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Abstract

Previous studies on new political parties have assumed that they change or disrupt the functioning of the party system and coalition politics by creating high electoral volatility. Five successful new parties in three elections analyzed in this paper failed to validate these assumptions. The paper presents preliminary analysis of the 22 new political parties with a view to finding the characteristic new party type in East-Central Europe, which is typically established for electoral success and often joins the governing coalition just after the election. Canonical discriminant analysis (Knutsen 1989) showed that the five new parties that fell into this category changed neither party competition structures, nor coalition politics. Contrary to the general assumption, new parties of this type do not cause instability in the party system or affect coalition politics directly. However, as indirect outcomes, these parties may cause unclear ex-post accountability, voter disappointment and instability of coalition government.
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New Parties' Effects on the Instability of Coalition Governments in East-Central Europe

Repeated emergence of new parties has been one of the areas of focus in the study of East-Central European party politics. It was explained as the evidence of party system immaturity and had been expected to decrease in time (Tavits, 2008a). However, in the latest elections in six East-European countries from 2010 to 2012, 10 new parties won parliamentary seats. New parties have never faded out, even after more than twenty years of democratic experience, and they seem to have become an established phenomenon in these countries.

The previous studies have assumed that the presence of the new parties is problematic for the stability of party systems. Behind this assumption lay the new parties’ image in Western Europe. Comparative politics research into new parties has been promoted since the 1970s, when new parties appeared, breaking the "frozen" political party system in Western Europe (Lipset and Rokkan, 1967). New parties had been studied with a focus on the social cleavage model. It is commonly perceived that new parties represent new issues or ideologies that might create new social cleavage (Hug 2001; Hino 2012). It was assumed that dimensions would be added to the party competition structure (Kitschelt 1988), and coalition politics would be changed inevitably because of the new elements.

These are the assumptions that would naturally underlie the existing studies on new parties in Western Europe. However, there are several studies that suggest a different image of new parties in East-Central Europe. Tavits (2008b) and Rose (2009) showed that the choices of elites is essential for the emergence of new parties.
suggesting the possible emergence of new parties that are not based on a new issue or ideology among the electorate. Tavits (2008c) considered the new parties that were programmatically close to established parties. Sikk (2011) explicitly analyzed the existence of new parties for which newness itself was the appealing feature, with ideological character being only a weak motivation.

If the types of new parties in East-Central Europe are different from those in Western Europe, it is fair to assume that the resulting effect of new parties on party politics and coalition politics will also be different. Previous studies have criticized the emergence of new parties without investigating this possibility.

To analyze the new parties’ effect on the party system and coalition politics, we chose canonical discriminant analysis (CDA) as the method which clearly shows party competition structure for each election (Knutsen 1989). Sets of variables that differentiate affiliation for the parties among members of the electorate could be found. Each set of variables indicated party competition structure. As a result, it became evident that emergence of new parties have hardly changed the party competition structure. Neither have coalition patterns been ever affected substantially. The effects of new parties on the party system and coalition politics could be characteristic in East-Central Europe.

This paper presents preliminary analysis of the characteristic types of new parties in East-Central Europe. Twenty-two new parties were classified according to: (a) the number of years that elapsed between establishment and electoral success, (b) their participation in governing coalition, and (c) their electoral endurance. Five new parties in the Czech Republic and Slovakia showed differences in these aspects, having been established just before their electoral success and often join the governing coalition after
the election. In the second section, CDA was carried out on these five parties and the relating party systems, producing the above mentioned results. The last section examines the side effect on coalition politics, including ex-post accountability of governmental coalition, voters' disappointment, and coalition popularity.

