

## OMITTED APPENDIX TO “ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AND THE VOTE FOR INCUMBENT PARTIES”: CODING OF PRIMARY AND OTHER INCUMBENTS

---

### **Incumbents**

In this section, the decision of whether or not to code a party as an incumbent is addressed, while the following section tackles the question of whether those parties coded as incumbents are Primary or Other Incumbents. The section is broken down by different types of coding decisions.

#### *Incumbents and Initial Elections*

As described in the text, in the first election of the post-communist era, the incumbent is the candidate that represents the old communist regime. The 1990 Hungarian parliamentary election is the only example of this type of election in the sample. Going to this election, the old ruling communist party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (MSzMP), had two successor parties. When it disbanded on October 7, 1989, it invited members to join the official successor, the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSzP) (Racz 1993; Swain 1993; Oltay 1994b; Tokes 1996). A small number of hard-line communists refused to join this party, and instead formed a “new” Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (MSzMP), which competed in the 1990 elections. By January of 1991, the name had been shortened simply to the Workers Party (MP) (Pittaway and Swain 1994, 243).<sup>1</sup>

#### *Incumbents in Presidential Systems*

Russia is the only country in the sample that is a presidential system and as such the only case where we have to worry about coding incumbent parliamentary parties in terms of their relationship to the incumbent president, as was outlined in the text. Fortunately, in both the 1993 and 1995 Russian parliamentary elections, there was a clear party of power closely associated with and supported by the

---

<sup>1</sup> To make matters more complicated, in 1993 a hard-line faction of the Workers Party split off and formed a third Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (MSzMP) under the leadership of Laszlo Fazekas.. This incarnation of the party, however, failed to play any role in the ensuing election (Pittaway and Swain 1994, 225).

presidential administration.<sup>2</sup> In 1993, Russia's Choice "represented the official face of the government . . . and was blessed with generous financial and other support" (Sakwa 1995, 199-200). McFaul and Markov, concur, noting that "going into the December, 1993, elections, Russia's Choice was the closest approximation to a 'party of power'" (McFaul and Markov 1995, 39). Although Russia's Choice was the party most clearly identified with the government, there were also a number of government ministers running under the banner of the Party for Russian Unity and Concord (PRES), so this party is also coded as an incumbent in 1993 (White, Rose and McAllister 1997, 111-12).<sup>3</sup> By 1995, Russia's Choice had fallen from its position as a party of power and was rapidly approaching insignificance as it competed with at least seven other democratic parties for the same electorate (Orttung 1995). It had been replaced as the party of power by Our Home is Russia (NDR), which Timothy Colton referred to as "the unabashed defender of the status quo" (Colton 1996, 296). NDR's standing as a party of power was cemented by the presence of Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin at the top of the party list, and it clearly enjoyed the support of the presidential administration (McFaul and Petrov 1995; Myagkov, Ordeshook and Sobyenin 1997; White, Rose and McAllister 1997; Tucker and Brader 1998).

#### *Incumbents and Multiple Governments: Poland*

There were two different governments in the period leading up to the 1991 Polish parliamentary elections. The first government, in power from September of 1989 through November of 1990, was led by Tadeusz Mazowiecki and was made up of ministers from the Democratic Union, the Polish Peasant's Party, the Polish Peasant Party Solidarity, and independents. The second government, led by Jan Krzysztof Bielecki, with ministers from the Congress of Liberal Democrats, the Center Alliance, the Christian Democrats, the Democratic Union, and independents, ruled from January of 1991 through the

---

<sup>2</sup> This trend of both a party of power the 2000 elections, with the role now being played by the Unity (*Edinstvo*) Party.

<sup>3</sup> In 1993, the Russia's Choice national list was headed by Yegor Gaidar, who had been the acting Prime Minister in 1992 and was reappointed a first deputy Prime Minister in September 1993. Other major government figures on the list included Andrei Kozyrev (Foreign Minister) Anatolii Chubais (Privatization) Boris Fedorov (Finance) and Ella Pamfilova (Social Security). In fact, at the party's first press conference, spokesmen for the party declared "we are the president's party" (cited in McFaul and Petrov 1995, 39). PRES included Deputy Premiers Sergei Shakhrai and Alexander Shokhin (White, Rose and McAllister 1997, 111-112).

