

UACES 45th Annual Conference

Bilbao, 7-9 September 2015

Conference papers are works-in-progress - they should not be cited without the author's permission. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s).

www.uaces.org

THE PROPORTIONALITY OF OFFICE DISTRIBUTION IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, 1994-2012: WHO GETS THE MEGA-SEATS?

Giacomo Benedetto
Department of Politics and International Relations
Royal Holloway, University of London

Paper presented at the UACES Conference, Bilbao, 9 September 2015
Panel 914: Parliamentary Dynamics

Abstract:

Recent scholarship on the European Parliament has focused on its empowerment, the development of competitive politics between right and left, and appointments to committees or to the role of *rapporteur*. The literature has neglected the distribution of internal office or “mega-seats” between and within the Parliament’s party groups, office that provides influence on outcomes and which is the subject of this paper. The research finds that such office is assigned in proportion to group or party size, largely regardless of levels of attendance, turnover/continuity, or voting behaviour of parliamentarians despite the formation of consistent centre-right majorities in the Parliament since 1999 and across the EU since 2004. Although the content of the Parliament’s legislative output is more anchored to the right, institutionalized consensus has ensured the perseverance of power-sharing in the Parliament.

Keywords:

European Parliament; Consensus democracy; Mega-Seats; Party Groups; Committees

Number of words (excluding abstract, bibliography and tables): 8209

INTRODUCTION

In the comparative study of legislative politics, an area that has recently attracted the attention of scholars is that of mega-seats, for example Carroll et al (2006) and Martin (2013). The notion of mega-seats presupposes that in parliaments there are ordinary seats elected by the citizens and then other more important seats – or “mega-seats” - which the parties determine. Mega-seats offer greater power or prestige to politicians than ordinary seats and can influence the behaviour of parliamentarians as strongly as the demands of constituency interests (Martin 2013). Examples of mega-seats include committee chairs, party group leaders or whips, and policy spokesmen.

Although some scholarship on the European Parliament has focused on the attribution of committee membership (McElroy 2006; Whitaker 2001; Yordanova 2009) or of drafters of parliamentary reports (Benedetto 2005; Høyland 2006; Hurka & Kaeding 2012; Kaeding 2004; Kaeding 2005; Yoshinaka et al 2010), the absence of work on the allocation of mega-seats seems odd given the policy responsibility of the committees of the European Parliament (EP) in the legislative process of the European Union (EU), the EP's independence from executive control, and the proliferation of posts such as party group coordinator (spokesman) on committees and parliamentary vice-presidencies, all of which offer their holders access to policy influence or prestige. Committee chairs, coordinators, and parliamentary vice-presidents are most often involved in negotiations with the European Commission and Council on the outcome of EU-

wide legislation. In view of the EP's increased empowerment since the Maastricht Treaty of 1993, appointment to these mega-seats and their ability to influence outcomes should be a matter of contestation between the political parties. This paper seeks to provide an answer as to who wins in securing those positions. Between 1989 and 1999, the groups of the Party of European Socialists (PES)ⁱ and European People's Party (EPP) in the EP revolved the parliamentary presidency between each other as well as sharing out the chairs of the most important committees. In 1999, a centre-right majority had formed in the EP. At the same time, the Treaty of Amsterdam was ratified, with the EP gaining more power over social, environmental and economic regulation, giving committee chairs and coordinators key roles in forming the outcome of legislation. In 1999 this led to an agreement between the groups of the EPP and Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE)ⁱⁱ to share the presidency and to log-roll chairs of committees, but did it leave the PES isolated and excluded?

In 2004 and 2009, centre-right majorities held in the EP, the Commission and Council, a unique occasion of "united government" in the EU. In 2004, 162 new Members of the EP (MEPs) also arrived from the member states that had just joined the EU.

The paper finds that the institutional and partisan changes in the EU since the early 1990s did not in fact affect the proportional allocation of "office" in the EP following the 1999, 2004 or 2009 elections.

Although competition on legislative matters has increased (Hix, Kreppel & Noury 2003; Hix, Noury & Roland 2005 & 2007; Hix & Noury 2009), the paper tests hypotheses that the proportional distribution of office has remained intact. It analyses how the assignment of office has evolved since 1994 given the changes in institutional powers and in the partisan complexions of the EU institutions, as well as EU Enlargement in 2004 and 2007. On occasions where the distribution of office is not proportional, this is a consequence of self-exclusion rather than competition with winners and losers. Variables such as attendance levels, continuity of membership of the EP, and defection from the party line in votes do not significantly affect the distribution of office between national parties in the same group.

The first part of the paper introduces a theory of office distribution and explains how the hypotheses will be tested. The second part of the paper focuses on the literature of committee allocation in the US Congress and EP. In the third section, the allocation of office positions, including but also beyond committee chairs, *between* and *within* the political groups, is tested quantitatively, before concluding at the end.

WHY CONSENSUS? FROM MEGA-SEATS TO POLICY

In their comparative analysis of legislative office holding, Carroll, Cox and Pachón (2006) define committee chairs and what they call 'board members',

equivalent to members of the Enlarged Bureau of the EP (President, Vice-Presidents and Quaestors) as 'mega-seats'. More recently, Martin (2013) has focused on the influence that the prize of mega-seats holds for parliamentarians in Ireland in terms of shaping their behaviour in the Dail. I shall follow them by using this term for the rest of the paper. Political parties compete against each other in elections so that they can win parliamentary seats. However, not all seats are equal because some of them can become mega-seats.

The power of the EP means that its committees affect outcomes in EU legislation. The extent of MEP specialisation in a particular policy area influences the decisions of group leaderships in assigning both the membership of specific committees (McElroy 2006) and the allocation of the committee chairs to which each political group is entitled (Whitaker 2011). This reflects the importance that parties attach to committee membership. We should therefore expect that gaining access to policy-oriented mega-seats of greater influence than simple committee membership would be a political priority.

Cox and McCubbins (2007) suggest that the committees of the US Congress are instruments of parties and facilitate the passing of legislation. They view party caucuses in Congress as vehicles for the assignment of mega-seats that enable legislators to access the resources that in turn assist with the distribution of constituency benefits to secure re-election. Both of these characteristics apply to the EP, although policy outcomes are more relevant for the careers of MEPs than

direct constituency benefits. Krehbiel (1990) and Groseclose (1994) find that committees are representative of Congress, containing specialists rather than ideological outliers, who are in a better position to obtain informational gains for the collective benefit of Congress (Gilligan and Krehbiel 1990). Compared to the US, and aside from diverse policy preferences of individual members, the EP also offers greater diversity of party preference in allocating committee positions.

Are some mega-seats worth more than others? For the sake of simplicity, this paper treats all mega-seats (President of EP, Vice-Presidents, Quaestors, committee chairs, EPP and PES group leaders, EPP and PES group coordinators on committees) as equal. Clearly to be President of the EP is more important than to be group coordinator on the Petitions Committee, so the choice of equality in measuring the distribution of mega-seats is subjective. It nevertheless allows for a test to see if their distribution provides either power or at least modest prestige in proportion to the seat share of political parties. The choice of equality is also necessary given the lack of consensus over how to rank committee membership and mega-seats. One method of ranking is to look at the size of a committee's membership since the EP may enlarge a committee's membership in order to accommodate demand.ⁱⁱⁱ The deficiency with this method is that the most popular committees may reflect individual preferences rather than the power-maximising choices of the political groups and parties. Until 2009, the third largest EP committee out of 22 was Development, known neither for its extensive powers nor for the interest of the larger political groups in its policy

area. This compares with the Legal Affairs Committee, one of the smallest despite its extensive powers. Groseclose and Stewart (1998) count the number of transfers from one committee to another in the House of Representatives and conclude that the committees gaining new members are the important ones. McElroy (2001) adapts this approach to the period before 1999. Neither the large membership of the Development committee nor the high number of transfers into it identified by McElroy (2001) are proof that the committee is among the most highly valued by the party leaderships, for the largest groups were happy to allow an MEP from the small European United Left/Nordic Green Left (EUL/NGL) Group to chair this committee between 1999 and 2007. The explanation for this must be that power alone is not the only force in motivating the committee choices of MEPs.

Another method to rank committees in absolute terms is to measure the quantity of legislation that they consider. The assumption is that a powerful legislative committee is the first choice of most MEPs. However, this does not cover specialisation of individual MEPs, sufficient for them to opt for membership of largely consultative committees.