1. Characteristic type of new parties in East-Central Europe

In the preliminary stage of the analysis to find the characteristic types of new parties in East-Central Europe, we investigated new parties that won seats since 2000 in six East-Central European Countries: Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, and Croatia. These countries have adopted the parliamentary system with elections based on proportional representation. Hungary, which used the single-seat constituency system combined with the proportional representative constituency approach, was the only exception. As for Hungary, we used proportional representative constituency data for our analysis. Previous studies on East-Central European party systems usually started analysis at the beginning of the democratization process to examine the institutionalization of party systems. In this study, we started the analysis as of the year 2000 so that we could explore the trend in recent years. In addition, the Slovak Democratic movement (HZDS) and Croatian Democratic Union (HZD) constrained pluralism in the 1990s in each country. By concentrating on the 2000s, it is also possible to remove this element.

The definition of new parties presents difficult problems (Sikk, 2005). In this paper, new parties are defined as parties that won seats in parliament for the first time. A political party that just changes its name is not considered to be a new party. But if a new party was launched by some of the former members of a political party, we recogn
ized it as an "offshoot new party" on condition that the original party continued to participate in the election. The original party could be called a "parent party."

By using the Election Database in Central and Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union Countries, which is published on the website of the Slavic Research Center at Hokkaido University, we listed 22 new parties and checked their size, time of establishment, policy orientation, prehistory (offshoot new party or not), names, coalition politics, and record of persistence (success or failure in the next election) (see Table 1).

New parties often started as medium-sized parties. The percentage of votes received tends to be relatively large, when they win the parliamentary seats for the first time. One reason is that in most East-Central European elections, the thresholds of 4-5% are provided. But the new parties often exceeded the threshold easily and won about 10% of votes. As is shown in Table 1, eight parties out of 22 parties won over 10% of votes.

In addition, 19 parties acquired parliamentary seats during the first election after their establishment. Most of them were established in the previous year or in the election year. There are three "exceptions." The Polish "Self-Defense," the Czech Green Party, and the Hungarian Jobbik were the only parties that had been established but not successful at the point of previous elections. They started as social movements outside parliament and won parliamentary seats after several years of activity. These parties have this feature in common with the "new parties" in Western Europe. Most of the new parties in East-Central Europe were established with an immediate focus on achieving electoral success. We may refer to these parties as election-oriented parties.

As for policy orientation, ten new parties involved in the research were
center-right, four center-left, two conservative, two "green," one radical right and one populist left-wing nationalist. Center-right new parties, which are about half of the 22 new parties, were found in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Slovenia. All of them were election-oriented parties that received a relatively high percentage of votes. New parties are easy to emerge with center-right orientations because, in contrast to the center-left position, where relatively coercive Social Democrats located themselves, most center-right parties in East-Central Europe are parliamentary parties with low levels of party discipline.

The influence of weak party discipline is also frequently found offshoot new parties. Ten parties were offshoot new party; of these, six were center-right, two were center-left, one conservative and one "green." Politicians working for established parent parties left those parties and in cooperation with personalities outside political circles, they established new offshoot parties.

It is difficult to guess ideology or principles from the names of new parties. New parties named themselves so as to emphasize their newness (Sikk, 2011). They wanted to make the point that they were different from older parties. They tried to show that they were on the side of ordinary citizens, representing the public voice, as indicated in the names "Civic Platform," "Public Affairs," and "Ordinary People."

As for coalition politics, nine new parties joined governing coalitions just after the elections. There is an interesting difference evident among six countries. In the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Slovenia, nine out of thirteen new parties became governing coalition partners. In Poland, Hungary, and Croatia, all the new parties remained in opposition.

As the last feature, we checked the endurance of new parties. New parties
frequently emerge in East-Central Europe and fade out with the same frequency. Out of twelve parties that have experienced the next elections, six parties had already lost parliamentary seats, four of them losing at the very next election. Offshoot parties survived well in party systems. All six offshoot parties that challenged in the second election won seats. On the contrary, among the Public Affairs, Alliance of New Citizens and Freedom and Solidarity, which were established by the people outside parliaments, the first two parties could not be accommodated in the party system. "Green" parties or radical right parties are typical new parties in Western Europe that settled in the party system. In East-Central Europe, "green" parties found difficulty fitting in. No "green" party has ever succeeded in being elected twice to the parliament.

