

Political data in 2011

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 2011

Continuing the well-established trend started in 2008, the economy remained one of the dominant themes in 2011 (Caramani et al. 2011; Bale & Caramani 2010; Bale & van Biezen 2008, 2009). For many countries, this equated to ongoing doom and gloom, while a few began to see the light at the end of the tunnel. However, the economy was by no means the only theme influencing domestic politics in 2011. A number of major events around the world had a ripple effect on politics within individual countries. These included the Arab Spring, the earthquake and nuclear disaster in Japan, and the horrific shootings in Norway. The ‘Occupy’ movement took off around the world. In times of hardship, people in some countries found themselves embroiled in a mentality of ‘us and them’: the ‘poor’ 99 per cent versus the ‘rich’ 1 per cent; indigenous versus immigrant populations; one partisan grouping against another. In this climate, it is perhaps unsurprising that four governments were toppled, in addition to the ousting of the Japanese Prime Minister.

Since the beginning of the economic crisis in 2008, some countries have begun to return to good economic health while others remain saddled with large debts and/or unpopular austerity measures. Some of the most high-profile international actors of 2011 were the credit ratings agencies such as Standard and Poor’s, Moody’s and Fitch. Their decisions to maintain or downgrade a country’s credit rating were highly symbolic; they affected not only the ease with which a country could borrow, but also the perceived status and economic health of a country. A bad rating could cause international embarrassment and domestic turmoil. The fear of a negative evaluation was sufficient to drive countries such as Austria towards austerity measures. Meanwhile, Cyprus was one of several countries to suffer from the shock waves emanating from the epicentre of the crisis: Greece. Cypriot exposure to Greek banks resulted in their downgrading by all three ratings agencies. Other struggling

countries such as Ireland and Portugal also kept a nervous eye on Greece as a portent of what might happen to them next.

Deficit and austerity have been two of the buzzwords of 2011, with an increase in the latter being frequently deemed necessary to effect a reduction in the former. Public sector cuts have been a popular target, with civil servants seeing their pay frozen for two years in Cyprus and five years in Luxembourg, while Latvia went even further and cut public sector pay. Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand and Portugal have also seen heavy cuts to public services. In some countries, such as Cyprus, the Czech Republic and France, these cuts were accompanied by increases in value-added tax (VAT) and other taxes. Public support for austerity has varied significantly from one country to another. Despite the urgency of resolving its debt crisis, the Greek government has failed to convince its population of the need to rein in public spending. On the other hand, the New Zealand government enjoyed widespread public support for its austerity measures, and was one of the rare examples of a government that was re-elected in the midst of a financial crisis. In some countries, diverging views on how best to strengthen the economy dominated party politics. In Denmark and Slovenia, parties of the right focused on austerity and cuts as a means of resolving the economic crisis, while parties of the left focused on protecting the welfare state and using state-promoted growth initiatives as a means of stimulating the economy.

High unemployment and low or negative growth has been a problem for many countries, including France, the United Kingdom and the United States. Bulgarians have the lowest per capita gross domestic product (GDP) in the European Union (EU), and Belgium and Hungary are still feeling the ongoing effects of crisis. The worst hit countries have been Greece, Portugal, Italy, Ireland and Spain. The need for the International Monetary Fund and EU bail-outs has had several ripple effects. In the countries concerned, there has been anxiety, humiliation and resentment. Elsewhere, the costs of bailing out failing economies has led to doubts about the stability and viability of the eurozone, with Latvia starting to question whether it still wanted to pursue entry. Some Dutch parties resented the bail-outs offered to countries such as Greece who had failed to manage their own economic situation. At the helm, Angela Merkel of Germany and Nicolas Sarkozy of France sought to impose their preferred model of austerity upon their reluctant neighbours.