October 1991 elections.<sup>4</sup> Since both governments ruled for roughly equal periods of time – and the first government actually ruled for a slightly longer period – all of these parties are coded as incumbents.

The 1993 Polish parliamentary elections are also case where there were multiple coalition governments prior to the election, but here we code only the members of the last coalition are coded as incumbents. Following the 1991 Polish election, Jan Olszewski of the Center Alliance became Prime Minister December of 1991 at the head of a very unsteady coalition of five parties that was generally opposed by an active President Walesa. The coalition soon dropped to three parties, and by May of 1992, the Polish parliament had already pass a vote of no confidence in the government. Not surprisingly, the government did not survive past June. Walesa then asked Waldemar Pawlak, the head of the Polish Peasant Party, a descendent of one of the Communist satellite parties, to form a government, which he was unable to do. Finally, in July of 1992, Hanna Suchocka of the UD put together a seven party coalition that ruled until the September, 1993 parliamentary elections.<sup>5</sup> Since the Olszewski government only ruled for a short period of time in the beginning of the electoral cycle and the Pawlak government never even took office, neither of these parties are coded as incumbents. From the Suchocka government, there were four parties that competed in the 1993 elections that received at least 2% of the vote – the Democratic Union (DU), Congress of Liberal Democrats (KLD), Peasant Alliance (PSL-PL), and the Catholic Election Committee – Fatherland (KKW) – and these are the four parties that are coded as incumbents.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The source for the parties of the different ministers is the *Economist Intelligence Unit* Country Reports and Country Updates. See also (Vinton 1990; Jasiewicz 1992; Millard 1992; Zubek 1993).

<sup>5</sup> This was not a regularly scheduled parliamentary election, but instead was triggered by a no confidence vote that passed by one vote. Following the vote, the parliament was unable to agree upon a new government, which led to the calling of new parliamentary elections. For more on this period of time in Poland, see (Koldys 1992; Sabbat-Swidlicka 1993; Vinton 1993; Jasiewicz 1994; Lewis 1994; Sabbat-Swidlicka 1994)

<sup>6</sup> Two of the parties in the Suchocka government – the Christian National Union and the Peasant-Christian Alliance – united with the Conservative Party to form the Catholic Electoral Committee – Fatherland bloc. The other two parties that participated in the Suchocka government – Party of Christian Democrats and Polish Economic Program – either did not compete in the election or joined coalitions that did not receive at least 2% of the vote (Koldys 1992; Florczyk 1993; Szajkowski 1994).

*Incumbents and Multiple Governments: The Czech Republic*

The 1992 Czech and Slovak republic level elections occurred concurrently with the elections for the Czechoslovakian parliament, seven months prior to the dissolution Czechoslovakia. For all practical purposes, one set of parties contested both the federal and republic level elections in the Czech Republic, and a different set contested the federal and republic level elections in the Slovak republic (Pehe 1992a). For these reasons, this study analyzes the republic level elections for the bodies that became the national parliaments of each country following the split of Czechoslovakia.<sup>7</sup>

In the 1990 Czechoslovak elections, the Civic Forum – a broad anti-communist movement – received approximately 50% of the vote in the Czech lands for both the federal parliament and the republic level parliament, more than three times more than the closest runner up, the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (Innes 1997). The Forum therefore dominated the composition of Czech republic-level government, with eleven out of the twenty one ministers in the government.<sup>8</sup> At the federal level, Civic Forum was the only Czech party/movement to have ministers in the government, had more ministries than any other party, and controlled the prestigious Ministries of Foreign Affairs (Jiri Dienstbier) Finance (Vaclav Klaus) and Economy (Vladimir Dlouhy) (Martin 1990). Had Civic Forum survived until the 1992 elections, it undoubtedly would have been coded as the incumbent party in the 1992 elections.

However, “by the end of 1990 it had become clear that Civic Forum and the Public against Violence [the Civic Forum’s Slovak counterpart] had fulfilled their role as provisional anticommunist alliances of people with divergent political philosophies and that they would break up into political groups with more clearly defined political orientations” (Pehe 1991b, 2). By the time of the 1992 elections, Civic Forum had effectively disintegrated into three parties: the Civic Democratic Alliance

---

<sup>7</sup> In the election, the proportion of the vote received by parties in their national councils and the parliament within their area of the country is basically constant (Innes 1997). Thus the analysis conducted for this paper would yield basically the same general results if the vote for the federal parliament were analyzed instead of the republic parliament.