From the perspective of this paper, new parties that joined the governing coalition after the election attracted our attention. These parties are concentrated in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Slovenia; most of them are election-oriented new parties (see Table 2). When new parties join the coalition government, do they affect party competition structure or coalition politics? To investigate this question, we chose five new parties of this category and four relevant elections in the Czech Republic and Slovakia to carry out further analysis, which is discussed in the next section. The reasons for differences in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia, on the one hand, and Poland, Hungary and Croatia, on the other, also captured our attention, but that discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.

2. New Parties in the party systems

We chose the Green Party, TOP 09, the Public Affairs Party, the Freedom and Solidarity Party, and the Bridge for further investigation, and we analyzed the relevant
elections held in the years 2002, 2006, 2010 for the Czech Republic and the Slovak election held in 2010.

First, we analyzed the party position on the left-right axis by following three aspects: (a) party position on the left-right axis according to all respondents, (b) positioning on the left-right axis of the political party according to voters who voted for the party, and (c) self-placement on the left-right axis by the voters who voted for each political party.

Next, we conducted CDA to interpret the characteristics of the party competition structures. CDA is a statistical technique that is used to estimate canonical discriminant functions (CDFs), which describe separation among groups based on specified linear composites (discriminant variables) of the outcome variables. In this article, we use as outcome variables party preferences or party choices in elections, and as candidates for discriminant variables, we use political issues, political ideologies, and demographic attributes. The CDFs and the discriminant variables define the issue dimensions of the party systems, each data case is a point on a scale of these dimensions and has composite canonical scores on the scales, defined as CDFs. A particular group (possibly supporters of a party) is represented by a swarm of points concentrated in some position on a particular scale. To summarize the position of a group, we can compute the group mean (the 'centroid'). We may plot centroids on the scales and interpret the character of the party systems based on the order of the centroids and the distance between them. After estimating CDFs, we can calculate discriminant rates (presented in classification tables) showing how much CDFs discriminate between the data properly. We identify them as an indicator of differentiation between the groups that support the parties. The higher discriminant rate belongs to a party that has more
distinctive supporters. Discriminant rate, which shows the extent to which each party's voters are distinct to that party based on the discriminant functions, is also calculated. Please see Appendix for figures showing the results of the analyses.

In comparison to manifest analysis, or policy position analysis based on expert surveys, CDA reveals the party competition structure according to voters' preferences. There are several conflict dimensions that could explain the party competition structure in a party system.

1) The Green Party and the 2006 Czech election

The Green Party was located by voters at the center-right position, overlapping with the Cristian Democratic Union (KDU-ČSL) (Appendix, figure in p.13 above. Here after “Ap.f.”). This position was occupied by the "Coalition" in previous elections, meaning the electoral coalition between KDU-ČSL and the Free Union (Ap.f..p.9 below). As seen from the left-right axis, the Green Party replaced the Free Union. Self-placement of voters culminated in the middle of the left-right axis, smoothly extending to the right (Ap.f. p.13 below). Some electors of the Green Party located themselves exactly right (Ap.f. p.14 above). The Green Party's distribution of self-placement overlapped with that of KDU-ČSL.

As for CDA, in the Czech 2006 election, the most useful variable that distinguished party attachment was "left-right." In this discriminant function, the Green Party was situated at the second "most rightist" position. The most rightist party was ODS, and KDU-ČSL was on the left side (Ap.f. p.14 below; p.15 above). The second discriminant function was the combination of variables: membership in the catholic denomination, age, and employment status. On the basis of this discriminant function,
only KDU-ČSL was separated from other parties. The Green Party was located on the opposite side to KDU-ČSL. The discriminant rate for the Green Party was as high as 60.71% (Ap.f. p.15 below). The Green Party was distinguished from parties other than KDU-ČSL by the left-right variable, and was distinguished from the KDU-ČSL by this second discriminant function.

