



## Horizontal and vertical spill-over in multilevel electoral systems

Arjan H. Schakel & Valentyna Romanova

To cite this article: Arjan H. Schakel & Valentyna Romanova (2021) Horizontal and vertical spill-over in multilevel electoral systems, *Regional & Federal Studies*, 31:3, 299-311, DOI: [10.1080/13597566.2021.1934455](https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2021.1934455)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2021.1934455>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 06 Jun 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 299



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Horizontal and vertical spill-over in multilevel electoral systems

Arjan H. Schakel<sup>a</sup> and Valentyna Romanova<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Comparative Politics, Faculty of Social Science, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway; <sup>b</sup>Department of Political Science, National University of 'Kyiv-Mohyla Academy', Kyiv, Ukraine

## ABSTRACT

A multilevel electoral system perspective reveals several ways in which electoral spill-over may occur. Vertical spill-over may be top-down from the national to the regional level or can be bottom-up from the regional to the national electoral arena. Horizontal spill-over happens when developments in one regional electoral arena impact electoral outcomes in another regional electoral arena. The literature on regional elections has mainly focused on vertical top-down spill-over. In this introduction, we discuss two main insights in relation to spill-over between electoral arenas that surface when considering the collection of articles and reports presented in this fourth annual review of regional elections. First, we discuss how horizontal spill-over can be identified and differentiated from diffusion of electoral developments driven by territorial cleavages. Second, we discuss several institutions that impact vertical spill-over. We conclude by considering a wider research agenda for the study of spill-over in multilevel electoral systems.

**KEYWORDS** Horizontal spill-over; vertical spill-over; regional electoral arena; multilevel electoral system; regional elections

## Introduction

This fourth annual review of regional elections includes four election articles and five election reports. The articles cover elections held in 21 provinces (*provincias*) and one autonomous city (*ciudad autónoma de Buenos Aires*) in Argentina, in Salzburg for 1984–2009 in Austria, in two communities (*gemeenschappen/communautés*) in Belgium, and in 33 provinces (*provinsi*) in Indonesia. The reports discuss elections held in 19 counties (*megyék*) and 23 cities with county rights (*megyei jogú városok*) in Hungary, in 41 prefectures (*todofuken*) in Japan, in 11 counties (*fylker*) in Norway, in 12 provinces

**CONTACT** Arjan H. Schakel  arjan.schakel@uib.no  Department of Comparative Politics, Faculty of Social Science, University of Bergen, PO Box 7802, Bergen 5020, Norway

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

(*provincies*) in the Netherlands, and in 50 provinces (*ilker*) plus 31 metropolitan municipalities (*büyükşehir*) in Turkey. This and the previous three annual reviews collectively cover elections held in a total of 838 regions, counties, provinces, and states in 33 countries which include a total population of close to 3.1 billion people (Schakel and Romanova 2018, 2019, 2020).

The main objective of the annual review is to systematically and comparatively report on regional elections across the globe.<sup>1</sup> Through the accumulation of annual reviews, we seek to increase our understanding of the factors that drive regional voters, regional election outcomes, and regional electoral dynamics (Schakel and Romanova 2018, 233–236). In each introduction, we draw comparative lessons and discuss the implications of the findings for our understanding of regional elections. With the series of introductions to the annual reviews, we aim to identify several crucial topics for the understanding of regional election outcomes. Hence, we will not highlight the main contributions that each of the election articles and reports separately make. Rather, we would like to offer our own insights derived from our own reading while adopting a *multilevel election system* perspective which brings together nationwide and regional elections and considers the vertical and horizontal interactions between and the integration of national and regional electoral arenas (Schakel and Romanova 2020).