It seems that the choice of committees or mega-seats by individuals or parties is not determined by power and influence, even if this is what mega-seats have the potential to offer. The ranking method that I use is not absolute. The leadership of each committee is decided firstly between the groups, and then between the

national delegations within each group, according to the D'Hondt method. Table 1 shows the logical place within the “pecking order” that the larger national delegations had in 1999 and the committee chairs that they and their internal national delegations selected. The D'Hondt method has been used for assigning positions between the groups since the EP was directly elected in 1979 (Kreppel 2002: 189).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The assignment of mega-seats is agreed in advance between the main political groups, which only contest internal elections when consensus breaks down. Consensus within the EP does not mean that there is no conflict; rather it means that conflict is contained within consensual mechanisms. The consensus between the large groups has always prevailed, despite being challenged unsuccessfully on numerous occasions illustrated in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Whereas previous work has measured the distribution of EP committee membership across parties and nationalities (McElroy 2006; Whitaker 2001; Yordanova 2009) or of rapporteurs (Benedetto 2005; Høyland 2006; Hurka & Kaeding 2012; Kaeding 2004; Keading 2005; Yoshinaka et al 2010) who draft EP legislative reports, this paper assesses the proportional distribution of mega-

seats^{iv} from 1994 to 2014 between all political groups, as well as between the national parties within the two largest groups, the EPP and the PES. Recent evidence, in particular Hix and Noury (2009), has shown that the EP has moved to the right and is characterised by increasing competition between left and right in roll call votes. Despite these developments, the paper finds that the distribution of mega-seats, including those that influence legislative outcomes with distributional consequences, remains proportional. Confirming this allows us to clarify the EP as a consensual institution that could belie a consociational political system as explored by Costa and Magnette (2003).

As a political system, the EU meets all the criteria of Lijphart (1984; 2012) for a consensus democracy, other than the lack of a corporatist system of social and economic policy management. We should therefore expect a proportional distribution of mega-seats in the EP between the political groups and the national parties that are internal to them. The more influential positions are contested but within the EP's embedded mechanisms of consensus. These mechanisms are path dependent (Pierson 2000), because an optimal alternative of a majoritarian system with winners and losers is rejected in view of the increasing returns of certainty from the status quo and the sunk costs of risking the loss of power in the long run. A majoritarian system could have been optimal if it allowed greater legitimacy, accountability and efficiency of outcome to the winning majority, while providing greater power to those within the majority and a realistic hope of future victory for those in the losing minority. However, as in other consensual systems,

path dependent consensus prevents that kind of majoritarianism but does not prevent the development of competition that is hidden and disguises the identity of losers. Hix and Noury (2009) find that a centre-right legislative majority has formed more often in roll call votes since 2004 despite the elections of Josep Borrell and Martin Schulz, both Socialists, to the presidency of the EP in 2004 and 2012. Whereas their elections may appear to be a return to the politics of formal alliance between the PES and EPP, intentionally or not, they disguise the presence of stronger centre-right majorities for legislation.

The share of mega-seats allocated in a consensus system would lead us to presuppose that a proportional distribution of office would occur within the EP. This is the case in consensual systems such as that of Switzerland, where the major parties of parliament are all represented in government and among the chairs of parliamentary committees. Parliamentary mega-seats are also allocated proportionately in Belgium, Germany, and even the majoritarian UK, in which a parliamentary opposition excluded from the executive is nevertheless granted access to positions within the parliamentary hierarchy. France, Spain and, since 1994, Italy have systems where the opposition is also excluded from most committee chairs. While a fully competitive system would be characterised by the total “exclusion” of an opposition or House minority from positions such as chair of legislative committees, as in France, Italy, or the US, a consensual system is characterised by the proportional distribution of such positions.

Application of the D'Hondt method (see Table 1) of proportionality between and within the political groups of the EP means that at least one position on the Bureau is assigned to a member from the two main political parties of the four or five largest states, while some of the smaller groups like the ALDE or Greens^v also gain something. Beyond that, mega-seats are allocated to some of the smaller national party delegations within the two large political groups.

Committee chairs are distributed in a similar way within the two large groups. A large delegation, like the German CDU-CSU or French Socialists, is usually able to chair an important committee and gain a vice-presidency of the EP.

Meanwhile, the smaller delegations from states like Greece or Sweden will only be able to gain the leadership of a committee or a vice-presidency (but not both) and usually have to revolve such positions between them. For example, a Swedish Social Democrat chaired the Women's Committee in 1999 but this passed to a Greek Socialist in 2002, with neither delegation holding a mega-seat during the other period.

In her analysis of EP committee membership, McElroy (2006) identifies strong proportionality between parties, nationalities and policy preferences. Her findings are consistent with those of Whitaker (2005), who found that the policy specific voting behaviour of committee members in roll call votes did not differ from those of their group colleagues who were members of other committees. In connection with this, the current paper also tests whether voting behaviour of national parties against the positions of their political groups affect their receipt of mega-seats.

Bowler and Farrell (1995: 227) confirm that competition for the membership of certain committees makes them reasonably representative of the EP as a whole. For example, business and labour are both well represented on the EP's social, economic, and industrial committees.

While committee members may be appointed between parties on a proportional basis, research on the appointment of rapporteurs, who draft the EP's legislative opinions, finds some element of disproportionality (Benedetto 2005; Høyland 2006). While Benedetto (2005) identifies the under-representation of the French and Italians in particular, Høyland (2006) identifies a disproportionate over-representation among parties which are in national governments. Yoshinaka et al (2010: 466) analyse the appointment of rapporteurs not by party but by variables that include expertise, seniority and ideological position and find that both partisan and expertise functions play a role.

Rapporteurs are important but Kreppel (2002) and Whitaker (2001: 2011) are the only authors to analyse the distribution of mega-seats with respect to committee chairs. Whitaker (2001) also analyses the role of party group coordinators. Neither of these two authors analyse the appointment of committee chairs or coordinators according to party. Whitaker (2011: 129-31) nevertheless analyses the appointment of committee chairs according to a number of variables that include committee, parliamentary or executive experience, or the voting loyalty of

MEPs. Whitaker (2011) agrees with Yoshinaka et al (2010) that both partisan considerations and expertise play a role in appointment to mega-seats.

There is a gap in measuring the distribution of mega-seats by party – whether transnational or national, which this paper seeks to fill. If the distribution of mega-seats is proportional between the large parliamentary groups, it will allow the EP to present itself as a more united institution on occasions when there is consensus for it to stand up to the other institutions, as discussed by Hix, Kreppel, and Noury (2003: 319). Having all significant parties on board in sharing out mega-seats also facilitates reaching the absolute majority thresholds for amending legislation under the codecision and ordinary legislative procedures since all parties would have a stake or a share of power in the legislative process.

The D'Hondt system does not appear in the EP's Rules of Procedure, but is a norm for assigning mega-seats. The Rules of Procedure nevertheless boost consensus in stipulating that there will be 14 Vice-Presidents and that all the mega-seats will be re-elected at the half way point of each parliamentary term.^{vi} The purpose is to maximise consensus; which other legislature could boast a maximum of 28 Vice-Presidents over a five-year term?

In 1994 after the election of a PES President, the D'Hondt method allowed for the election of 19 other Bureau members (14 Vice-Presidents and five Quaestors):

seven from the EPP, six from the PES, two from the ALDE, and one each from the EUL/NGL, the *Gaullist* European Democratic Alliance (EDA), and Forza Europa (FE) groups. The Greens and Radicals (ERA) were tied for the final place. However, the nomination of a candidate from Silvio Berlusconi's FE was contested by the Greens and other left wing MEPs. In the ensuing debate, speakers from the EPP Group shared concerns for the delicate balance in the EP and insisted the observance of the D'Hondt formula meant voting for the FE candidate.^{vii} At the third ballot the FE candidate was elected with 278 votes against 234 for the Green candidate. Although this election was contested, the result was that the unwritten rules of consensus were maintained (Table 2). This has continued to be the case.

Proportional distribution of mega-seats appears to go against the view of literature on roll call votes that the EP is characterised by competition between left and right (Hix, Kreppel, and Noury 2003; Hix, Noury, and Roland 2005; 2007; Hix and Noury 2009). If national interests can be reconciled in a transnational system, these cases show that politicians prefer an equitable division of offices and resources, so that multinational and multiparty power sharing can be maintained. Kreppel (2002: 202) concludes that national delegations determine the allocation of office, which is distributed proportionately within and between political groups. She eliminates voting loyalty of individual MEPs as an influential factor. While Kreppel's data are limited to the serial appointment of the same MEPs to the roles of committee chair or rapporteurs, McElroy (2006) analyses

the “representativeness” or proportionality between national party delegations within the same group on the membership of committees. She finds that there is proportionality in partisan, ideological, and national terms. For rapporteurs who author legislative reports in the EP, this is less the case (Benedetto 2005) or not at all (Høyland 2006; Kaeding 2004). Qualitative work has found that committees operate by overwhelming consensus when considering legislative dossiers, even if that consensus is not replicated in plenary (Settembri and Neuhold 2009).

The apparently healthy life of consensus in most aspects of the EP’s work leads me to present the following hypotheses:

H1: that the allocation of committee chairs and Bureau seats between the groups has remained consistently proportional, according to the D’Hondt formula since 1994, regardless of institutional change and EU enlargement

H2: that within the EPP and PES groups, the allocation of mega-seats between national party delegations has remained proportional.