The discriminant functions of the Czech 2006 election were the same as those in 2002 (Ap.f. p.11 above; p.14 below). Even though the Green Party was elected in the 2006 Czech elections, post-material variable, which is generally assumed to be related with the Green Party, was not selected in the discriminant function in this election.

2) TOP 09 and the Czech 2010 election

On the left-right axis, TOP 09 was located in a position somewhat to the right, overlapping with ODS (Ap.f. p.16 above). The location of ODS was almost the same as it had been in the 2006 election. Self-placement of the party had shifted to the center. The distribution of the self-placement was concentrated at center point, peaking at the same point with ODS. TOP 09 had more centralists among its supporters than did the ODS.

The CDA shows that in the 2010 election too, group means for each party’s supporters were spread separately on left-right variables (Ap.f. p.18 above). The TOP 09's place was distinguished from the position of the other parties.

However, on the second discriminant function, which consisted of variables including age, unemployment, education, and membership in the private sector, the parties were located quite closely and it was difficult to differentiate TOP 09 on the basis of this discriminant function. On the third discriminant function, variables as
religious affiliation and denominational differences distinguished KDU-ČSL, but other social attribute variables were difficult to identify as the basis for discriminating the party attachment of the electorates.

The discriminant rate for TOP 09 was as low as 28.46% (Ap.f. p.18 below). Only the 26.92% of the electorate who voted for TOP 09 in reality, were discriminated as supporters of the Civic Democrats. Discrimination between KDU-ČSL and Public Affairs was also difficult. KDU-ČSL – TOP 09's parent party – had as high a discriminant rate as 63.51% in the 2006 election, thanks to the denominational variables. In contrast to its parent party, TOP 09's discriminant rate was low and pushed down other parties' discriminant rates as well.

The discriminant functions in the 2010 election did not change considerably (Ap.f. p.14 below, Ap.f. p.17 below). The function including denominational variables changed from the second function to the third, but the difference in importance between the third and the second is very small (0.098 and 0.090 respectively, Ap.f. p.17 below).

3) The Public Affairs (VV)

The Public Affairs Party also won the parliamentary seats in the 2010 Czech election. It was located in the center-right position on the left-right axis, left of ODS and TOP 09 (Ap.f. p.15 above). In the 2006 election, KDU-ČSL and the Green Party were allocated this place. These two parties were judged more centrist in the 2010 election. Distribution of the self-placement of the supporters showed two peaks, one near the center and the other at center-right. The peak at the center overlapped with the right peak of the Social Democrats (Ap.f. p.17 above). Supporters’ self-placement also overlapped with that of the TOP 09 supporters.
The CDA suggests that Public Affairs can be recognized by the left-right variables (Ap.f. p.18 above). For the second and third discriminant function it was difficult to distinguish voters' attachment to Public Affairs. The discriminant rate for Public Affairs was very low at 17.65%. This was the lowest rate in this election. Many of the persons who voted for Public Affairs were identified as the supporters of KDU-ČSL, TOP 09, ODS, and the Green Party.

4) The Freedom and Solidarity Party(SaS) and the Slovak 2010 election

The Freedom and Solidarity Party was located on the left-right axis on the right side of center-right, next to the SDKU-DS (Ap.f. p.29 above). The Party position of SDKU-DS, the Freedom and Solidarity Party, and the KDH (Christian Democratic Movement) overlapped. The distribution of voter self-placement was flat from center to right. It was difficult to find the differences among KDH, the Bridge Party, and the Hungarian Coalition Party.

In the 2010 Slovakian election, the first discriminant function consisted of linguistic variables, the second function consisted of left-right variables, and the third one consisted of age, unemployment, and church attendance variables (Ap.f. p.30 below). The Freedom and Solidarity Party distinguished itself at the second left-right function, located next to SDKU-DS and KDH. The third function suggested that the Freedom and Solidarity attachment was associated with less church attendance, youth, and employment. The discriminant rate was relatively high, at 56.1% (Ap.f. p.31 below). The discriminant rate of the Freedom and Solidarity was much higher than that for SDKU-DS (27.94%) and Direction (35.17%).