A multilevel election perspective induces one to acknowledge that regional election outcomes cannot be fully understood without taking into account the possibility of horizontal and vertical interactions or spill-over from other electoral arenas (Golder et al. 2017, 3). Vertical interaction or spill-over occurs when developments in the statewide electoral arena impact on processes in regional electoral arenas (top-down spill-over) or vice versa (bottom-up spill-over). Vertical top-down spill-over features much more prominently in election research than bottom-up vertical spill-over. For example, the second-order election model explains regional election outcomes by the governmental status of parties in the national electoral arena – e.g. parties in government should lose whereas parties in opposition should win vote share. Other examples are the nationalization of elections literature which is interested in explaining when and how party systems are different across the territory and the coattails literature which is concerned with illuminating when and how regional candidates and parties benefit from the electoral success of national candidates and parties. These three bodies literatures have singled out regional authority and electoral institutions such as electoral timing, thresholds, and rules translating votes into seats, as particularly important for the magnitude of second-order election effects and coattails and the degree of territorialization of the vote (see for example Borges and Lloyd 2016; Dandoy and Schakel 2013; Hough and Jeffery 2006; Schakel and Jeffery 2013; Schakel and Romanova 2018).

Several recent studies have found evidence for vertical bottom-up spill-over. A recurrent finding is the importance of an ‘springboard effect’ whereby the electoral success of parties at the national level is positively associated with vote shares won by parties at the regional level (Dinas and Foos 2017; Massetti and Schakel 2017; Spoon and Jones West 2015; Yadav and Palshikar 2009). Similarly, the literature acknowledges the possibility of horizontal spill-over but offers few examples. Horizontal spill-over occurs when developments in one regional electoral arena impacts processes in another electoral arena in the same tier of governance. One example is the widening support of regionalist parties in Spain during the 1980s and 1990s which Swenden and Maddens (2009, 8–9) label as a ‘snowball effect’. Regionalist parties emerged first in the elections held in the historic communities (Basque Country, Catalonia, and Galicia) which subsequently triggered the establishment and electoral success of regionalist parties in the other communities (Pallarés and Keating 2003).

Overall, we know very little about what kinds of horizontal and vertical spill-over occur (often) and which variables drive the direction and magnitude of interactions between electoral arenas. In addition, far less attention has been paid to vertical bottom-up and horizontal spill-over in comparison to vertical top-down spill-over.

In this introduction we discuss several insights into horizontal and vertical spill-over provided by the collection of election articles and reports included in this fourth annual review of regional elections. Our aim is to use the articles and reports as examples to illustrate our arguments. In the next section we discuss the urban-rural cleavage and its impact on electoral outcomes to reveal how horizontal spill-over can be identified. The third section deals with vertical spill-over and we discuss several institutions that have a large impact on the magnitude of vertical spill-over. In the discussion we consider a research agenda for studying horizontal and vertical spill-over in multilevel electoral systems.

## **Horizontal spill-over between electoral arenas**

Horizontal spill-over occurs when developments in one regional electoral arena, i.e. a ‘trigger’, induces a ‘response’ among voters and parties in another regional electoral arena. Electoral outcomes may be the same or different depending on whether the trigger induces a similar or a different response among voters. Therefore, (dis)similar electoral outcomes across regional electoral arenas cannot be taken alone as evidence that horizontal spill-over has (not) occurred. The identification of horizontal spill-over always requires linking electoral outcomes in one electoral arena to a ‘trigger’ from another electoral arena. The election reports on Hungary, Norway, and Turkey can serve as an illustration. In these three countries,

regional election results are substantially different between urban and rural jurisdictions. In the case of Norway and Turkey these differences are driven by horizontal spill-over between urban and rural areas whereas in Hungary these differences are driven by like-minded voters who tend to cluster in either urban or rural areas.

The 2019 municipal and county elections in Norway stand out historically because of the emergence of The People's Action Against Toll Fees (*Folkeaksjonen Nei til mer bompenger*, FNB), a single-issue party that campaigned for abolishing toll fees (Stein et al. 2021). The party participated in the elections held in 11 out of 356 municipalities and in 4 out of 11 counties.<sup>2</sup> In Rogaland the FNB fielded lists in the county capital Stavanger and its surrounding municipalities of Klepp, Sandnes, and Sola and the FNB attracted a total of 11 834 municipal council votes and 10 986 county council votes. However, the total number of county council votes for the FNB in Rogaland was 14 066 (6.4%) which means that the party won more than 3000 votes (about 1.4%) in municipalities where it did not field a list for the municipal elections. Similarly, the FNB presented lists in Bergen (the county capital) and Alver, Askøy, and Øygarden in Vestland county and collectively these lists won 31 098 municipal council and 24 906 county council votes. Yet, the total number of FNB county council votes was 28 236 (9.1%) in Vestland county. Finally, the FNB won 19 299 votes (3.5%) in the Viken county council election – a county that borders Oslo<sup>3</sup> – but the FNB did not field candidates in any of the municipalities in Viken.<sup>4</sup>