The two hypotheses predict proportionality in the apportionment of mega-seats regardless of the potential that mega-seats have for distributional consequences in legislative outcomes and regardless of any assumption that voting indiscipline, poor levels of attendance or high turnover of parliamentary membership among national parties could lead to their failure to secure mega-seats. I have collected

data concerning the latter assumptions that allow me to propose a counter-factual to H2 as follows:

H3: that within the EPP and PES groups, the allocation of mega-seats between national party delegations is determined in part through levels of attendance at plenary, continuity in EP membership, and voting behaviour loyal to the party group

H1 will be tested by running the D'Hondt formula against the seat totals of each of the political groups since 1994 to establish whether each group has received its "correct" share of committee chairs and bureau seats. H2 and H3 will be tested through the means of correlations and Poisson regressions. The mega-seats in question are EP Bureau seats, including the President, Vice-Presidents and Quaestors, the leaders of each of the two large groups, committee chairs, and group coordinators (leaders) on each of the committees. In order to create a consistent dataset, the selection of type of mega-seats is subjective, but goes beyond those prescribed by Carroll, Cox and Pachón (2006), with the inclusion of committee coordinators and group leaders. The selection of Poisson regressions is appropriate since the dependent variable (the number of mega-seats per national party) is a count whose allocation does not depend directly on the allocation of seats elsewhere, while all variables are whole integers and none are set at less than zero. The primary independent variable for H2 and H3 is the size (number of MEPs) for each national party. The control variables for H2 are

specific national delegations (such as Germany or France) and for H3 are levels of aggregate attendance, continuity, or voting behaviour within each national party delegation.

POSITIONS BETWEEN AND WITHIN THE POLITICAL GROUPS

This section tests the hypotheses. In the first part, the D'Hondt formula is used to test the level of its observance in allocating mega-seats *between* rather than *within* the groups. The subsequent subsections test H2 and H3 by concentrating on the share of positions between national delegations within each of the large groups. The section concludes with Poisson regressions of the distribution of positions within the two large groups. Even if on balance, such distribution is proportional, this analysis will illustrate the extent of any skew in that proportionality according to relevant control variables.

Seats on the EP's Bureau and Committee Chairs

Table 3 displays the results of the allocation of committee chairs and Bureau seats between the political groups since 1994. In each case, the 'actual numbers' are the quantity of committee chairs or Bureau members assigned to each group, while the columns marked 'D'Hondt Allocation' are the share that would have been allocated if the D'Hondt formula were perfectly applied. This takes into

account a norm that the Group filling the Presidency of the EP “loses” two other seats on the Bureau.^{viii}

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

We can see that the allocations generally follow the D’Hondt formula. Each EP provides for 15 bureau members and 20 to 22 committee chairs to be elected in each half of each legislature, allowing for a maximum total of 74 in each EP. In EP4 (mega-seats elected in July 1994 and January 1997), each party group’s mega-seats were assigned according to the D’Hondt norm apart from the ALDE and the EDA, which were deprived of one each, and the EUL/NGL, which gained two. Only one mega-seat was misplaced out of 74 in EP5 (elected 1999 and 2002), the parliament when the left-right consensus for the parliamentary presidency had come to an end. Misplacement increased in EP6, with the EPP and PES benefitting at the expense of the ALDE and the hard Eurosceptic IND/DEM group, of which the latter spurned the offer of the Chair of the Petitions Committee in preference to a senior Vice-Chair of the Environment Committee.^{ix} This was accentuated in EP7, when the EPP and PES gained at the expense of the Green, European Conservative and Reform (ECR) and hard Eurosceptic European Freedom and Democracy (EFD) groups. Even in the case of EP7, the disproportionality – partly voluntary in the case of the EFD, which had opted not to chair the Petitions Committee – was only six mega-seats out of 74.

Is there dispute between or within the party groups over who will gain which mega-seat? Literature on coalition formation focuses on the formation of governments, including explanations of which parties are likely to bid for which ministries (Budge and Keman 1993). The fact that some parties in a coalition want certain ministries that interest other parties far less, while the competition for certain other ministries may be intense is equally true when it comes to sharing out committee chairmen in the EP. Applying this analysis during EP4 (1994 and 1997), the chairs of any of the six or seven most popular committees, such as Foreign Affairs, Economics, Budgets or Environment would have been attractive to either of the main groups. The agreement between the PES and EPP to allocate social and environment committees to the PES and economic committees to the EPP was terminated in 1999. The increasing legislative and regulatory profile of the Environment Committee, whose influence over consumer policy was growing given the BSE (mad cow) and dioxin scandals and the development of genetically modified foods. This made its chair a target for the EPP^x Group. In turn the EPP was prepared to give up the chair of the Economic and Monetary Committee.

At the half-way point of EP6 in 2007, competition occurred within the EPP Group on the allocation of its Bureau seats and committee chairs. The Polish delegation to the EPP failed to have its candidate accepted for a Vice-Presidency of the EP. After some weeks, the Poles were successful in claiming the first choice of EPP committee chair as “compensation”. For a smaller delegation (19 MEPs) taking

the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, meant displacing Elmar Brok of the German CDU-CSU (49 MEPs). As the largest delegation of the largest group, the CDU-CSU had chaired this committee, exercising the first choice among all delegations. The CDU-CSU exercised second choice within the Group, displacing the British Conservatives on the Industry Committee, who were demoted to Agriculture.^{xi}

At the beginning of EP7 in 2009, two new groups formed, the European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR) led by the British Conservatives and the more Eurosceptic European Freedom and Democracy group (EFD), which replaced the IND/DEM group. Although the ECR was coalitionable, it was excluded from mega-seats unlike the far left EUL/NGL group. Edward McMillan-Scott, a Conservative expelled from the party was elected as EP Vice-President against the ECR's own candidate, a Polish MEP accused of anti-semitism and homophobia.^{xii} The ECR group also failed to secure election of James Nicholson as a Quaestor of the EP, as "compensation" for not securing a Vice-Presidency, at the same time that a member of the smaller EUL/NGL group was elected as a Quaestor. The EFD group opted not to chair the Petitions Committee, which would have been its right under the D'Hondt rules, in place of first choice of a Committee Vice-Chair as in EP5, choosing the first Vice-Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The EFD's Marta Andreasen should have been entitled to a Vice-Chair of the Budgetary Control Committee, which was denied by the other groups. We see exclusion or part-exclusion of groups that put themselves

outside the system, although the system includes the EUL/NGL group. Such groups can be compensated with other mega-seats, and the ECR group did succeed in electing more moderate members as Vice-President of the EP in 2012 and as Chair of the Internal Market Committee in both 2009 and 2012. Concerning the Petitions Committee, the IND/DEM and EFD groups chose to exclude themselves in EP6 and EP7.

On most occasions that competition emerged, as with the fourteenth vice-presidency of the EP or Chair of the Research Committee in 1994 (Table 2), the end of logrolling committee chairs between the EPP and PES in 1999, and the dispute within the EPP in 2007, the result was the reconfirmation of embedded consensus, the eventual election of the “correct candidate”, or compensation for his party in the case of the Poles in 2007, and continued observance of the D’Hondt mechanism. Although the CDU-CSU and British Conservatives were “demoted” in 2007, they still retained their correct number of mega-seats. Competition between and within political groups exists in the EP, but it is contained within embedded mechanisms of consensus. Indeed competition in the EP has become no fiercer than in any other ‘consensual’ system defined by Lijphart (1984; 2012).

Disproportionality of around 10 percent on the Bureau and among committee chairs has usually not excluded smaller groups and has always respected the balance between the larger groups. Unless they self-exclude, like the IND/DEM

Group in 2004 and its successor EFD Group in 2009, all groups with at least 30 MEPs (now equivalent to around 4 percent of the total) can gain control of at least one committee chair or Bureau seat. This suggests that H1 is correct and that proportionality between the political groups continues despite the EP's empowerment and the move to a centre-right majority that could exclude its political rivals.

Committee Coordinators

The main political groups appoint a coordinator or group leader on each of the committees, who takes responsibility for that policy area. As such they act on behalf of the group's wider leadership (Whitaker 2001). They make sure that the members of their groups are allocated influential reports. Whitaker's evidence suggests that once a group is assigned an important report, the coordinator decides which of his or her MEPs will actually be the rapporteur. Rapporteurs write the legislative report for the committee and build consensus in committee and across the EP for proposals to be passed, where necessary being part of the EP's negotiating team with the Council and Commission. Whitaker addresses whether committees are run more by their chairs, which would suggest that they are institutionally independent, or by the coordinators, in which case we could conclude that the political groups are the main arbiters of the EP. The interview data collected indicate that neither the chairs nor coordinators prevail over the other.

Within the two large groups, one startling fact is the very small number of constituent parties from which the coordinators are drawn (Appendix: Tables A1 and A2) until 2009 for the EPP and beyond then for the PES. Unlike the other mega-seats mentioned above, the office of coordinator is not distributed proportionately. It is assigned to those MEPs who choose to specialise in particular areas and who are committed to remaining in the EP for more than one term. This eliminates those who come from member states whose delegations have a tradition of high turnover.

Of the EPP coordinators elected in 2004, six were German, five were British, five were Spanish, two were Dutch, two were Greek, with one each coming from Austria, Italy and Ireland, and none from France. In 1999, there were no coordinators among either group's 51 Italian or 43 French members. It was the members of the British, German, and Spanish member parties of the PES that occupy the leading positions of policy held by the Group, mirroring the case of the EPP.