According to the opinion poll conducted in February 2010 before the election,
31% of the Freedom and Solidarity supporters voted for SDKU-DS, 21% for the Direction, 11% abstained in the 2006 election and 21% ad acquired voting rights for the first time for the 2010 election (Bútorová a Gyárfašová, 2010). Supporters of the Freedom and Solidarity Party were more accepting of diverse sexual orientation, the use of “soft” drugs, and abortion (Bútorová, Gyárfašová a Krivý 2010).

The Freedom and Solidarity Party received 307,287 votes (12.15%) in the 2010 election, but lost half of its votes, receiving 150,266 (5.88%) in the 2012 election (4). According to the opinion poll after the election, about 55,300 former voters for Freedom and Solidarity voted for the Ordinary People, the newest party, in the 2012 election, and 67,400 members of the electorate abstained. On the other hand, 26,900 former SDKU-DS voters voted for Freedom and Solidarity in the 2012 election. It is presumed that some voters moved from older parties to new parties, and later, to even newer parties.

The discriminant functions in the Slovakian 2010 election changed from those in 2004 (Ap.f. p.31 above, p.27 above). The former election was carried out in 2006, but the data for this year was unavailable. In 2010, the first discriminant function consisted of linguistic variables. The cleavage between the Hungarian and the Slovakian voters strongly correlated with the voters’ party attachment. In 2004, the Hungarian appreciation variable comprised the second discriminant function, together with urban residence and denomination (not Catholic). However, the correlation of this function to the party attachment was rather weak. The self-placement on the left-right axis was the strongest variable indicating satisfaction with the democratic regime and EU citizenship. The left-right self-placement was, in 2010 also, the second discriminant function on which parties located themselves, differentiating them from other parties.
The Bridge also won the parliamentary seats in the 2010 Slovak election. It was the offshoot party from the Hungarian Coalition Party. According to members of the electorate, this party was located at center-right on the left-right axis (Ap.f. p.29 above). But supporters of this party located it at the right end (Ap.f. p.29 below). Voters’ self-location was also in the position on the right. The distribution of voters’ self-placement was similar to that of the supporters of Freedom and Solidarity (Ap.f. p.30 above).

CDA revealed that the Bridge and its parent party, the Hungarian Coalition Party could be recognized by the linguistic (ethnic) variables (Ap.f. p.31 above). But the second discriminant function showed that the Bridge’s supporters were slightly younger and more likely to be employed than the supporters of the parent party. The discriminant rate for the Bridge Party was relatively high at 50%, but it was difficult to distinguish between voters for the Bridge Party and those for the Hungarian Coalition Party. According to the opinion poll, 58% of the Bridge’s voters voted for the Hungarian Coalition Party in the 2006 election, and 18% of the Bridge’s voters gained voting rights for the first time (Bútorová a Gyárfášová, 2010).

3. Case analysis

From this analysis, how can we interpret the new parties’ effect on party competition structure and coalition politics? This question is addressed in the discussion below.
1) Party competition structure

As far as party competition structure is concerned, the discriminant functions and the variables included did not change considerably, even though relatively large new parties had entered the party systems. The left-right self-placement axis correlated strongly with voters' party attachment in both countries, in every election.

The persistence of the Czech party competition structure deserves attention. The Green party did not add new conflict dimensions to Czech party politics. This may explain the Green Party's failure in the subsequent election. It was not based on the post-modern value orientation of the electorate, as in Western Europe. The Green Party was supported by the electors whose self-placement was at center-right. Its economic policy orientation was liberal. The Green Party, as a new party, replaced the Free Union and was replaced by other new parties, such as the Public Affairs Party and TOP 09. The emergence of TOP 09 and the Public Affairs Party changed the party landscape. However these parties had only replaced former center-right parties on the existing conflict dimensions.