The ability of the FNB to attract voters beyond the municipalities that have implemented road tolls can be explained by horizontal spill-over between municipal electoral arenas. A road toll policy in one municipality (trigger) induces voters in another neighbouring municipality to vote for the FNB (response) either in municipal elections (horizontal spill-over) and/or in county elections (both horizontal and vertical spill-over). Road tolls directly affect citizens living in the areas around a city who use their car to commute between their work in the city and their homes in the suburbs or municipalities around the downtown area of the city. It is likely that citizens in municipalities around the county capitals and Oslo used their municipal and county council vote to send a signal of dissatisfaction with a road-toll policy that is decided in another municipality.<sup>5</sup>

In Turkey, spill-over arising from an urban-rural cleavage has been enhanced and institutionalized through jurisdictional reform. The Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*, AKP), in national government since the early 2000s, adopted a law in 2012 which dissolved the administrations of 30 provinces and the territory of the former province is now governed by a metropolitan municipality. The 30 metropolitan municipalities are subdivided into 519 district municipalities (*ilçe*), each with their own assembly and mayor. The metropolitan municipality council (*büyükşehir*

*belediye meclisi*) consists of at least one fifth of the councillors of the district municipalities from within the metropolitan area and all mayors of the district municipalities are ex officio members (Hooghe et al. 2016; Shair-Rosenfield et al. 2021). Taşkin (2021) notes that the 2012 reform helped the AKP to retain power in the metropolitan municipalities by winning majorities in the district councils and by winning an absolute majority of the district mayors. The AKP won 10 173 (49%) and the Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*, CHP) – the major opposition party – won 4613 (22%) out of a total of 20 745 district council seats and the AKP won 742 (55%) and the CHP won 240 (18%) out of a total of 1355 district mayoralties.<sup>6</sup> As a result, AKP-dominated metropolitan municipality councils hinder CHP mayors to implement their policies by not attending council sessions or by vetoing proposals (Taşkin 2021).

Hence, there were strong incentives for the AKP to dissolve the institutions of provinces that included a large or metropolitan city to 'constrain' the powers of the mayors of urban jurisdictions. Since the elections of 2019, the CHP delivers the mayors for the most populous metropolitan municipalities that collectively account for 44% (30.7 million) of the total population of Turkey (70.6 million). The AKP and its ally the Nationalist Movement Party (*Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*, MHP) deliver the mayors for 24 out of a total of 50 provinces but these account for only 14% (18.1 million) of the total population (Taşkin 2021, Tables 3 and 4). In other words, an urban-rural cleavage is institutionally and electorally embedded in many metropolitan municipalities through a mayor elected at large which gives voters from the (largest) city the upper hand in the election of the metropolitan mayor whereas voters from the suburban and rural areas around the (largest) city are overrepresented in the council which is constituted by district council members and mayors. The different voting behaviour between urban and rural districts (horizontal spill-over) in combination with the institutional setting (vertical spill-over) induces voters to vote 'strategically'. Voters in the rural areas around the metropolitan city realize that they need to vote for the AKP or MHP in district elections in case they would like to balance a CHP mayor's policies at the metropolitan municipality level. Similarly, voters in the urban districts may be motivated to vote for a CHP mayor at the metropolitan municipality level to balance out a metropolitan municipality council dominated by AKP plus MHP councillors and mayors.<sup>7</sup>

It is important to conceptually and empirically distinguish electoral spill-over from (dis)similar election outcomes that find their origin in territorial cleavages. Urban-rural voting patterns can also arise from the political mobilization of particular groups of voters who are territorially clustered. For example, electoral outcomes in many countries reveal an urban-rural cleavage whereby green and liberal parties tend to win higher vote shares in the urban areas whereas right-wing populist and conservative parties are

more successful in rural areas. As a result, the dissimilarity in the vote is higher between urban and rural jurisdictions but it is lower among urban and among rural jurisdictions.