Mega-seats within the EPP and PES Groups

Together with the previous subsection, here I investigate H2 concerning the proportionality of mega-seat distribution within the political groups by national party delegation and H3 concerning the effect of national party levels of

attendance and continuity, as well as voting behaviour. The analysis is limited to the EPP and PES Groups only. The other smaller groups are not included. This is because they tend to be allocated one committee chair and parliamentary vice-presidency for the whole group and so far as their committee coordinators are concerned, it could happen that more than one-third of a group's members are coordinators. This was the case for the ALDE in 1994, when 20 committee coordinators were drawn from 43 MEPs in total.

Evaluations of correlations between mega-seats and the size of national party delegations will follow (Table 4). The subsection concludes with the Poisson regressions of mega-seats internal to both large groups.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

A high degree of proportionality within the groups applied in the EP4 elected in 1994. The correlations fell significantly in EP5 elected in 1999 and in EP6 before rising again in EP7. However, the lowest correlation of .795 still indicates significant proportionality on this scale. Besides “competition”, reasons for decreasing proportionality include not just the arrival of larger numbers of inexperienced MEPs as a consequence of EU Enlargement, but a growing total number of disparate political parties joining the two large groups leading to significant heterogeneity in which some will play a more marginal role.

An important caveat on these data is that they measure mega-seats held, purely in terms of numbers, without a system of weighting for more important positions.

Running a Poisson regression using R (2011) is helpful in balancing the fact that many small delegations could have extreme variation in the dependent variable of mega-seats, ranging from a ratio of zero to 1.0. Poisson regressions allow for counts where all the variables are integers and many of the dependent variables can be set at zero.

In the assignment of mega-seats within the two largest groups, Poisson regressions measure the likelihood of uptake according to the size of a national delegation (how many MEPs it has) and in Model 1 according to aggregate aspects of behaviour in each national party delegation. Is the distribution proportional to size or, if not, do MEP attendance levels, continuity from one EP to another, or voting behaviour make a difference? During the previous parliamentary term, so EP3 elected in 1989 with respect to EP4 elected in 1994, these aspects of behaviour that may affect mega-seat distribution include percentage of EP sittings where members of a national delegation sign the attendance register at plenary meetings (ATTEND), percentage continuity or the percentage share of newly elected MEPs in a national delegation who were MEPs (CONTINUITY) in the previous parliament, the mean distance of a national delegation from the party group's mean positions on left-right votes (NOMINATE1) and from the second dimension (NOMINATE2)^{xiii} that could

include pro and anti-European integration positions or the difference between parties in government or opposition at the national level (Hix et al 2006). It seems plausible that MEPs from parties with historically high levels of attendance may be rewarded with mega-seats, while those with low levels of attendance will be penalised or may in any case be less interested in obtaining mega-seats. The same assumption applies to the effects of high versus low levels of continuity of parliamentary membership, and closeness or distance to the group mean on each of the NOMINATE dimensions.

Høyland (2006) has measured uptake of rapporteurs according to these behavioural dimensions while Yoshinaka et al (2011) have analysed rapporteur allocation according to individual MEPs, largely regardless of national party. It is true that an expert, committed MEP from an otherwise lazy and ill-disciplined national party delegation may obtain a mega-seat on his or her own merits. However, the point of this paper is to compare the success of national delegations within the party groups at obtaining mega-seats collectively in order to understand whether a consensual norm between parties supports a high degree of proportionality in attributing mega-seats which can affect policy outcomes.

Model 2 measures delegation size, together with dummies for each of the four to six largest member states. For the S&D, these include France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK. For the EPP, these include Germany, France, Italy and Spain

throughout, the UK from EP4 to EP6, and Poland in EP7. The baseline is the behaviour of the other national delegations. It has been found that immediately following enlargements, uptake of reports from new member states' MEPs is very low due to inexperience (Benedetto 2005; Hurka and Kaeding 2012). I also found this to be the case in regressions that are not reported here. Therefore, the effects of Austrian, Finnish and Swedish MEPs are reported only from 1999 (EP5) and those of the 2004 and 2007 enlargements are reported only from 2009 (EP7).

Table 5 reports the results for the EPP and Table 6 reports those for the PES. Models 1 and 2 are repeated in Table 7 which shows the pooled results for the EPP and PES groups between 1994 and 2012. Here Model 2 includes all of the national delegations among the EU's original 12 members prior to the 1995 enlargement, which had members within each group throughout those years. The pooled results for the EPP therefore exclude the Portuguese PSD which joined the EPP group only in 1996 and the British Conservatives who left the EPP group in 2009. The baseline for each group is the national delegations from member states that joined the EU since 1995 as well as the Portuguese and British members for the EPP.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Table 5 shows that in almost every case, the number of MEPs in a national party delegation (size) for the EPP is statistically significant at below the .01 level with a positive coefficient. By far the most reliable indicator of the assignment of mega-seats is size, indicating that mega-seats are usually distributed according to proportionality. For the EPP in Model 2, this significance shrinks for EP5 (1999) to the .05 level and to just .10 in EP6 (2004), in both cases when comparing size with the dummies for individual countries. For the PES Group (Table 6), size remains statistically significant with $p < .01$ and a positive coefficient in EP6, EP7 and in the pooled results for EP4 through to EP7 (Table 7). In EP4, size is significant at $p < .10$ in Model 2, though statistical significance increases to $p < .05$ when member state dummies are taken out in Model 1. The non-significance of size in EP5 (Table 6: Model 2) must be due to the member state dummies since the statistical significance at $p < .01$ holds for size in Model 1 measuring behaviour.

I find that voting behaviour measured through the NOMINATE1 and NOMINATE2 dimensions (Table 5: Model 1) for the EPP was significant at below the .05 level only in EP6 for behaviour that had taken place in EP5. In EP6 (2004), there were positive and significant coefficients at below .01 for attendance and for the NOMINATE2 dimension (pro versus anti-integration or national government versus opposition). This means that those national parties whose members attended more often and who were furthest from the group mean in terms of pro and anti-integration positions during EP5 were more likely to accede to mega-

seats but only in EP6 elected in 2004. The NOMINATE1 dimension for EP6 was also statistically significant and negative, indicating that in terms of left versus right positioning, parties closest to the group mean were comparatively over-represented. In the other parliaments, none of the behavioural variables was statistically significant and nor was CONTINUITY in EP6, suggesting that a high continuity in MEPs had no effect on the chance of securing mega-seats.

Model 2 comparing member states reveals statistical significance at least at $p < .05$ and negative coefficients for the German CDU-CSU in EP4, EP5 (Table 5) and in the pooled results (Table 7). Although Germans occupy the most mega-seats, they are also the most populous delegation and are therefore under-represented in the distribution of mega-seats within the EPP Group. In EP6 and EP7, the German CDU-CSU continues to have a negative coefficient but it is not statistically significant. The French and Italian members of the Group enjoyed a statistically significant over-representation in EP4, when most of them were Christian Democrats either in the French UDF or Italian PPI. This position reversed in EP5 when they were joined respectively by the Gaullist RPR and Forza Italia. In EP6 and EP7, the French and Italians continued to be under-represented but this was not statistically significant. Under-representation of the Spanish PP was registered in EP4 and EP5 but was statistically significant only at $p < .10$. The British Conservatives with 36 MEPs in EP5 (1999) did well but, like the Germans, were not assigned as many mega-seats as might be expected from their size. Their under-representation was statically significant in EP5, but

this was not the case with fewer mega-seats in EP4 and EP6 given their smaller delegations than in EP5.

Concerning the pooled results (1994-2012) for the EPP Group (Table 7), Model 1 shows significance at $p < .01$ only for delegation size, indicating very significant cumulative proportionality with the group for allocating mega-seats. For NOMINATE2, covering pro and anti-integration as well as other factors, there is slight significance at $p < .10$ to reward distance from the group mean. Model 2 illustrates the coefficients for each member state's party that was permanently a member of the group. Statistically significant (at $p < .01$) and larger negative coefficients apply to EPP parties from Germany and Italy. The Germans were always such a large delegation, while among Italians, uptake of mega-seats has been below expectation. Under-representation for the Spanish PP was also significant at $p < .01$. EPP members from France and Luxembourg have cumulatively enjoyed over-representation for mega-seats though significant at only $p < .05$. Throughout the period, Luxembourg has never had more than three MEPs in the EPP group, but they often gained mega-seats. EPP members from Greece, Ireland and the Netherlands have enjoyed the most notable over-representation and at statistical significance of $p < .01$. The Danish Conservatives had a negative coefficient and the Belgian Christian Democrats a positive coefficient, both lacking statistical significance. How can it be that Germany suffers from the largest degree of under-representation and yet size of delegation predicts the allocation of mega-seats? The German Christian Democrats are the

largest component of the EPP and have the most mega-seats though they are comparatively under-represented in mega-seats due to the delegation's size. Dutch Christian Democrats are a small delegation significantly over-represented in mega-seats. Despite their under-representation, the Germans still gain more mega-seats than the Dutch precisely because of their delegation's greater size.