The costs of the crisis have been political as well as economic. The incumbent governments of Ireland and Spain were both subjected to humiliating electoral defeats by disillusioned electorates. In Portugal, the Prime Minister was forced to resign after failing to obtain support for an austerity programme drawn up as part of negotiations with the EU. His party lost the subsequent election with an eight percentage point drop in vote share; he

resigned from his parliamentary seat and retired from public life. In Italy, the maverick Silvio Berlusconi was also ousted from office. The Japanese Prime Minister, under intense pressure following the Fukushima nuclear crisis, resigned in September. Meanwhile, there were unsuccessful attempts to oust the Lithuanian government one minister at a time, and the Icelandic government saw a huge decline in popularity. The trend was not entirely negative, however. The governments of Canada, New Zealand and Poland all secured their own re-election – in the case of Poland, this was the first time in the country's post-communist history that a governing party was awarded a second term.

Just as some governing parties bucked the negative trend, so did some economies. Despite high rates of inflation and unemployment, Estonia boasted the fastest growing economy in the EU, and earned the dubious honour of joining the eurozone. Latvia likewise had double-digit unemployment levels, but 4.5 per cent growth – part of a wider economic rebound fuelled by an increase in exports. Lithuania and Romania both showed signs of slow economic recovery, with Lithuania also having one of the highest growth rates. Economic recovery is not limited to Eastern Europe; Malta is also doing quite well, and Israel is flourishing, although the impact of the global economic crisis is starting to cause a slowdown in growth.

Moving away from the direct effects of the economic crisis, one of the most contested areas of policy reform has been in the area of pensions. Aside the short-term effects of reduced state funds and the diminished value of private pension investments, most countries are facing a more long-term demographic crisis. Populations are living longer, birth rates are declining, and there simply are not enough younger people to be able to support the cost of retirement under the conditions currently enjoyed by the present generation of retirees. Resolving this dilemma has required at least one of several possible solutions. Lithuania simply cut the value of pensions. Ireland enforced public sector pay cuts to help fund the state's growing pension commitments. The Czech Republic partially privatised pension schemes. Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark all sought to raise the retirement age, although in each case, this was met with fierce opposition. This is a policy area that is likely to continue causing headaches for many years to come.

Another thorny policy area has been energy policy. In the wake of the nuclear disaster in Fukushima, there was a global shift in public opinion away from nuclear power. In France, determination from the Green Party to phase out nuclear power (which represents 80 per cent of France's energy supply) led to tensions on the left. Neighbouring Luxembourg also put pressure on France and sought to end its own dependence on nuclear power. In Germany, Merkel did a u-turn and opted to phase out nuclear power as swiftly as possible. The

Lithuanian government was faced with controversy over the cost of decommissioning an old nuclear power plant, and loss of public enthusiasm for a planned new plant. The newfound public distaste for nuclear energy sat uneasily alongside efforts by governments to reduce their energy dependence on areas such as Russia and the Middle East, and to reduce their carbon emissions in accordance with international agreements.

Nuclear power was not the only issue thrust onto the agenda as a result of events. The brutal murder of 77 people in Norway, most of them teenagers, by a lone right-wing fanatic led to an intense debate about immigration and integration. Far-right parties saw a decline in support in Norway and neighbouring Sweden. However, anti-immigrant sentiment remained alive and well in many countries. Alongside the all-too-familiar Islamophobia, popular targets for racial hatred in 2011 were the Roma. Deported from France, forced out of their homes in Hungary following conflict with the far right, the subject of protests in Bulgaria and Luxembourg, Roma populations had a difficult year. In times of crisis, the Roma have become an easy scapegoat and diversion from economic woes.

However, anti-immigrant sentiment has not been sufficient to distract people from a generous dose of political scandal. This volume of the *PDY* is littered with tales of political corruption, from misappropriation of state funds and a 'Cash for Laws' scandal in Austria to exposure of a wide range of misdemeanours in the Czech Republic courtesy of wiretaps. The raising of illegal campaign funds in Japan was overlooked only because the story got buried by the earthquake that erupted the same day. In Romania and Slovenia, half-hearted attempts to rein in corruption have done little to deter a major and endemic problem. Meanwhile, a spate of scandals left politicians blushing all over the place. The Austrian Chancellor was caught faking 'friends' on Facebook. In France, former President Chirac was convicted of financial misdemeanours, while one-time presidential hopeful Dominique Strauss-Kahn jettisoned his career after allegedly sexually assaulting a chambermaid. Berlusconi's libido likewise got him into trouble, with allegations that he had sex with an underage prostitute. Senior politicians in Norway and the United States were also caught up in scandals involving sexual misconduct with minors. The Latvian President was found guilty of tax evasion, while the German Defence Minister was caught out for plagiarising his PhD. Green Party officials were caught defacing the campaign posters of a rival party in the New Zealand general election. The Catholic Church produced ongoing scandals in Ireland and Slovenia. Sweden had a parliamentary expenses scandal reminiscent of that in the United Kingdom in 2009, while the United Kingdom was now embroiled in a phone-hacking scandal by a corrupt newspaper.