Hungary may serve as an example. In the 2014 county elections, FIDESZ-KDNP, the alliance which was in government at the national level, won absolute majorities of the seats in all 20 counties and in 21 out of 23 cities with county rank (Kákai and Kovács 2021, Tables 2 and 3). In the 2019 county elections, FIDESZ-KDNP was able to keep absolute majorities in all counties except Budapest which is a consolidated capital city-county government. However, FIDESZ-KDNP lost its absolute majority in 13 cities with county rank. Overall, the average seat share decreased from 65% in 2014 to 48% in 2019 for the cities with county rank whereas the average seat share increased from 59% in 2014 to 64% in 2019 for the counties. Kákai and Kovács (2021) note that FIDESZ-KDNP receives relatively more support from poor and low-educated people and those who are deprived of internet access and this kind of people tend to live in rural areas. In addition, in the counties the electoral campaign was dominated by government-owned media whereas candidates from opposition parties had to rely on social media which is more frequently used by young and educated people and they tend to live in the cities (Kákai and Kovács 2021).

It is also important to distinguish between electoral outcomes produced by horizontal spill-over between regional electoral arenas and those produced by interactions between citizens *within* or *between* jurisdictions as is illustrated by respectively the Austrian and Belgian election articles. Jansesberger, Lefkofridi, and Mühlböck (2021) analyse the electoral success of the populist radical right party FPÖ (*Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs*; Freedom Party of Austria) in elections held in Salzburg (in Austria) for 1984 until 2009.<sup>8</sup> Importantly, they disaggregate regional (*Land*) election results to 118 municipalities and they find that the FPÖ wins higher vote shares in municipalities where 'modernization losers and winners' are more polarized, that is the extent to which these groups of voters are of similar size *within a municipality*. In polarized municipalities, modernization-losers are constantly reminded of their poor situation compared to modernization-winners and this constitutes an 'ideal breeding ground' for popular-radical-right-parties such as the FPÖ (Jansesberger, Lefkofridi, and Mühlböck 2021).

Tijssen et al. (2021) provide an interesting example where voters who have regular contact with voters from another jurisdiction voted differently in the 2019 federal elections in Belgium compared to voters who do not have these interactions. The Flanders and Walloon party systems are (almost) completely split which subsequently significantly limits the occurrence of electoral spill-over (Medeiros, Gauvin, and Chhim 2020). Voters in Flanders and Walloon vote for separate parties and split-ticket voting between federal and regional elections is limited (less than 16%). However,

this does not necessarily mean that the neighbouring jurisdiction has become irrelevant for explaining election outcomes. Thijssen et al. (2021) reveal with survey evidence that Belgian citizens who have regular contacts<sup>9</sup> across the borders tend to have a lower probability to vote for a regionalist party but a higher probability to vote for green and liberal parties.

## **Vertical spill-over between national and regional electoral arenas**

Vertical electoral spill-over occurs when a development in one electoral arena at a higher/lower territorial level impacts electoral outcomes in another electoral arena at a lower/higher territorial level. It can be either top-down from national to regional or bottom-up from regional to national electoral arenas. In stark contrast to horizontal spill-over, we know much more about vertical spill-over thanks to three bodies of literature. Scholars who apply the second-order election model are interested in the conditions and institutions which are conducive for protest voting in the regional electoral arena to send a signal to politicians and parties at the national level. Scholars looking at the nationalization of elections have identified the conditions and institutions which are conducive for territorially differentiating party systems. And scholars who are interested in 'coattail effects' often set out to identify the conditions under which subnational candidates and parties can benefit electorally from the popularity of national candidates and parties. These literatures have singled out regional authority and electoral institutions such as electoral timing, thresholds, and rules translating votes into seats, as particularly important for the magnitude of second-order election effects and coattails and the degree of territorialization of the vote (see for example Borges and Lloyd 2016; Dandoy and Schakel 2013; Hough and Jeffery 2006; Schakel and Jeffery 2013; Schakel and Romanova 2018). The election articles on Argentina and Indonesia and the election reports on Japan and the Netherlands provide further insights into the importance of institutions and their impact on vertical spill-over.