In terms of behaviour for member parties of the PES Group (Table 6), Model 1 shows that, with statistical significance at $p < .05$ attendance levels in EP4 are significant with a positive coefficient for predicting mega-seats in EP5 only. The same applied to continuity in EP7 only and to the NOMINATE1 variable of left versus right positions in EP4 and EP5. In EP4, previous closeness to the group mean may have been positively rewarded with mega-seats, while distance seems to have been rewarded in EP5. The NOMINATE2 variable was never statistically significant for the PES Group.

INSERT TABLE 6 HERE

Turning to larger national parties in the PES Group, in Model 2, we note no significance for any of the member state dummies in EP4 (in 1994 and 1997). In EP5, the Spanish, British and Italian parties in the PES all enjoyed over-representation statistically significant at $p < .05$. In the same parliament, French and German members of the Group were also over-represented although the statistical significance was lower at $p < .10$. In EP6, each of the larger member

state delegations is under-represented although size as a variable became more positively significant. This must be because medium size delegations from states like the Netherlands were doing better than the very smallest. The results from EP6, however, show that this under-representation among the largest is statistically significant at $p < .05$ only for the French whose negative coefficient is over three times more than that of Germany. In EP7, the under-representation of France falls back and is no longer statistically significant. Instead the only statistically significant case of under-representation in mega-seats is that of the Italian Democratic Party whose negative coefficient is notably larger than that of the other states.

INSERT TABLE 7 HERE

The pooled results for the PES Group (Table 7) show strong and statistically significant proportionality (size) in the attribution of mega-seats. Model 1 shows a negative coefficient with $p < .10$ for NOMINATE2 suggesting that delegations tending to be loyal tend to do better in gaining mega-seats. For Model 2, performance among all national parties permanently a part of the group during 1994-2012 is illustrated. Negative coefficients with $p < .05$ apply to Socialists from the UK, Germany, Spain, France and Italy. Only the Irish Labour Party has a statistically significant positive coefficient. This is due to being a delegation of just one MEP from 1994 to 2009, who often accessed a mega-seat. As with the EPP, size still matters. The British Labour Party, a large delegation, is relatively under-

represented in mega-seats compared to Irish Labour. However, the British party still gets more than the Irish party because it is larger. Positive coefficients apply to the Belgians and the Dutch, while negative coefficients apply to the Greeks, Portuguese and Luxembourgese, none of which are statistically significant.

Throughout Tables 5 to 7, Model 1 revealed that although attendance, continuity and voting behaviour made a difference in certain periods, tested by H3, there was no consistent pattern compared to that for proportionality, tested by H2. Running regressions against fewer of the control variables in Model 1 did not result in increased statistical significance for any of them, indicating that there was no co-linearity.

This subsection has found that H2 concerning the proportionality in the allocation of mega-seats *between* delegations *within* the EPP and PES, is correct, but with some qualifications. Although still high for the PES at .873 and the EPP at .931, the correlations for the distribution of mega-seats according to the size of national party delegations has fallen from levels above .950 for both groups. The Poisson regressions in Tables 5 to 7 have revealed that the size of the delegation is the single most significant predictor of the number of mega-seats assigned, which indicates proportionality. This subsection also found that there was little evidence for supporting H3 and that attendance, continuity, and voting behaviour had little effect in determining allocation of mega-seats within the two large groups.

CONCLUSION

Positions of influence within the EP are shared proportionately between the political groups. The larger groups also share out key positions internally, with the smaller delegations revolving mega-seats. The smaller groups have more limited access to mega-seats, for example the only committee chaired by a Green in 1994 was the Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities Committee, considered the least important.

Since 1999, the distribution of mega-seats was more proportional between groups but also more competitive. Whereas the larger groups agreed to share-out key committee leadership roles before 1999, the only important committees controlled by the PES after 1999 were Economic and Monetary Affairs, Budgets, and Industry. In 2004 the PES lost the latter two but gained Internal Market and Consumer Affairs. In 2009, it controlled Environment, Citizens' Rights and Freedoms, Agriculture, and International Trade, but lost Economic and Monetary Affairs and Internal Market and Consumer Affairs. Increased competition took the form of a suspension in logrolling between the two large groups that had hitherto been practiced, and by a stricter observance of the D'Hondt formula, which is an embedded consensual mechanism for containing competition.

Proportionality does not apply to the attribution of committee coordinators within the two large groups. Until 2009, the coordinator positions are monopolised by northern Europeans, the Spanish and the Greeks, but not the French. However, the disproportionate allocation of coordinators is not sufficient to distort the wider picture of proportional mega-seats distribution within the two large groups (Tables 5 to 7).

H1 and H2 predicted that mega-seats would be distributed proportionately between and within the political groups. The evidence presented in this paper indicates the correctness of these hypotheses despite a slight increase in competition for mega-seats. H3 predicted that the levels of attendance or continuity of membership on the part of national party delegations or their voting behaviour could determine the distribution of mega-seats; after all, it seems plausible that particular parties may either be punished for poor discipline or opt out of accessing mega-seats if they are less interested. However, the evidence found that with little variation, the assumption of H3 was incorrect and that attendance, continuity, and voting behaviour had almost no effect.

In their analyses of the EP, Hix, Kreppel, and Noury (2003), Hix, Noury, and Roland (2005; 2007); and Kreppel (2000) identify increasing competition between left and right with regard to legislative decision-making. The application of this preconception to the field of legislative mega-seats, such as committee chairs, would lead us to assume not just a suspension of logrolling between the two

large groups, but party based competition with visible “losers” for key committee leadership positions. As this paper has shown, such a development has not occurred. Yet, despite the election of a Socialist President of the EP in 2004 and 2012, centre-right legislative majorities excluding the PES have contemporaneously become more common (Hix and Noury 2009). The degree of legislative competition in the EP may, in any case, still be less than that found in other consensual systems. The emergence of centre-right legislative majorities reflects the success of the EP’s embedded mechanisms for consensus in hiding the identity of losers by compensating them with mega-seats.

REFERENCES

- Benedetto, G. (2005) 'Rapporteurs as Legislative Entrepreneurs: The Dynamics of the Codecision Procedure in Europe's Parliament', *Journal of European Public Policy* 12(1): 67-88.
- Bowler, S. and Farrell, D. M. (1995) 'The organizing of the European Parliament committees, specialization and co ordination', *British Journal of Political Science* 25(2): 219-244.
- Budge, I. and Keman, H. (1993) *Parties and democracy: coalition formation and government functioning in twenty states*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, R., Cox, G. W., Pachón, M. (2006) 'How parties create electoral democracy, chapter 2', *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 31(2): 153-174.
- Costa, O. and Magnette, P. (2003) 'The European Union as a Consociation? A Methodological Assessment', *West European Politics* 26(3): 1-18.
- Cox, G. W. and McCubbins, M. D. (2007) *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilligan, T. W. and Krehbiel, K. (1990) 'Organization of Informative Committees by a Rational Legislature', *American Journal of Political Science* 34(2): 531-564.
- Groseclose, T. (1994) 'The Committee Outlier Debate: A Review and a Reexamination of some of the Evidence', *Public Choice* 80: 265-73.
- Groseclose, T. and Stewart, C. (1998) 'The Value of Committee Seats in the House', *American Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 453-474.
- Hix, S., Kreppel, A., and Noury, A. (2003) 'The Party System of the European Parliament: Collusive or Competitive?' *Journal of Common Market Studies* 41(2): 309-331.
- Hix, S. and Noury, A. (2009) 'After Enlargement: Voting patterns in the sixth European Parliament', *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 34(2): 159–74.
- Hix, S., Noury, A., and Roland, G. (2005) 'Power to the Parties: Cohesion and Competition in the European Parliament, 1979-2001', *British Journal of Political Science* 35(2): 209-234.
- Hix, S., Noury, A. and Roland, G. (2006) 'Dimensions of Politics in the European Parliament', *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2) 494-511.

Hix, S., Noury, A., and Roland, G. (2007) *Democratic Politics in the European Parliament*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Høyland, B. (2006) 'Allocation of Codecision Reports in the Fifth European Parliament', *European Union Politics* 7(1): 30-50.

Hurka, S. and M. Kaeding (2012) 'Report allocation in the European Parliament after eastern enlargement', *Journal of European Public Policy* 19(4): 512-529.

Kaeding, M. (2004) 'What drives rapporteurship allocation in the European Parliament?' *European Union Politics* 5(3): 355-373.

Kaeding, M. (2005) 'The world of committee reports: rapporteurship assignment in the European Parliament', *Journal of Legislative Studies* 11(1): 82–104.

Krehbiel, K. (1990) 'Are Congressional Committees Composed of Preference Outliers?' *American Political Science Review* 84(1): 149-163.

Kreppel, A. (2000) 'Rules, Ideology and Coalition Formation in the European Parliament', *European Union Politics* 1(3): 340-362.

Kreppel, A. (2002) *The European Parliament and Supranational Party System*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lijphart, A. (1984) *Democracies: Pattern of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in twenty-one Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lijphart, A. (2012) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Martin, S. (2013) 'Why Electoral Systems don't always Matter: The Impact of "Mega-seats" on Legislative Behavior in Ireland', *Party Politics*.