The combination of unpopular austerity measures and some shameful behaviour by politicians resulted in some widespread public protests. Bulgaria and Greece were subject to repeated street protests. Cyprus had labour strikes protesting against austerity, while Belgium was paralysed by a general strike in opposition to welfare reform. Doctors and nurses protested over health care reform in Slovakia. In the United States, the 'Occupy' movement began in Wall Street, with similar movements being inspired in other countries such as the United Kingdom. More disturbingly, Britain witnessed the worst urban riots since the 1980s. While none of these protests matched the spectacular events of the Arab Spring, they were symptomatic of the resentment caused by growing hardship and inequality.

If the gap between the richest and poorest seemed to grow during the economic crisis, the gender gap between men and women received more uneven treatment. In France, the two most senior female ministers left the government, and the exit of several female ministers from the Slovenian government left only one female minister remaining. The new Irish government was also notable for its dearth of women (only two out of 15). However, the cabinet in Sweden achieved gender parity, and Poland introduced a new electoral law requiring a minimum of 35 per cent women on party lists. Women also finally made it into the Austrian national anthem, with daughters now celebrated alongside sons – although the female minister behind the reform was initially ridiculed, and her proposal was taken seriously only after attracting public support and international attention.

In all, 2011 was rather a troubled year. The economic bad times continued for many, with public protests and ousted governments indicating high levels of public dissatisfaction. Many politicians continued to behave badly. Nonetheless, some countries have turned the page and are starting to enjoy better economic health, offering some prospect – however faint – of optimism for 2012.

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 2011 unless specified otherwise).

In 2011 new cabinets were installed in 18 countries (half of the countries considered here). In 11 of these cases, new cabinets were issued from general elections, except in the case of Greek Cyprus where general elections were

Table 1. Number of parties in cabinets, type of cabinet and age and gender of cabinet members on 31 December 2011

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)	51.6
Austria	14	2	MWC	6 (42.9)	52.3
Belgium	19 ⁱ	6	OC	6 (31.6) ²	47.0 ³
Bulgaria	17	1	SPMI	3 (17.7)	45.9
Canada	27	1	SPMI	7 (25.9)	53.1
Cyprus: Greek ⁴	13	1 ⁵	SPMI ⁶	3 (23.1)	55.5
Cyprus: TRNC	11	1	SPMA	1 (9.0)	51.7
Czech Republic	14	3	OC	0 (0.0)	49.6
Denmark	23	3	MC	9 (39.1)	42.8
Estonia	13	2	MWC	1 (7.7)	45.6
Finland	19	6	OC	9 (47.4)	46.6
France	33	1	OC	9 (27.3)	52.0
Germany	16	3 ⁷	MWC	5 (31.3)	50.8
Greece	19	3	OC	1 (5.3)	58.3
Hungary	11	2	OC	1 (9.0)	61.0
Iceland	9	2	MWC	5 (55.6)	53.1
Ireland	15	2	MWC	2 (13.3)	56.3
Israel	29	6	OC	3 (10.3)	59.5
Italy	18	0	OC	3 (16.6)	62.8
Japan	18	2	OC	2 (11.1)	58.6
Latvia	14	3	MWC	4 (28.6)	43.5
Lithuania	15	4 ⁸	MWC	2 (13.3)	47.7
Luxembourg	15	2	MWC	4 (26.7)	56.1