The election report on Japan illustrates a very stark example of how candidates in regional elections make a conscious effort to enable or inhibit vertical spill-over from the national level. Candidates in Japanese local elections can decide different gradations of partisan support and they may choose to stand as an *independent* candidate, as a candidate that is *recommended* by a party, as a candidate that is *supported* by a party, or as a candidate that is *nominated* by a party (Hijino 2021). In other words, candidates can choose the extent to which they are and can be linked to a national party. Hijino (2021) explains that candidates tend to delink themselves from national parties when the national party is unpopular at the national level, when the national party is subject to splits or re-aligning itself, or when a candidate



competes against another candidate who is affiliated to the same national party.<sup>10</sup> As a result, dissimilarity between prefectural and national elections and between prefectures is high. Dissimilarity between the national and regional vote is above 30% for the 2010s for both party system and election congruence (Hijino 2021, Figure 2) which means that almost a third of the voters in each prefecture choose a different party compared to voters in other prefectures and/or switch their vote between national and prefectural elections.<sup>11</sup>

The Netherlands stands in stark contrast to Japan in that national and provincial electoral arenas are strongly linked to each other. Binnema and Vollaard (2021) report that 97% of the provincial vote in 2019 was won by statewide parties that were represented in the lower chamber of parliament. In addition, the 2019 provincial elections exhibited strong second-order election effects and the combined vote share loss for the parties in national government varied from 8% to 14% across the 12 provinces (Binnema and Vollaard 2021). Even though dissimilarities between 2017 national and the 2019 provincial vote are large, the extent of nationalization, i.e. vertical top-down spillover, of provincial elections is large because voters base their provincial vote choice on cues arising out of the national electoral arena (Schakel and Dandoy 2013). Dutch voters are thought to do this because provincial assemblies elect the members of the upper chamber of parliament two months after the provincial elections and the upper chamber has veto powers over all national legislation (Binnema and Vollaard 2021). In other words, the stakes are high in provincial elections because they may establish a strong veto player in the national parliament who can significantly hamper and modify national legislation. This is an important observation because many authors assume that increasing authority for regional government should go hand-in-hand with decreasing second-order election effects (e.g. Hough and Jeffery 2006; Schakel and Jeffery 2013). The Dutch case strongly suggests that the impact of regional authority may depend on the kind of authority that is devolved. Self-rule – the authority exercised by a region in its own jurisdiction – may decrease second-order election effects whereas shared rule – the authority exercised by a region in the country as a whole – may amplify second-order election effects although for a different reason. Voters may vote for an opposition party not to punish parties in national government but to balance power in the upper chamber.<sup>12</sup>

Institutions can and are frequently reformed by political actors who are often very much aware that their electoral gains may depend on what happens in other electoral arenas. Provincial and gubernatorial elections in Argentina are an example of significant electoral engineering by provincial politicians in order to remain in office. Since the 1980s, provinces have implemented various power-sharing (proportional rule, limited terms for offices) and power-concentrating reforms (majoritarian rule, no term limit

for offices) implemented by provincial leaders who seek to untie provincial from national electoral competition (Suarez-Cao 2021). In 2015, half of the provincial elections coincided with presidential elections and this number dropped to only 4 (out of a total of 22) in 2019. Two out of these four provinces were ruled by the coalition of the incumbent *national* president. Furthermore, the asymmetry across provincial party and electoral systems induces national parties to enter into multilevel electoral coalitions when fielding candidates for provincial offices (Suarez-Cao 2021). Thus, through electoral engineering, provincial governors have been able to modify the extent *and* form of vertical top-down spill-over.