In Slovakia, the linguistic – ethnic – variable constituted the strongest discriminant function in 2010. This emerged as the important difference in comparison to analysis of the 2004 data. The Hungarian minority thought that their situation had deteriorated since the establishment of the coalition government of the Direction (Smer), the Slovakian National Party (SNS), and the Movement for the Democratic Slovakia (HZDS) in 2006 (Bútorová a Gyárfášová, 2010). Almost all the voters for the Hungarian Coalition Party were members of the Hungarian minority, and 70% of Bridge Party voters were also Hungarian. The emergence of the Bridge Party could be related to the prominence of the linguistic variables.
In addition, in Slovakia, the third discriminant function which consisted of age, employment, and church attendance worked to distinguish new parties. The function which consisted of religion and pension variables had existed in the 2004 analysis. The third function used in 2010 had religious and work status variables in common, but the age variable emerged as the most important one. The difference between the new party and its parent party was recognizable by this function. New parties – the Bridge Party and the Freedom and Solidarity Party – tended to be supported by the younger generation, who were highly paid, employed in larger numbers, and less earnest about going to church. It is interesting to note that members of the electorate were not motivated to support the new party on the basis of economic hardship.

As far as these five new parties are concerned, the party competition structure in the Czech Republic has hardly been influenced. In Slovakia, the linguistic dimension, added to the cultural and economic dimensions, changed the components of the party competition structure with the emergence of new parties.

2) Coalition politics

All five parties took part in governing coalitions after the elections. Did this mean they took the initiative in the creation of the new governing coalition? The Green Party's emergence certainly coincided with the change in coalition politics. Till the election of 2002, the Czech coalition politics had displayed a partially alternating pattern with three poles. Center-right Parties had formed governing coalitions with either left Social Democrats or right Civic Democrats. The 2006 election was the turning point for Czech coalition politics. Two blocks of left and right were formed, including the Green Party in the right block. The formation of the two blocks was mainly caused by the
approximation of the Communists and the Social Democrats, along with an embittered relationship between The KDU-ČSL and the Social Democrats. The Green Party chose the center-right coalition as the result of these circumstances and did not cause the change in coalition politics.

TOP 09 and Public Affairs did not affect the two-block pattern of coalition politics. Those parties replaced the KDU-ČSL and the Green party in the center-right position and participated in a coalition with the Civic Democrats. The same trend was seen in the case of the two new Slovakian parties. In spite of the change in party competition structure, the left and right governing coalition remained unchanged. Two coalition blocks fully alternate.

The party positions on the left-right axis also suggest these coalition patterns. The positions of TOP 09 and the Public Affairs Party consolidated the right block (Ap.f. p.16 above) and so did the Bridge Party and the Freedom and Solidarity Party (Ap.f. p.29 above). The positions of the two offshoot parties was very near to their parent parties.

4. Conclusion

Our five cases show that new parties do not always change party competition structures, and coalition patterns remain the same even when the party competition structure changes. Contrary to general assumptions, parties of this type do not directly cause instability within the party system and coalition politics. These five new parties are characteristic of new types of parties in East-Central Europe, especially in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Slovenia. High electoral volatility caused by the "supply side effect" of new parties has been getting attention because of the possibility of the party politics turmoil affected by the continuous emergence of new parties. However, as we
have shown in this paper, about half of these constantly emerging new parties do not always cause changes in the party competition structure and generally, they keep the coalition pattern unchanged.

On the other hand, we suggest that these parties may cause the following three indirect outcomes: unclear ex-post accountability, voter disappointment, and instability of coalition governments. Where accountability is concerned, governing parties are appreciated or punished by voters according to voters' judgment of government’s political achievements up to the elections. This is the government’s ex-post accountability as measured by the voters. When new parties got support in an election, the ex-post accountability of the governing coalition became unclear. The uncertainty is more evident in cases in which new parties join the coalition with former governing parties, as in the case of TOP 09 and the Public Affairs Party. The Ordinary People Party in the 2012 Slovakian election also fell into this category. TOP 09 and the Ordinary People Party were formed by the split of coalition parties, which re-entered the coalition after the election. These new parties hindered clear accountability of the coalition government. Voters could be disappointed by the new parties’ policy after the election.