Malta	8	1	SPMA	2 (25.0)	53.0
The Netherlands	12	2	MC	4 (33.0)	53.3
New Zealand	20	1	SPMI	6 (30.0)	50.3
Norway	20	3	MWC	10 (50.0)	51.7
Poland	20	2	MWC	4 (20.0)	46.8
Portugal	12	2 ⁹	MWC	2 (16.6)	47.8
Romania	17	3	MC	2 (11.8)	47.6
Slovakia	14	4	OC	2 (14.3)	48.3
Slovenia	12	2	MC	1 (8.3)	53.8
Spain	14	1	SPMA	4 (28.6)	56.0
Sweden	24	4	MC	12 (50.0)	47.3
Switzerland	7	5	OC	3 (42.9)	52.0
United Kingdom	23	2	MWC	5 (21.7)	51.0
United States	23 ¹⁰	1		6 (26.1)	59.0

Notes: Data relevant to 31 December of 2011. ¹ Thirteen full cabinet ministers and six secretaries of State (deputy/junior ministers). ² The proportion of women in cabinet is 38.5 per cent if one only counts the full ministers (five out of the six female members of government are full ministers). Both figures show an increase in comparison with the previous government. However, in the 'inner cabinet' consisting of the Prime Ministers and the Deputy Prime Ministers, there are now two female members out of seven, making the proportion fall from 33.3 to 28.6 per cent (due to the addition of a seventh member position for the new coalition partner in comparison with the previous cabinet which counted only six members). ³ The average for the thirteen full ministers goes up to 49 years. In the previous cabinet, junior ministers were older, on average, than full ministers, which is not the case of this cabinet anymore. ⁴ 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. ⁵ One could also argue that the government is in fact a coalition government consisting of two parties since several members of the cabinet belong to the United Democrats (next to the considerable number of independent cabinet members). They are a registered party but ran for the last parliamentary elections on a joint ticket with AKEL. ⁶ The Republic of Cyprus has a presidential system. The categorisation refers to the strength of the supporting parties of the government in parliament. The government could be categorised as MC if one follows the line of argument of Note 5 above. ⁷ In Germany, the CDU and CSU have been counted as separate parties. ⁸ For almost a whole year the ruling coalition was made up of four parties and the number of parties in cabinet decreased to three after a merger of Nation's Resurrection Party with the Liberal and Centre Union on 10 December 2011. ⁹ Plus Independents. ¹⁰ Of which, seven are of 'cabinet rank'.
 Legend: SPMA (single-party majority); SPMI (single-party minority); MWC (minimum-winning coalition); MC (minority coalition); OC (oversized coalition).

held but through the presidential system an automatic change of cabinet does not take place. As Table 2 shows, seven of the new cabinets are the product of coalition changes, lack of support in parliament or reshuffles without the legislature having come to a natural end and without legislative elections: Australia (as late as December 2011), Belgium (the Di Rupo cabinet was also invested in December), Turkish Cyprus and France (in both cases these were government reshuffles similar to what happened in 2010), Greece (in November), Italy (again in December) and Japan (which in 2011 inaugurated two new cabinets in January and September). General elections took place in 12 countries and presidential elections in three with semi-presidential systems.

The year 2011 was not a European Parliament election year. On the contrary, it was an important year for a number of sub-national elections, primarily in federal countries but also in some unitary states. Among the usual federal countries in which important regional or state elections take place there were Australia, Canada, Lithuania and Switzerland, as well as Spain with the election in 13 out of 17 autonomous regions. As documented in the contribution on Germany, a number of watershed elections took place at the Land level in Baden-Württemberg, Bremen, Berlin, Hamburg, Rhineland-Palatinate and Saxony-Anhalt. Finally, in two countries that are usually considered unitary and centralised, elections in devolved units took place. First, elections took place in Finland in Åland under its system of asymmetrical federalism. Second, in the devolved British system elections took place for the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly.

Referenda were held in eight countries. One of the remarkable events in 2011 was that only one federal referendum (on firearms) was held in Switzerland, which usually has many more. Of course, several referenda were held at cantonal and communal level. Other significant referenda were held on electoral systems both in the United Kingdom (rejection of the alternative vote and maintenance of first-past-the-post) and New Zealand. In Iceland, a referendum was held on Icesave after the President refused to countersign the law passed by the parliament. In Ireland two referenda were held on judicial matters and in Slovenia on matters concerning the job market. In Latvia, a referendum was held to ask citizens if they agreed with the dissolution of the Saeima and the call for extraordinary parliamentary elections. Finally, Italy had four referenda on privatisation of public services, water tariffs, nuclear energy and the rules allowing the Prime Minister and other government ministers not to appear in court. As usual in Italy, referenda are held to abrogate laws.