Electoral engineering does not automatically provide regional political elites with a tool that enables them to fully steer electoral competition. Decentralization reforms in Indonesia strengthened the fiscal and political powers of local government heads who can authorize spending, set priorities of the budget, and appoint civil servants also in the secretariat of local parliaments. Despite these powers, local government heads were not able to establish an authoritarian regime in their local jurisdictions. In part, Buehler, Nataatmadja, and Anugrah (2021) ascribe this to the impact of other institutions that inhibit the extent to which local government heads can engage in electoral engineering. National government still determines most governmental tasks and controls most of the public budget and the national election commission regulates and controls subnational elections. However, Buehler, Nataatmadja, and Anugrah (2021) also point out that institutions are most likely not sufficient to explain the absence of local authoritarian regimes in Indonesia. Very importantly, voters are not economically dependent on local (political) elites. Land ownership is not concentrated in a few hands and large-scale industrialization and land mining operations are absent in most parts of Indonesia. This makes Indonesian voters relatively economically independent. For example, rural voters do not depend on one type of agricultural commodity for their livelihood (Buehler, Nataatmadja, and Anugrah 2021).<sup>13</sup> In sum, local government head elections in Indonesia provides for an example that, as in the case of horizontal spill-over, the identification of vertical spill-over requires one to establish whether the ‘trigger’ that produces a particular electoral outcome originates from an electoral arena situated at a higher or lower territorial scale and cannot be ascribed to the political mobilization of territorial cleavages that run across several jurisdictions.

## Discussion

In this introduction we have argued that horizontal spill-over can be empirically identified when a trigger in one electoral arena can be causally linked to an electoral outcome in another electoral arena. Horizontal spill-over may lead to similar and dissimilar electoral outcomes as we have illustrated with

the impact of urban-rural cleavages on the regional vote in Norway and Turkey. In addition, the examples of voting for the FPÖ in Salzburg, Austria and the urban-rural cleavage in Hungary reveal that similar electoral outcomes across jurisdictions may find their origins from 'triggers' situated within the jurisdictions themselves. Furthermore, the impact of inter-regional contacts on the vote in Belgium reveals that one should also acknowledge that horizontal inter-regional interactions among citizens may produce similar voting patterns even across split-party systems.

The set of articles and reports featuring in this fourth annual review reveal a substantial lack in our knowledge regarding horizontal spill-over. We do not know which kind of contexts or developments can serve as a 'trigger' to produce particular electoral outcomes in another electoral arena in the same tier of governance. Thus, we first need to identify instances of horizontal spill-over. In addition, we do not know which institutions inhibit or enhance the occurrence of horizontal spill-over and to be able to do this, one needs indicators that tap into the magnitude, scope and form of horizontal spill-over.

There is more research on vertical spill-over between national and regional electoral arenas thanks to the literatures on the second-order election model, coattails, and the nationalization of elections. The Dutch and Japanese election reports and the Argentinian and Indonesian election articles add to these literatures by identifying institutions that also impact on the extent of vertical spill-over from the national to the regional electoral arena. However, these examples and the literature are primarily concerned with top-down vertical spill-over whereas we know far less about bottom-up vertical spill-over (see also Schakel 2018, 2021).

The Argentinian election article and the Turkish election report reveal that horizontal and vertical spill-over may interact and/or occur at the same time. And there are more examples for the co-occurrence of horizontal and vertical spill-over. Green parties in Austria and Germany (respectively *Die Grünen–Die Grüne Alternative* and *Bündnis 90–Die Grünen*) may serve as an illustration. These parties first achieved electoral success and governmental representation in one or few *Länder*, then they gained representation in other *Länder*, paving the way for statewide electoral success and a role in federal government at a later stage (Schakel 2018, 691). The examples discussed in this introduction reveal that investigating horizontal and vertical spill-over in multilevel electoral systems constitutes a fertile ground for a promising and exciting research agenda for the coming decades.

## Notes

1. See <https://www.arjanschakel.nl/index.php/arore> for more information about the annual review of regional elections and a call for interest to write an election article or election report for the next annual reviews.