In the case of new parties, voters' self-placement was widely distributed on the left-right axis. As for Public Affairs, the distribution line had two peaks. The Freedom and Solidarity Party’s supporters were distributed from center-left to center-right. New parties discriminant rates were generally low, and this affected discriminant rates of the older parties. In the 2002 and 2006 Czech elections, all the parties except the Social Democrats had discriminant rates of more than 60%. The discriminant rate decreased in the 2010 election. More than half of the parties got only one-third of previous rate (Ap.f. p.18 below). The Communist Party was scarcely affected, and the Civic Democrats still
kept 58% of the discriminant rate, but the Social Democrats' rate went down to 28%. Voters’ perceptions of the parties’ plans may be widely different from the actual direction which new parties take after elections.

New parties' willingness to enter the Governmental coalitions with older parties could be especially disappointing for the voters. New parties attack old parties for corruption or poor governance during electoral campaigns. Sikk suggested that some types of new parties do not represent new issues or ideologies but just win elections by projecting the image of "newness" (Sikk 2011). The voters for the new parties chose them to show their disapproval of the existing parties or of government politics. But their choice was not reflected in the composition of the new coalition.

As one of the effects, some of the new parties lost popularity in a short time. The New Citizens Alliance, the Green Party, and Public Affairs Party entered into coalition governments with high levels of popularity but they lost popularity at the end of their governments. On the other hand, the Freedom and Solidarity Party and TOP 09 showed popularity persistence, even though the former group lost half of its former voters. The reason why new parties in East-Central Europe are inclined to have short lives needs more investigation.

When new parties lost popularity, this damaged popular support for the coalition government. Unpopular new parties often lost integrity and lost their deputies to the opposition. These occurrences may cause instability for the governing coalitions in these countries.

An important point is that these indirect outcomes are closely connected to the stability of the party competition structure and coalition politics. This paper's conclusion is still tentative, as the in-depth investigation has been limited to five cases in the Czech
Republic and Slovakia. Still, it is clear that there exist new types of new parties in East-Central Europe, a reality that needs special consideration to determine the real significance of their emergence.

Notes

1 The Election Database in Central and Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union Countries is a comprehensive database on parliamentary elections, presidential elections, and European elections. It contains the background information by experts on political parties and elections. http://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/election_europe/index.html.

2 As Sikk pointed out, Italy and Japan are the two old democracies that have produced numerous new parties since the 1990s. Japanese new parties are too numerous to count. Most of them are established as new offshoot parties. The names of the new parties show that founders of new parties tried to emphasize their newness: New Party Sakigake (SAKIGAKE: Forerunner), New Frontier Party (SHINSHINTO), Japan Renewal Party (SINSEITO), Sunrise Party of Japan (TACHIAGARE NIPPON: Stand up Japan), People's Life First, Tomorrow Party of Japan (MIRAI noTO: Future Party). The effects of new parties on coalition governments are real in Japan, where three new parties gained more than a quarter of votes in proportional representation constituencies in the 2012 parliamentary election. In Italy and East-Central Europe, voters can locate new parties on the left-right axis. In Japan, voters have difficulty in locating parties on the left-right axis. On the Japanese party scene, there are no serious leftist parties. We can see the Polish-style right versus right politics in Japan.

3 Canonical Discriminant Analysis (CDA) consists of a variety of multivariate statistical techniques to be conducted for the purpose of estimating canonical discriminant functions (CDFs), which describe separation among groups based on some linear composites (discriminant variables) of the outcome variables. CDA may also properly classify cases into the groups and provide the absolute and relative magnitude of different discriminant variables. For technical details, see Klecka (1980) and Huberty (2010). For examples of the application to comparative politics, see Knutsen 21
As for data, the following were used: Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) 1, 2, 3, European Election Studies (EES) 2004, 2009, and European Values Survey (EVS), European Values Survey (EVS), World Values Survey (WVS) 1999/2000.