Similarly to the two years before, at the end of 2011 the most frequent type of cabinet was the minimum-winning coalition with 12 out of 35 countries. This type of cabinet makes up 34.3 per cent of the countries considered here (the

United States and the Republic of Cyprus are not included in the calculation of the percentages of the types of cabinet because of their unique presidential systems among the countries considered here). Among the 13 minimum-winning coalitions at the end of 2010, two changed into different cabinet types: Italy and Sweden. A new minimum-winning coalition since 2011, on the other hand, is Portugal. The other major type of cabinet is the oversized coalition with 31.4 per cent of the countries having this type of cabinet. In 2011 this category also includes Italy and its technocratic government backed by the major parties in parliament, as well as France and Greece. In total there are 11 such cabinets – three more than at the end of 2010. Other countries with oversized coalitions include Belgium, Israel and Switzerland. In the medium-term trend, the number of oversized coalitions is increasing and may be read as a sign of the necessity of national unity to face the financial and economic crisis in Europe, even if in some cases such coalitions disguise consociational types of democracies and in others, highly unstructured party systems.

More rare are minority cabinets, be they single-party minority governments or minority coalitions. The former type exists in four countries (11.4 per cent): Australia, Bulgaria, Canada and New Zealand. The latter type exists in five countries (14.3 per cent): Denmark, The Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden. No major changes in numbers or countries took place since 2010 for these two types of cabinet. Finally, the number of single-party majority governments seems to decline over the years with five cabinets (8.6 per cent) in this category (five in 2009 and four in 2010). This type of government is becoming increasingly rare. Among the countries with single-party majority governments, two are small countries (Cyprus TRNC and Malta), with Spain remaining the only large democracy with single-party government since the United Kingdom is run by a coalition and Australia by a minority party.

Since 2009 and through 2010, the number of parties in cabinet has hardly changed as the overall figure across the 37 countries retains the ‘two and a half’ format (2.4). In a few countries the number of parties in the governmental coalition has increased either by two (as in Finland and Greece) or by one (as in Belgium, Denmark, Latvia and Portugal). In a number of countries, cabinets include fewer parties compared to 2010 (two fewer in Slovenia, one less in the Republic of Cyprus). A particular case is the technocratic cabinet led by Mario Monti in Italy since December 2011. Table 1 indicates that there are zero parties making up this cabinet as all members of the cabinet are nonpartisan personalities. The cabinet nonetheless enjoys a large majority in parliament especially from the two main parties: Democratic Party and People of Freedom. In all other countries, the number of cabinet parties remained unchanged, including the United Kingdom where the coalition between

Conservatives and Liberal Democrats is in power for the second year since the 2010 general election.

While the overall share of women in cabinet did not vary much between 2011 and 2010 (24.1 per cent, down from 24.5), for a number of countries changes between the two years have been very large. One of these countries is Switzerland, which in 2010 had for the first time a majority of women in the cabinet (57.1 per cent). The share of women declined by 14.2 percentage points – not a very large number considering that the Swiss Federal Council includes only seven ministers. Much more dramatic appears the change in Slovenia and Spain where the decline in the share of female ministers has been 18.0 percentage points for both countries (also large was the decline in Greece and Portugal). On the contrary, the share of women in cabinet between 2010 and 2011 increased most in Iceland (15.6 percentage points) as well as in Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands (around 9 percentage points). In 2011 there was only one country in which female ministers were totally absent: the Czech Republic, which in 2010 also had no female cabinet members. Particularly low shares of women in cabinet can also be seen in Estonia, Greece and Slovenia. Whereas both Northern Cyprus and Hungary did not have any women ministers in 2010, they both now have a share of 9.0 per cent. On the other end of the spectrum there are three countries in which the share of female ministers is at least 50.0 per cent: Iceland (which, with 55.6 per cent is the only country with more women than men in government), Norway and Sweden (both 50.0 per cent). Apart from the aforementioned Swiss case, no other country has a proportion above 40.0 per cent with the exception of Austria. Summing up, the advance of gender equality in the executive branch varies to a very large degree among the 37 countries with no clear trend across them.

