* 42(7–8): 873–879.
- Katz, R.S. & Koole, R. (2002). Political data in 2001. *European Journal of Political Research* 41(7–8): 885–896.

Table 2. Cumulative index of 'variable' headings¹

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	<i>Land</i> , cantonal and state elections ¹³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Australia	2004 2007 2010			2010	2004 2007	2004 2007 2010			
Austria	2002 2006 2008	2004 2010	2004 2009	2010	2003 2004 2005 2008 2009 2010	2003 2007 2008		2005 2007 2009 2010	2004 (1998: PE) ⁷
Belgium	2003 2007 2010		2004 2009		2003 2007 ¹¹ 2010	2003 2007 2008 2009		2002 2003 2005 2006 2008	2006 (2005: C)
Bulgaria ⁹	2005 2009	2006	2007 2009			2009		2005 2006 2007 2009 2010 2004	
Canada	2004 2006 2008			2010	2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008	2003 2004 2006 2008			

Table 2. Continued.

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	<i>Land</i> , cantonal and state elections ¹³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Cyprus: Greek	2006	2003 2008	2004 2009			2003 2008	2004	2006	
Cyprus: TRNC ⁴	2003 2005 2009	2005 2010				2004 2005 2006 2009 2010			
Czech Republic	2002 2006 2010		2004 2009		2002 2004 2006 2008 2010	2002 2004 2005 2006 2007 2009 2010	2003	2002 2006	
Denmark	2005 2007		2004 2009			2005 2007 2009	2009	2005 2009	
Estonia	2003 2007		2004 2009			2003 2005 2007 2009	2003	2002 2003 2005 2007	
Finland	2003 2007	2006	2004 2009			2003 2007 2010			
France	2002 ⁸ 2007 ¹²	2002 ⁸ 2007	2004 2009		2004 2008	2002 2004 2007 2009 2010	2005	2003 2005 2008	

Germany	2002 2005 2009	2004 2009	2010	2002 2003 2004 2005 2007 2008 2010	2002 2005 2009	2006	2004 (1999–2003; UP) 2005 (2005; GE) 2007 (2005; 2006; C)
Greece	2004 2007 2009	2004 2009			2004 2007 2009	2005 2007 2008 2010	
Hungary	2002 2006	2004 2009			2002 2006 2008 2009 2010	2003 2004 2008	2004 (2002; 2003; C)
Iceland	2003 2007 2009		2004		2003 2004 2006 2007 2009	2010	2004 (2000; PE) ^s
Ireland	2002 2007	2004 2009			2002 2007 2008	2002 2004 2008 2009	
Israel	2003 2006 2009				2003 2006 2009	2003 2004 2005 2010	

Table 2. Continued.

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	Land, cantonal and state elections ¹³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Italy	2006		2004 2009		2006	2005 2006	2003 2005 2006	2005	
Japan	2003 2005 2009				2002 2003 2004 2005 2005 ¹⁰ 2006 2007	2002 2004 2005 2006 2007			
Latvia	2002 2006 2010		2004 2009		2006 2007 2008 2009 2010	2002 2004 2006 2007 2009 2010	2003 2007 2008	2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009	
Lithuania	2004 2008	2003 ⁵ 2004 2009	2004 2009	2010		2004 2006 2008	2003 2008	2002 2003 2009	2002 2003 2008 2009

Luxembourg	2004 2009	2004 2009	2004 2009	2004 2009	2005	2002 2003 2004 2006 2007 2008 2009	2007 (2006: C)
Malta	2003 2008	2004 2009	2003 2004 2008	2003 2004 2008	2003	2003 2004 2007	
The Netherlands	2002 2003 2006 2010	2004 2009	2003 2007 2010	2002 2003 2006 2007	2005	2002 2003 2005 2006 2008 2009	
New Zealand	2002 2005 2008			2002 2005 2008	2009		
Norway	2005 2009			2005 2009			
Poland	2005 2007	2005 2010	2005 2006 2007 2009 2010	2004 2005 2006 2007	2003	2003 2004 2006 2007	
Portugal	2002 2005 2009	2006	2006	2002 2004 2005 2009		2006 2007	

Table 2. Continued.

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	Land, cantonal and state elections ¹³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Romania ⁹	2004 2008 2009	2004 2009	2007 2009		2004 2008	2004 2007 2008 2009 2010	2007 2009	2008 2009	
Slovakia	2002 2006 2010	2004 2009	2004 2009			2002 2006 2010	2003 2004 2010	2002 2006	
Slovenia	2004 2008	2002 2007	2004 2009		2002	2002 2004 2008	2003 2004 2005 2007 2008 2010	2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009	
Spain	2004 2008		2004 2009		2004 2008	2004 2008 2010	2005	2006 2010	
Sweden	2002 2006 2010		2004 2009			2002 2006 2010		2002 2010	

Switzerland	2003	2010	2003	2003	2002
	2007		2007	2007	2003
			2010	2010	2004
					2005
					2006
					2007
					2008
United Kingdom	2005	2004	2002	2005	2004
	2010	2009	2003	2010	
			2004		
			2005		
			2006		
			2007		
			2008		
			2009		
			2010		
			2002	2005	
United States	2002	2004	2002	2005	2003
	2004	2008	2004		
	2006		2006		
	2008		2008		
	2010		2010		

Notes: ¹ For a cumulative index 1991–2001, see Katz and Koole (2002: 890–895). ² Direct presidential elections. ³ Direct elections to the European Parliament. ⁴ The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. ⁵ Second round of presidential elections. ⁶ GE = general elections; PE = presidential elections; UP = changes in upper house; C = cabinets. ⁷ Not mentioned in the cumulative index in Katz and Koole (2002). ⁸ Not mentioned in the cumulative index in Katz (2003), and Biezen and Katz (2004; 2005). ⁹ First reported in *Political Data Yearbook 2006*. ¹⁰ Not mentioned in the cumulative index in Biezen and Katz (2006). ¹¹ Not mentioned in the cumulative index in Biezen and Katz (2004; 2005; 2006). ¹² Not mentioned in the cumulative index in Bale and Biezen (2008). ¹³ Information collected since 2010.