Party preference in Slovakia, opinion poll by Focus, http://www.focus-research.sk/?section=show&id=10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First election which won seats</th>
<th>New Parties</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Votes %</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Seats %</th>
<th>Year of Foundation</th>
<th>result of the next election</th>
<th>policy orientation</th>
<th>Offshoot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Civic Platform PORP</td>
<td>1,651,099</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Win seats</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Defence Samoobrona</td>
<td>1,327,624</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Win seats (Fail in 2007)</td>
<td>populist, left wing nationalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law and Justice PiS</td>
<td>1,236,787</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Win seats</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League of Polish LPR</td>
<td>1,025,148</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Win seats (Fail in 2007)</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palikot's Movement Ruch Palikota</td>
<td>1,439,490</td>
<td>10.02%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>green, center-left, personal initiative</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Green Party SZ</td>
<td>336,487</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>green, center-right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOP 09 TOP'09</td>
<td>873,833</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs VV (Věci veřejné)</td>
<td>569,127</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Direction SMER</td>
<td>387,100</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Win seats</td>
<td>center-left</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliance of New Citizens ANO</td>
<td>230,309</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom and Solidarity SaS</td>
<td>307,287</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Win seats</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge MOST-HÍD</td>
<td>205,538</td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Win seats</td>
<td>center-right, ethnic party</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinary People OĽaNO</td>
<td>218,537</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary**</td>
<td>Jobbik Jobbik</td>
<td>855,436</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>radical right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics Can Be Different LMP</td>
<td>383,876</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>New Slovenia – Christian People's Party NSi</td>
<td>94,661</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Win seats</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenian Youth SMS</td>
<td>46,719</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>green, center-right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zares - New Politics Zares</td>
<td>98,526</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>center-right</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoran Janković’s Croatian Renewal LŽJ-PS</td>
<td>314,273</td>
<td>28.51%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.11%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>center-left, personal initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virant’s List DL Gregorija Viranta</td>
<td>92,282</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>center-right, personal initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Party/List</td>
<td>Leader/Name</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>Votes %</td>
<td>Seats</td>
<td>Seats %</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Coalition/Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Croatian Labourists</td>
<td>Hrvatski Laburisti-Stranka rada</td>
<td>97,701</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>center-left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Grubišić's List</td>
<td>Ivan Grubišić</td>
<td>29,088</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>2011***</td>
<td>center-left, personal initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*yellow cell: joining the ruling coalition after the election.
*As for Hungary, votes, votes rate, seats and seats rate are that of proportional district (district list)
***Grubišić himself participated in 2003 election.
Table 2: New parties electoral success and coalition participation in East–Central Europe since 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Type</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral success needs several years</strong></td>
<td>Opposition (9) Self-Defence (POL), (Jobbik (HUN)), (Politics Can Be Different (HUN))</td>
<td>The Green Party (CZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental coalition (1)</strong></td>
<td>Civic Platform (POL), Jaw and Justice (POL), League of Polish Farmers (POL), (Palikot Movement (POL)), Direction (SLK), (Ordinary People (SLK)), (Positive Slovenia (SLV)), (Croatian Labours (HRV)), (Grubis’s list (HRV))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral success just after establishment</strong></td>
<td>Opposition (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental coalition (10)</strong></td>
<td>(TOP 09 (CZ)), Freedom and Solidarity (SLK), Bridge (SLK), New Slovenia Cristian Party (SLV), (Virant’s List (SLV))</td>
<td>(Public Affairs (CZ)), Alliance of New Citizens (SLK), Slovenian Youth Party (SLV), Zares (SLV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parties in blue letters are offshoot new parties.
*Parties in parenthesis won parliamentary seats at the latest election in
*Underlined parties are investigated in the second section.
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