The average age of cabinet members was 51.9 years in 2011, and fundamentally did not change since 2010 when it was 51.7. Among the 37 countries in Table 1, Denmark and Poland stand out for the reduction of the age with the instauration of the new cabinet in 2011 (more than five years younger on average compared to the previous cabinet). Denmark is the country with the youngest ministers. Similar to last year, there is a pattern of young members of cabinet in the East European countries (with average ages of about 48 years), with the exception of Hungary. Hungary is also one of the countries for which the average age has increased the most since 2010 (six years older). This is also the case for the new technocratic government in Italy (6.2 years older than the predecessor cabinet) and for the cabinet in Slovenia. The Italian cabinet is the oldest of the 37 countries with an average age of almost 63 years (a difference of twenty years with Denmark which has the youngest cabinet).

In terms of number of parties in cabinet, share of women, as well as age no dramatic changes took place between 2010 and 2011.

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 2011 to 31 December 2011. 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 since last year's 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. Since 2010, Table 2 also includes 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 European Union. 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 2011 are concerned, all of the country reports include information regarding *cabinet composition* and *issues in national politics*. As one can see from the list of countries below, the number of new cabinets has been quite considerable in 2011 and can be linked to the political turmoil caused by the financial and economic crisis in Europe in particular. 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:

Canada, Republic of Cyprus (Greek), Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland

Presidential elections:

Bulgaria, Ireland, Portugal

Elections to the European Parliament:

None

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

Canada, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Spain, Switzerland

Changes in the composition of the Upper House of Parliament:

Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, United Kingdom

New cabinets:

Australia, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus (TRNC), Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland

Results of national referenda:

France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, New Zealand, Slovenia, Switzerland

Institutional changes:

Belgium, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovakia, Spain

References

- Bale, T. & van Biezen, I. (2008). Political data in 2007. *European Journal of Political Research* 47(7–8): 877–891.
- Bale, T. & van Biezen, I. (2009). Political data in 2008. *European Journal of Political Research* 48(7–8): 859–873.
- Bale, T. & Caramani, D. (2010). Political data in 2009. *European Journal of Political Research* 49(7–8): 855–867.
- Caramani, D., Deegan-Krause, K. & Murray, R. (2011). Political data in 2010. *European Journal of Political Research* 50(7–8): 869–887.
- van Biezen, I. & Katz, R.S. (2004). Political data in 2003. *European Journal of Political Research* 43(7–8): 919–926.
- van Biezen, I. & Katz, R.S. (2005). Political data in 2004. *European Journal of Political Research* 44(7–8): 919–928.
- van Biezen, I. & 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	Land, cantonal, state elections ¹³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Australia	2004 2007 2010			2010 2011	2004 2007 2011	2004 2007 2010 2011			
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 2011 ¹⁴	2003 2007 2008 2009 2011		2002 2003 2005 2006 2008 2011 ¹⁵	2006 (2005: C)
Bulgaria ⁹	2005 2009	2006 2011	2007 2009			2009		2005 2006 2007 2009 2010 2004	
Canada	2004 2006 2008 2011			2010 2011	2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011	2003 2004 2006 2008 2011			

Cyprus: Greek	2006 2011	2003 2008	2004 2009		2003 2008	2004	2006
Cyprus: TRNC ^d	2003 2005 2009	2005 2010			2004 2005 2006 2009 2010 2011		
Czech Republic	2002 2006 2010		2004 2009		2002 2004 2006 2008 2010	2003	2002 2006
Denmark	2005 2007 2011		2004 2009		2005 2007 2009 2010 2011	2009	2005 2009
Estonia	2003 2007 2011		2004 2009		2003 2005 2007 2009 2011	2003	2002 2003 2005 2007
Finland	2003 2007 2011		2004 2009		2003 2007 2010 2011		
France	2002 ^s 2007 ¹²	2002 ^s 2007	2004 2009	2011	2004 2008 2011	2005	2003 2005 2008