McElroy, G. (2001) 'Committees and Party Cohesion in the European Parliament', European Parliament Research Group Working Paper 8, presented at the Conference of the American Political Science Association, 30 August 2001.

McElroy, G. (2006) 'Committee Representation in the European Parliament', *European Union Politics* 7(1): 5-29.

Pierson, P. (2000) 'Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics', *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 251-267.

R Development Core Team (2011) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL <http://www.R-project.org>.

Whitaker, R. (2001) 'Party control in a committee-based legislature? The case of the European Parliament', *Journal of Legislative Studies* 7(4): 63-88.

Whitaker, R. (2005) 'National Parties in the European Parliament: An Influence in the Committee System', *European Union Politics* 6(1):5-28.

Yordanova, N. (2009) 'The rationale behind committee assignment in the European Parliament – distributive, informational and partisan perspectives', *European Union Politics* 10(2): 253–80.

Yoshinaka, A., McElroy, G. and Bowler, S. (2010) 'The Appointment of Rapporteurs in the European Parliament', *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 35(4): 457-486.

Table 1: Logical attribution of committee chairs to political groups and national party delegations in 1999, according to number of seats, calculated by the D'Hondt formula

Preference	Group	Seats	State	Seats
1	EPP	233	Germany	53
	reduced to	116.5		26.5
2	PES	180	Germany	33
	reduced to	90		16.5
3	EPP	116.5	UK	36
	reduced to	77.7		18
4	PES	90	UK	29
	reduced to	60		14.5
5	EPP	77.7	Spain	28
	reduced to	58.3		14
6	PES	60	Spain	24
	reduced to	45		12
7	EPP	58.3	Germany	26.5
	reduced to	46.6		17.7
8	ALDE	51	UK	10
	reduced to	25.5		5
9	Greens	48	France	9
	reduced to	24		4.5
10	EPP	46.6	Italy	21
	reduced to	38.8		10.5
11	PES	45	France	22
	reduced to	36		11
12	EUL/NGL	42	France or	6
	reduced to	21	Germany	3
13	EPP	38.8	UK	18
	reduced to	33.3		12
14	PES	36	Italy	17
	reduced to	30		8.5
15	EPP	33.3	Germany	17.7
	reduced to	29.1		13.3
16	PES	30	Germany	16.5
	reduced to	25.7		11
17	EPP	29.1	Spain	14
	reduced to	25.9		9.3

Table 2: Unsuccessful Mega-Seat Competition, 1994-2012

Year	Mega-seat	Challenger	Support	Votes
1994	Vice-President of EP	Ripa di Maena	Greens, ERA, EUL/NGL, some PES and ELDR	234
1994	Chair of Research Committee ¹	Désama	PES, EUL/NGL, Greens, ERA	13
1997	President	Lalumière	EUL/NGL, Greens, ERA (Radicals), some PES	177
1998	Vice-President of EP	Bloch von Blottnitz	Greens, some PES	141
1999 and 2002	Fontaine and Cox elected as President as part of EPP/ED-ELDR deal, with PES challenge			
2004	President	Geremek	ALDE, UEN, Greens, some EPP/ED	208
2007	President	Frassoni	Greens, EUL/NGL, some PES and ALDE	145
2009	Vice-President of EP	Kamiński	ECR, EFD, some EPP	194
2012	President	Deva	ECR, EFD, some EPP	142
2012	President	Wallis	Some ALDE, EPP and Greens	141
2012	Vice-President	Tarand	Across the House	104

¹ The election was limited to members of the Committee only, with 13 voting for Désama and 12 voting for his Forza Europa opponent, Umberto Scapagnini.

Table 3: Allocation of Bureau Seats and Committee Chairs - Actual numbers and D'Hondt formula, 1994-2014

	EP4				EP5				EP6				EP7			
	MEPs	Actual Numbers	D'Hondt Allocation	Deviation	MEPs	Actual Numbers	D'Hondt Allocation	Deviation	MEPs	Actual Numbers	D'Hondt Allocation	Deviation	MEPs	Actual Numbers	D'Hondt Allocation	Deviation
EPP	155	27	27	0	233	34	33	+1	268	36	33	+3	265	37	34	+3
PES	201	34	34	0	180	27	27	0	198	27	26	+1	184	24	21	+3
ELDR-ALDE	43	4	5	-1	51	5	5	0	88	11	13	-2	84	10	10	0
Greens	21	2	2	0	48	4	5	-1	42	4	4	0	55	6	7	-1
ERA	21	0	0	0												
EUL/NGL	28	6	4	+2	42	4	4	0	41	4	4	0	35	4	4	0
EDA-UEN-ECR	29	5	6	-1	21	0	0	0	27	3	3	0	54	3	4	-1
FE	29	2	2	0												
IEN-EDD-ID-EFD	15	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	37	0	2	-2	32	0	4	-4
TDI-ITS					18	0	0	0								

Table 4: Correlations between Mega-Seats and sizes of national party delegations in the EPP and PES Groups, 1994-2014

	EP4	EP5	EP6	EP7
EPP	.959	.948	.918	.931
PES	.978	.842	.795	.873

Table 5: Poisson Regression Distribution of Mega-Seats within the EPP Group (with control variables), 1994-2014

	Model 1	Model 2 ²	Model 1	Model 2
	EP4: 1994-1999 ³		EP5: 1999-2004	
Size ⁴	0.027(0.005)***	0.21(0.052)***	0.032(0.004)***	0.215(0.091)**
Attend ⁵	0.027(0.022)		0.004(0.014)	
Continuity ⁶	-0.009(0.011)		-0.002(0.009)	
Nom1 ⁷	-6.570(8.148)		1.006(6.768)	
Nom2	0.374(0.751)		-1.772(1.811)	
France		0.568(0.230)**		-5.210(2.394)**
Germany		-2.588(1.152)**		-16.676(8.174)**
Italy		1.026(0.232)***		-9.619(4.741)**
Spain		-1.155(0.692)*		-6.558(3.652)*
UK		0.289(0.281)		-10.373(5.189)**
Intercept	-0.351(0.986)	1.849(0.202)***	-0.002(0.743)	-2.897(1.480)*
N	15	15	15	15
	EP6: 2004-2009 ⁸		EP7: 2009-2014	
Size	0.255(0.020)***	0.095(0.051)*	0.037(0.003)***	0.055(.021)***
Attend	0.204(0.043)***		0.007(0.010)	
Continuity	-0.043(0.032)		0.005(0.005)	
Nom1	-30.971(9.867)**		-3.918(4.105)	
Nom2	29.394(5.817)***		-3.636(2.592)	
France		-1.556(1.245)		-0.699(1.028)
Germany		-5.133(4.230)		-1.174(1.511)
Italy		-1.629(1.756)		-1.068(1.256)
Spain		-1.010(1.737)		0.104(0.804)
UK		-1.443(2.127)		
Poland				-0.535(0.969)
Intercept	-16.569(3.490)***	-0.971(0.781)	-0.291(0.690)	-0.335(0.348)
N	25	25	26	26

Data collected from How MEPs Vote project (Hix et al 2007).

* $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$. Standard errors in parentheses. Dependent variable: number of mega-seats for each national delegation in EPP Group.

² The baseline for Model 2 is the distribution of mega-seats to MEPs from member states not listed in Model 2.

³ The data in Model 1 for this box exclude Austria, Finland and Sweden, which joined the EU in 1995.

⁴ Size is the number of MEPs in a national party delegation.

⁵ The variable Attend for each national party delegation is the average percentage of days in which its members signed the EP attendance register during the previous parliamentary term (e.g. 1989-1994 for EP4 elected in 1994).

⁶ The variable Continuity is the percentage of the membership of the national party delegations, which had previous experience as MEPs.

⁷ The variables Nom1 and Nom2 denote the distance of each national party delegation from the mean NOMINATE scores, for the respective NOMINATE dimensions, in the previous parliamentary term.

⁸ The data for this box exclude the states that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007.

Table 6: Poisson Regression Distribution of Mega-Seats within the PES Group (with control variables), 1994-2014

	Model 1	Model 2 ⁹	Model 1	Model 2
	EP4: 1994-1999 ¹⁰		EP5: 1999-2004	
Size	0.031(0.004)**	0.095(0.050)*	0.058(0.020)***	-0.058(0.053)
Attend	-0.036(0.018)		0.038(0.012)***	
Continuity	0.002(0.009)		-0.013(0.017)	
Nom1	-14.501(5.530)***		19.223(7.841)**	
Nom2	4.275(3.862)		-1.801(1.425)	
France		-0.581(0.945)		3.282(1.967)*
Germany		-3.950(3.259)		5.768(3.178)*
Italy		-0.552(1.210)		2.646(1.421)**
Spain		-1.848(1.452)		4.692(2.130)**
UK		-8.099(5.654)		5.596(2.701)**
Intercept	2.349(0.962)***	-0.751(0.825)	-3.037(.960)***	0.649(0.544)
N	15	15	15	15
	EP6: 2004-2009 ^{xiv}		EP7: 2009-2014 ^{xv}	
Size	0.044(0.008)***	0.094(0.033)***	0.070(0.008)***	0.119(.034)***
Attend	0.034(0.027)		0.012(0.014)	
Continuity	0.007(0.005)		0.026(0.007)***	
Nom1	-6.886(4.129)*		-6.377(4.105)	
Nom2	-0.115(2.390)		0.169(1.162)	
France		-3.293(1.586)**		-0.661(0.723)
Germany		-0.980(1.057)		-1.515(1.193)
Italy		-1.269(0.783)		-2.258(1.143)**
Spain		-1.979(1.150)*		-1.866(1.146)
UK		-1.327(0.877)		0.269(0.595)
Intercept	-2.614(2.218)	-0.449(0.541)	-0.291(0.690)	-0.335(0.348)
N	23	23	27	27

Data collected from How MEPs Vote project (Hix et al 2007).