2. The election data is obtained from the Norwegian electoral committee: Valgdir-ektoratet, <https://valgresultat.no>.
3. The FNB won 21 346 votes (5.8%) in Oslo which is a consolidated municipality-county government.
4. There will be elections for the national parliament on 13 September 2021 and at the time of writing (May 2021) it is highly unlikely that the FNB will win a seat. <https://www.nrk.no/norge/bompengepartiet-naermast-borte---minipartia-slit-med-a-gjere-seg-relevante-1.15470747>.
5. It is important to note that voters went to the ballot box in September 2019 to elect representatives for the new merged municipalities (from 428 to 356) and counties (from 19 to 11) who took office in January 2020 (Stein et al. 2021). It may be the case that some voters were not aware that their municipality or county was merged.
6. The election data is obtained from Turkish Supreme Election Board T.C. Yüksek Seçim Kurulu: <https://www.ysk.gov.tr/en/past-elections/1852>.
7. The extent of horizontal and vertical spill-over in the metropolitan municipalities may have increased. In 2014, AKP and the MHP won the mayorship in 34 provinces and 20 metropolitan municipalities. The CHP plus other opposition parties delivered the mayor for 17 provinces and 10 metropolitan municipalities. In 2019, there was no overall change for the mayoral contests in provinces, but the AKP plus MHP lost four metropolitan municipalities to the CHP plus other opposition parties, including the two largest cities of Istanbul and Ankara (Taşkin 2021, Tables 3 and 4).
8. The 2013 and 2018 elections in Salzburg are excluded from the analysis because scandals render them not comparable (Jansesberger, Lefkofridi, and Mühlböck 2021).
9. The extent of interregional contacts is measured by an indicator that summarizes the frequency of holiday, friends, and shopping visits as well as the level of consuming media from the other linguistic community (Thijssen et al. 2021).
10. Candidates also choose to present themselves as independent when they want to align themselves with a popular non-partisan governor in their prefecture (Hijino 2021).
11. It is important to note that many independent candidates join a legislative party group after their election (Hijino 2021). Thus, while their campaigning strategies appear to limit vertical spill over, their post-election strategy may do the opposite.
12. An open question is whether shared rule exercised through an upper chamber of national parliament has a similar impact on the regional vote as shared rule exercised through bi- or multi-lateral meetings between national and regional governments.
13. Buehler, Nataatmadja, and Anugrah (2021) also discuss three other possible contributing variables: low party institutionalization, territorially highly fragmented party systems, and the option for several local candidates to exploit the bureaucracy for electoral gain – i.e. civil servants campaigning for their superiors.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

Arjan H. Schakel would like to thank the Trond Mohn Foundation [grant number TMS2019REK01] and the University of Bergen [grant number 812468] for financial support.

## References

- Binnema, Harmen, and Hans Vollaard. 2021. "The 2019 Provincial Elections in the Netherlands: The Rise for Forum Voor Democratie After a Heavily Nationalized Campaign." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2020.1840365.
- Borges, André, and Ryan Lloyd. 2016. "Presidential Coattails and Electoral Coordination in Multilevel Elections: Comparative Lessons from Brazil." *Electoral Studies* 43: 104–114.
- Buehler, Michael, Ronnie Nataatmadja, and Iqra Anugrah. 2021. "Limitations to Subnational Authoritarianism: Indonesian Local Government Head Elections in Comparative Perspective." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2021.1918388.
- Dandoy, Régis, and Arjan H. Schakel, eds. 2013. *Regional and National Elections in Western Europe. Territoriality of the Vote in Thirteen Countries*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dinas, Elias, and Florian Foos. 2017. "The National Effects of Subnational Representation: Access to Regional Parliaments and National Electoral Performance." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 21 (1): 1–35.
- Golder, Sonia N., Ignacio Lago, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Thomas Gschwend. 2017. *Multilevel Electoral Politics. Beyond the Second-Order Election Model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hijino, Ken Vicot Leonard. 2021. "What Drives Japanese Regional Elections? Multilevel Factors and Partisan Independents." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2020.1840367.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, Arjan H. Schakel, Sandra Chapman-Osterkat, Sara Niedzwiecki, and Sarah Shair-Rosenfield. 2016. *Measuring Regional Authority: A Postfunctionalist Theory of Governance, Volume I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hough, Dan, and Charlie Jeffery. 2006. *Devolution and Electoral Politics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Jansesberger, Viktoria, Zoe Lefkofridi, and Armin Mühlböck. 2021. "Understanding Populist Radical Right Parties' Success in Regional Elections: The Case of FPÖ in Salzburg over Time." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2021.1928087.
- Kákai, László, and Ilona Pálné Kovács. 2021. "Counties in a Vacuum: The Electoral Consequences of a Declining Meso-Tier in Hungary." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2020.1855148.
- Masseti, Emanuele, and Arjan H. Schakel. 2017. "Decentralisation Reforms and Regionalist Parties' Strength: Accommodation, Empowerment or Both?" *Political Studies* 65 (2): 432–451.
- Medeiros, Mike, Jean-Phillippe Gauvin, and Chris Chhim. 2020. "Unified Voters in a Divided Society: Ideology and Regionalism in Belgium." *Regional & Federal Studies*. doi:10.1080/13597566.2020.1843021.