Table 2. Continued

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	Land, cantonal, state elections ¹³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Germany	2002 2005 2009		2004 2009	2010 2011	2002 2003 2004 2005 2007 2008 2010 2011	2002 2005 2009		2006	2004 (1999–2003; UP) 2005 (2005; GE) 2007 (2005; 2006; C)
Greece	2004 2007 2009		2004 2009			2004 2007 2009 2011		2005 2007 2008 2010	
Hungary	2002 2006		2004 2009			2002 2006 2008 2009 2010	2003 2004 2008	2005 2010 2011	2004 (2002; 2003; C)
Iceland	2003 2007 2009	2004				2003 2004 2006 2007 2009 2010	2010 2011	2007	2004 (2000; PE) ⁸
Ireland	2002 2007 2011	2004 2011	2004 2009		2011	2002 2007 2008 2011	2002 2004 2008 2009 2011		

Israel	2003 2006 2009		2003 2006 2009		2003 2006 2009		2003 2004 2005 2010
Italy	2006 2008	2004 2009	2006 2008	2005 2006 2011	2003 2005 2006 2011	2011 (2008: GE, UP) ¹⁶	2005
Japan	2003 2005 2009		2002 2003 2004 2005 2005 ¹⁰ 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2010	2002 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011			
Latvia	2002 2006 2010 2011	2004 2009		2002 2004 2006 2007 2009 2010 2011	2003 2007 2008 2011		2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2011
Lithuania	2004 2008	2004 2009	2010 2011	2004 2006 2008	2003 2008		2002 2003 2003 2009

Table 2. Continued

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	Land, cantonal, state elections ³	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Luxembourg	2004 2009		2004 2009			2004 2009	2005	2002 2003 2004 2006 2007 2008 2009 2011	2007 (2006: C)
Malta	2003 2008		2004 2009			2003 2004 2008	2003	2003	
The Netherlands	2002 2003 2006 2010		2004 2009		2003 2007 2010 2011	2002 2003 2006 2007	2005	2002 2003 2005 2006 2008 2009	
New Zealand	2002 2005 2008 2011					2002 2005 2008 2011	2009 2011		

Norway	2005 2009			2005 2009		2003 2004 2006 2007
Poland	2005 2007 2011	2004 2009	2005 2006 2007 2009 2010 2011	2004 2005 2006 2007 2011	2003	2002 2003 2004 2009 2011
Portugal	2002 2005 2009 2011	2004 2009		2002 2004 2005 2009 2011		2006 2007
Romania ⁹	2004 2008 2009	2007 2009	2004 2008	2004 2007 2008	2007 2009	2008 2009
Slovakia	2002 2006	2004 2009		2002 2006 2010	2003 2004 2010	2002 2006 2011

Table 2. Continued

Country	General elections	Presidential elections ²	European elections ³	Land, cantonal, state elections ^{1,3}	Changes in upper house	New cabinets	National referenda	Institutional changes	Errata ⁶
Slovenia	2004	2002	2004		2002	2002	2003	2003	
	2008	2007	2009			2004 2008	2004 2005 2007 2008 2010 2011	2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2006	
Spain	2004		2004	2011	2004	2004	2005	2006	
	2008		2009		2008	2008		2010	
	2011				2011	2010 2011		2011	
Sweden	2002					2002		2002	
	2006		2004			2006		2010	
	2010		2009			2010			
	2003			2010	2003	2003	2002		
Switzerland	2007			2011	2007	2007	2003		
	2011				2010	2010	2004		
					2011	2011	2005		
							2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011		

United Kingdom	2005	2004	2011	2002	2005	2011	2004
	2010	2009		2003	2010		
				2004			
				2005			
				2006			
				2007			
				2008			
				2009			
				2010			
				2011			
United States	2002	2004		2002	2005		2003
	2004	2008	2010	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. ¹⁴ Changes in upper house: linked to cabinet formation (Di Rupo I, 6 December 2011) after the very long ‘transition’ cabinet (Leterme II). ¹⁵ Some major institutional changes (especially further devolution of prerogatives and budgets to the subnational entities) are contained in the governmental agreement reached in December 2011, but they were not yet implemented in 2011. ¹⁶ Not mentioned in the cumulative index in Caramani et al. (2011).