* $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$. Standard errors in parentheses. Dependent variable: number of mega-seats for each national delegation in PES Group.

⁹ The baseline for Model 2 is the distribution of mega seats to MEPs from member states not listed in Model 2.

¹⁰ The data in Model 1 for this box exclude Austria, Finland and Sweden, which joined the EU in 1995.

Table 7: Poisson Regression Distribution of Mega-Seats – Pooled Results for EPP and PES Groups (with control variables), 1994-2014¹¹

	EPP Group: 1994-2012		PES Group: 1999-2012	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Size	0.010(0.000)***	0.022(0.002)***	0.014(0.001)***	0.055(0.016)***
Attend	0.004(0.007)		-0.009(0.007)	
Continuity	-0.002(0.005)		0.000(0.004)	
Nom1	-2.613(4.923)		3.162(4.460)	
Nom2	2.037(1.081)*		-3.487(1.785)*	
France		0.694(0.285)**		-5.332(2.201)**
Germany		-3.868(0.521)***		-8.352(3.398)**
Italy		-1.361(0.292)***		-4.134(1.865)**
Spain		-0.669(0.259)***		-5.801(2.469)**
UK				-9.052(3.575)**
Belgium		0.575(0.475)		0.415(0.454)
Denmark		-0.233(1.022)		-0.371(0.732)
Greece		0.894(0.318)***		-1.126(0.765)
Ireland		1.312(0.395)***		1.771(0.532)***
Luxembourg		1.198(0.489)**		-18.213(5717.532)
Netherlands		1.427(0.288)***		0.137(0.490)
Portugal				-1.126(0.765)
Intercept	1.087(0.361)***	-0.034(0.229)	1.740(0.498)***	-0.639(0.512)
N	27	27	27	27

Data collected from How MEPs Vote project (Hix et al 2007).

* p<.1; ** p<.05 *** p<.01. Standard errors in parentheses. Dependent variable: number of mega-seats for each national delegation in EPP or PES Groups.

¹¹ Only those countries which sent MEPs to the EPP or PES groups throughout 1994-2014 are listed. The other member state parties are the baseline.

Appendix: Descriptive Statistics

Table A1: Distribution of co-ordinators within the EPP Group, 1994-2014

State	1994		1997		1999		2002		2004*		2007*		2009		2012	
	MEPs	C*	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C
A	-	-	7	0	7	1	7	2	6	1	6	0	6	1	6	1
B	7	1	7	1	6	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	5	1	5	1
D	47	8	47	9	53	7	53	4	49	6	49	7	42	6	42	7
DK	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
E	29	4	29	5	28	4	28	4	24	5	24	4	23	4	25	3
F	13	1	13	0	21	0	20	0	17	0	17	0	29	2	30	1
FIN	-	-	4	0	5	0	5	0	4	0	4	0	4	1	4	1
GR	9	1	9	1	9	0	9	2	11	2	11	0	8	0	7	0
I	12	0	15	0	35	0	36	0	24	1	24	1	36	2	36	2
IRL	4	0	4	0	5	0	5	0	5	1	5	1	4	1	4	1
L	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0
NL	10	3	9	1	9	2	9	2	7	2	7	2	5	1	5	1
P	-	-	9	0	9	0	9	0	9	0	9	0	10	0	10	0
S	-	-	5	0	7	0	7	0	6	0	6	0	5	0	5	1
UK	19	2	18	3	37	3	36	3	27	5	27	7	-	-	-	-
CY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
CZ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	0	14	0	2	0	2	0
EE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
H	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	0	13	0	14	2	14	1
LT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	2	0	4	0	4	0
LV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	3	0	3	1	4	1
ML	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	1
PL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	0	19	0	27	2	29	3
SK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	0	8	0	6	1	6	0
SL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0	4	0	3	0	4	0
BG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0	6	0	7	1
RO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	0	13	1	14	1
TOTAL	155	20	181	20	233	17	232	18	266	23	277	23	263	26	272	26

* It should be noted that the EPP's MEPs from the ten new member states totalled 69, but none of them were selected as coordinators in either 2004 or 2007.

* C denotes the number of co-ordinators.

Table A2: Distribution of co-ordinators within the PES Group, 1994-2014

State	1994		1997		1999		2002		2004*		2007*		2009		2012	
	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C	MEPs	C
A	-	-	4	0	7	0	7	0	7	2	7	1	4	0	5	0
B	6	1	6	0	5	0	5	0	6	1	6	2	5	1	5	1
D	40	6	40	7	33	4	35	4	23	6	23	6	23	6	23	7
DK	4	0	4	0	3	0	2	0	5	0	5	0	4	1	4	1
E	21	0	21	0	24	4	24	4	24	2	24	2	21	3	23	3
F	16	1	15	0	22	0	22	1	31	2	31	2	14	1	14	0
FIN	-	-	6	0	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	0	2	0	2	0
GR	10	0	10	0	9	0	9	0	8	1	8	0	8	0	8	0
I	19	2	19	4	16	0	15	0	16	1	14	1	21	1	22	1
IRL	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	3	0
L	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
NL	8	1	7	1	6	1	6	0	7	1	7	2	3	1	3	1
P	10	1	10	0	12	0	12	0	12	1	12	1	7	1	7	2
S	-	-	7	0	7	0	7	0	5	0	5	0	5	1	6	1
UK	64	8	64	8	30	6	29	6	19	2	19	2	13	4	13	4
CY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
CZ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	2	0	7	0	7	0
EE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
H	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	0	9	1	4	0	4	0
LT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	2	0	3	0	3	0
LV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
ML	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	3	0	3	0	4	0
PL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	0	8	0	7	0	7	0
SK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	3	0	5	0	5	0
SL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0
BG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	0	5	1	4	0
RO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	0	11	1	11	1
TOTAL	201	20	216	20	180	17	179	17	199	20	217	20	185	22	190	22

* Of the 31 PES MEPs from the ten new member states, none were selected as coordinators in 2004. One Hungarian Social Democrat was selected in 2007.

Table A3a: Distribution of mega-seats¹² within EPP Group, 1994-2004 (EP4 and EP5)

State	EP4 MEPs ¹³	EP4 Mega-Seats	EP3 %Attend	EP4 %Continuity	EP3 NOM1 Distance from Mean	EP3 NOM2 Distance from Group Mean	EP5 MEPs	EP5 Mega-Seats	EP4 %Attend	EP5 %Continuity	EP4 NOM1 Distance from Group Mean	EP4 NOM2 Distance from Group Mean
A	7	0					14	1	42.5	85.7	0.032	0.076
B	14	3	69.2	71.4	0.020	0.009	12	0	84.2	60	0.025	0.070
D	92	25	61.5	44.9	0.013	0.028	106	24	75.4	64.8	0.025	0.128
DK	6	1	43.9	33.3	0.005	0.294	2	0	48.5	100	0.000	0.077
E	58	16	60.5	33.3	0.006	0.042	56	13	61.9	51.5	0.005	0.061
F	26	4	44.4	56.3	0.019	0.234	41	2	47.6	35.7	0.025	0.439
FIN	4	0					10	0	34.2	20	0.017	0.128
GR	18	4	57.5	44.4	0.018	0.114	18	2	74.4	30	0.016	0.001
I	27	2	40.0	20.0	0.012	0.014	68	8	48.8	19.5	0.024	0.048
IRL	8	0	71.5	75.0	0.032	0.085	10	2	76.6	60	0.038	0.003
L	4	1	57.0	100	0.011	0.041	4	0	77.5	50	0.022	0.020
NL	20	6	66.6	77.8	0.006	0.044	18	4	79.8	70	0.043	0.092
P	9	1	40.3	54.5	0.178	0.298	18	2	47.8	27.3	0.130	0.324
S	5	0					14	1	67.6	44.4	0.059	0.152
UK	37	7	68.4	63.2	0.032	0.642	73	11	63.7	29.7	0.059	0.077

¹² President, Vice-President or Quaestor of EP, Party Group Leader, Committee Chair, or Party Group Coordinator on Committee.

¹³ In Tables A3a, A3b, A4a and A4b, the number of MEPs per national delegation in each parliament is effectively doubled as the sum of MEPs at the start and the mid-point of each parliament when mega-seats are allocated.