- Pallarés, Francesc, and Michael Keating. 2003. "Multi-Level Electoral Competition. Regional Elections and Party Systems in Spain." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 10 (3): 239–255.
- Schakel, Arjan H. 2018. "Rethinking European Elections: The Importance of Regional Spillover into the European Electoral Arena." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 56 (3): 687–705.
- Schakel, Arjan H. 2021. "Regional Spill-Over into Third-Order European Elections." *Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12434>
- Schakel, Arjan H., and Régis Dandoy. 2013. "Conclusion: Regional Election in Comparative Perspective." In *Regional and National Elections in Western Europe: Territoriality of the Vote in Thirteen Countries*, edited by Régis Dandoy and Arjan H. Schakel, 275–299. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schakel, Arjan H., and Charlie Jeffery. 2013. "Are Regional Elections Really Second-Order Elections?" *Regional Studies* 47 (3): 323–341.
- Schakel, Arjan H., and Valentyna Romanova. 2018. "Towards a Scholarship on Regional Elections." *Regional & Federal Studies* 28 (3): 233–252.
- Schakel, Arjan H., and Valentyna Romanova. 2019. "Two Analytical Building Blocks for a Comprehensive Understanding of Regional Voting." *Regional & Federal Studies* 29 (3): 297–306.
- Schakel, Arjan H., and Valentyna Romanova. 2020. "Vertical Linkages Between Regional and National Electoral Arenas and Their Impact on Multilevel Democracy." *Regional & Federal Studies* 30 (3): 323–342.
- Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, Arjan H. Schakel, Sara Niedzwiecki, Gary Marks, and Liesbet Hooghe. 2021. "Language Difference and Regional Authority." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (1): 73–97.
- Spoon, Jae-Jae, and Karleen Jones West. 2015. "Bottoms up: How Subnational Elections Predict Parties' Decisions to Run in Presidential Elections in Europe and Latin America." *Research & Politics* 2 (3): 1–8.
- Stein, Jonas, Bjarte Folkestad, Jacob Aars, and Dag Arne Christensen. 2021. "The 2019 Local and Regional Elections in Norway: The Periphery Strikes Again." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2020.1840364.
- Suarez-Cao, Julietta. 2021. "Squaring the Circle: The Consolidation of Incumbency Advantage in the Argentine Provincial Elections of 2019." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2021.1919873.
- Swenden, Wilfried, and Bart Maddens. 2009. "Introduction: Territorial Party Politics in Western Europe: A Framework for Analysis." In *Territorial Party Politics in Western Europe*, edited by Wilfried Swenden and Bart Maddens, 1–30. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taşkın, Burcu. 2021. "The 2019 Provincial Elections in Turkey: AKP's Struggle to Maintain Power vis-à-vis a Revitalized CHP." *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2020.1858811.
- Thijssen, Peter, Min Reuchamps, Jeremy Dodeigne, Lieven De Winter, and Dave Sinardet. 2021. "Inter-regional Contacts and Voting Behaviour in Belgium: What Can We Learn from the 2019 Elections?" *Regional & Federal Studies* 31 (3). doi:10.1080/13597566.2021.1919096.
- Yadav, Yogendra, and Suhas Palshikar. 2009. "Principal State Level Contests and Derivative National Choices: National Trends in 2004–09." *Economic and Political Weekly* 44 (6): 55–62.