Table A3b: Distribution of mega-seats within EPP Group, 2004-2014 (EP6 and EP7)

State	EP6 MEPs	EP6 Mega-Seats	EP5 %Attend	EP6 %Continuity	EP5 NOM1 Distance from Group Mean	EP5 NOM2 Distance from Group Mean	EP7 MEPs	EP7 Mega-Seats	EP6 %Attend	EP7 %Continuity	EP6 NOM1 Distance from Group Mean	EP6 NOM2 Distance from Group Mean
A	12	1	79.1	14.3	0.060	0.075	12	3	76.2	66.7	0.036	0.061
B	12	0	84.4	33.3	0.141	0.096	10	2	82.0	75.0	0.126	0.111
BG	4	0					13	1	28.4	11.1	0.034	0.129
CY	6	0					4	0	60.8	50.0	0.064	0.117
CZ	28	2					4	0	83.2	100	0.094	0.394
D	98	24	83.9	74.1	0.021	0.102	84	22	76.7	78.6	0.040	0.106
DK	2	0	77.4	50.0	0.015	0.124	2	0	79.3	0	0.135	0.040
E	48	13	72.6	48.1	0.026	0.159	48	11	68.3	72	0.002	0.085
EE	2	0					2	0	91.7	100	0.042	0.091
F	34	2	66.1	60.0	0.082	0.047	59	9	74.7	36.7	0.067	0.119
FIN	8	0	79.5	16.7	0.077	0.035	8	0	55.0	75	0.116	0.052
GR	22	4	75.7	30.8	0.063	0.087	15	2	73.6	25	0.122	0.078
H	26	0					28	5	81.9	64.3	0.035	0.055
I	48	7	54.6	41.2	0.033	0.091	71	12	55.4	14.1	0.007	0.077
IRL	10	2	82.5	16.7	0.045	0.004	8	4	84.1	75.0	0.035	0.023
L	6	2	85.8	33.3	0.031	0.051	6	2	88.6	33.3	0.028	0.126
LT	4	0					8	0	69.8	50.0	0.020	0.056
LV	6	0					7	2	76.7	0	0.038	0.074

MT	4	0					4	2	83.2	100	0.019	0.087
NL	14	4	80.6	40.0	0.072	0.080	10	2	59.5	80.0	0.017	0.082
P	18	0	73.3	44.4	0.069	0.074	20	0	75.6	10.0	0.045	0.104
PL	34	3					56	9	74.4	41.4	0.041	0.005
RO	9	0					28	2	25.4	50.0	0.010	0.096
S	12	0	75.9	33.3	0.078	0.115	10	1	80.3	60.0	0.153	0.297
SK	16	2					12	1	90.9	50.0	0.012	0.059
SL	8	0					7	0	85.4	50.0	0.006	0.115
UK	56	18	78.3	88.9	0.212	0.487						

Table A4a: Distribution of mega-seats within PES Group, 1994-2004 (EP4 and EP5)

State	EP4						EP5					
	MEPs	Mega-Seats	%Attend	%Continuity	NOM1 Distance from Group Mean	NOM2 Distance from Group Mean	MEPs	Mega-Seats	%Attend	%Continuity	NOM1 Distance from Group Mean	NOM2 Distance from Group Mean
A	6	0					14	0	41.8	57.1	0.005	0.102
B	12	1	58.6	42.9	0.026	0.076	10	2	62.7	11.1	0.000	0.166
D	80	18	64.3	46.3	0.006	0.093	68	12	72.4	77.8	0.000	0.057
DK	8	0	51.0	50.0	0.040	0.080	5	0	60.9	0	0.051	0.296
E	42	4	72.9	73.9	0.041	0.054	48	13	63.7	52	0.058	0.086
F	31	5	51.4	21.7	0.062	0.186	44	4	33.5	42.8	0.080	0.258
FIN	4	1					6	0	40.5	100	0.015	0.089
GB	128	27	65.3	61.5	0.065	0.020	59	17	73.8	86.7	0.062	0.506
GR	20	2	52.7	8.3	0.039	0.016	18	1	42.7	30.0	0.043	0.137
I	38	10	42.4	50.0	0.018	0.056	33	4	49.2	25.0	0.044	0.102
IRL	2	0	78.3	100	0.061	0.061	2	2	77.6	0	0.065	0.153
L	4	2	52.0	100	0.011	0.035	4	4	78.9	0	0.046	0.166
NL	15	3	71.8	71.4	0.002	0.064	12	0	72.4	16.7	0.005	0.070
P	20	4	49.2	23.1	0.015	0.075	24	1	39.1	46.2	0.028	0.034
S	7	0					12	1	51.0	50.0	0.032	0.127

Table A4b: Distribution of mega-seats within PES Group, 2004-2014 (EP6 and EP7)

State	EP6 MEPs	EP6 Mega-Seats	EP5 %Attend	EP6 %Continuity	EP5 NOM1 Distance from Group mean	EP5 NOM2 Distance from Group Mean	EP7 MEPs	EP7 Mega-Seats	EP6 %Attend	EP7 %Continuity	EP6 NOM1 Distance from Group Mean	EP6 NOM2 Distance from Group Mean
A	14	4	88.7	75.0	0.043	0.006	9	1	77.6	40.0	0.039	0.012
B	14	5	77.0	50.0	0.089	0.181	10	2	76.5	60.0	0.067	0.154
BG	6	0					9	1	40.2	75.0	0.037	0.190
CY							4	0				
CZ	4	0					14	2	86.6	28.6	0.028	0.185
D	46	18	80.1	88.0	0.024	0.145	46	18	75.9	52.0	0.048	0.170
DK	10	0	78.2	0	0.074	0.305	8	2	70.6	100	0.055	0.260
E	48	8	78.6	44.4	0.004	0.127	44	10	70.9	52.2	0.036	0.276
EE	6	0					2	0	81.3	0	0.088	0.076
F	62	8	73.1	38.7	0.085	0.157	28	5	78.7	69.2	0.124	0.284
FIN	6	2	88.9	66.7	0.019	0.002	4	0	82.0	0	0.021	0.022
GB	38	6	75.4	100	0.076	0.070	26	10	72.6	92.3	0.062	0.024
GR	16	3	80.2	0	0.030	0.075	16	2	52.7	37.5	0.050	0.278
H	18	3					8	0	69.8	75.0	0.057	0.063
I	30	3	67.8	27.8	0.023	0.036	43	6	72.2	26.1	0.004	0.021
IRL	2	0	70.0	100	0.030	0.088	6	0	79.6	33.3	0.000	0.202
L	2	0	89.1	100	0.112	0.098	2	0	81.7	100	0.169	0.002
LT	4	0					6	0	80.9	33.3	0.038	0.186

LV							2	0				
MT	6	0					7	0	75.1	50	0.050	0.114
NL	14	3	87.5	44.4	0.011	0.016	6	2	64.6	66.7	0.012	0.124
P	24	4	74.6	16.7	0.008	0.001	14	5	70.3	57.1	0.011	0.129
PL	17	2					14	3	82.9	57.1	0.087	0.002
RO	12	0					22	2	30.5	50.0	0.027	0.202
S	10	1	71.4	40.0	0.020	0.203	11	2	71.3	50.0	0.028	0.391
SL	2	0					4	0	82.1	0	0.017	0.008
SK	6	0					10	1	78.7	40.0	0.045	0.172

NOTES

- ⁱ In 2009 the PES changed its name to the Socialists and Democrats in order to accommodate Italian Christian Democrats. For simplicity, this group will hereby be referred to as the PES.
- ⁱⁱ The Liberals' Group was called the European Liberal Democrat and Reform Group (ELDR) until 2004 when it was renamed ALDE, which is how I refer to it from now on for the sake of simplicity.
- ⁱⁱⁱ I am grateful to Francis Jacobs for this suggestion.
- ^{iv} In the EP, I define mega-seats as: President, Vice-Presidents, and Quaestors of EP, committee chairs, group leaders, and party leaders (coordinators) on committees.
- ^v The Greens formed an alliance with the European Free Alliance (G/EFA) of regionalist parties in 1999. However, for the sake of simplicity, I shall refer to them as the Greens from now on.
- ^{vi} Rules 15 and 17.
- ^{vii} Verbatim Report of Proceedings of the European Parliament, *Official Journal of the European Communities*, 19 July 1994.
- ^{viii} Interview, Alexander Beels, Deputy Secretary-General of the ALDE Group, Brussels, January 2000.
- ^{ix} Interview, Jens-Peter Bonde MEP, leader of the IND/DEM Group, Brussels, July 2004.
- ^x In 1999, the name of the EPP Group was changed to European People's Party/European Democrats (EPP/ED). In 2009 it reverted to EPP following the exit of the British Conservatives from the group. For simplicity, this group will be referred to as the EPP.
- ^{xi} euobserver.com, 24th, 25th, 30th January 2007.
- ^{xii} euobserver.com, 15th July 2009.
- ^{xiii} NOMINATE scores for each MEP and national party were collected by the 'How MEPs Vote Project', see Hix, Noury and Roland (2007).
- ^{xiv} The data for this box exclude the states that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007.
- ^{xv} The data for this box exclude Cyprus and Latvia, which had no MEPs in the PES Group during EP6 (2004-2009).