<sup>8</sup> Indeed, only three other ministers were affiliated with any other parties; seven of the twenty one were independents (Martin 1990).

(ODA), the Civic Democratic Forum (ODS), and the Civic Movement (OM) (Pehe 1991b; Wightman 1993).<sup>9</sup> As all three parties were clearly linked to the Civic Forum and were represented in the parliaments and governments at the time of the 1992 elections, all three are coded as incumbents in the 1992 election.

#### *Incumbents and Multiple Governments: Slovakia*

The 1990 elections to the Slovak parliament saw a slightly more equitable distribution of votes than the Czech Parliament. While an umbrella anti-Communist movement – called the Public Against Violence movement – still clearly won the election, it took close to 30% of the vote, as opposed to the close to 50% won by Civic Forum. Moreover, three additional parties received between 10-20% of the vote, the Christian Democratic Movement (KDH), Slovak National Party (SNS), and the Communists (still running as a unified party with its Czech counterparts) (Innes 1997).<sup>10</sup> The Slovak government that emerged following the election was dominated by the Public against Violence, which had thirteen out of twenty-three ministries, including the Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar; seven of the remaining ten ministers came from the KDH (Martin 1990).<sup>11</sup> Like Civic Forum, Public Against Violence (PAV) began to disintegrate in the spring of 1991, when Meciar formed his own group within PVA in March, 1991. By the end of April, PAV had officially split and Meciar had been dismissed as the Slovak Prime Minister (Pehe 1991b). Meciar's group went on to become the political party Movement for a Democratic Slovakia. Meciar was replaced as Prime Minister by Jan Carnogursky of the KDH in April, 1991 (Wightman 1993). In addition, once PAV split, KDH became the strongest party in the Slovak parliament (Pehe 1992b, 3). The remaining part of PAV continued to support the Carnogursky government, and it

---

<sup>9</sup> The Civic Forum officially split into the Civic Democratic Party and the Civic Movement on February 23, 1991. Shortly thereafter, the Civic Democratic Alliance split off as well, holding its founding conference on April 20, 1991. There were several other smaller groups that emerged from the Civic Forum, but none captured over 2% of the vote in the 1992 elections (Pehe 1991b, 2).

<sup>10</sup> As in the Czech part of the federation, the votes were basically the same for the Federal Assembly and the Slovak republic level parliament. See Innes 1997, 396.

<sup>11</sup> The remaining three ministers were from the Democratic Party (DS), which would normally qualify the DS as an incumbent party as well. However, in the 1992 the DS ran on a coalition with the Czech ODS, which clearly was not an incumbent party in Slovakia (Obrman 1992a). Indeed, the ODS was not even really a Slovak party, which

entered the 1992 campaign as the Civic Democratic Union (ODU) (Obrman 1992a). Since all three parties played a clear role in the government in the period between the 1990 and 1992 elections, all three are coded as incumbents.<sup>12</sup>

Meciar came back to power following the 1992 election, and he was again removed from office before the next round of elections, this time in the spring of 1994. Following the 1992 election, Meciar put together a government composed largely of members of his own party.<sup>13</sup> However, by March of 1993, a split in the HZDS had already occurred – 8 MPs left the party – and the HZDS was forced to enter into a coalition with the SNS.<sup>14</sup> Over the next year, support for Meciar and the HZDS continued to deteriorate, culminating in a no confidence vote in the government on March 11, 1994.<sup>15</sup> Following the no confidence vote, Meciar's government was replaced by a five party coalition of the Christian Democratic Movement, the Party of the Democratic Left, the Democratic Union of Slovakia, the Alliance of Democrats, and the National Democratic Party under the leadership of Jozef Moravcik of the Democratic Union of Slovakia (Fisher 1994).<sup>16</sup> This coalition ruled until the 1994 Slovak parliamentary election, and actually managed to pass a good deal of legislation in its seven months in office and

---

makes the coding difficult. As the DS also only played a small part in the government (three out of twenty-three ministries), the decision was made not to code it as an incumbent party.

<sup>12</sup> The reason why Meciar's HZDS is included as an incumbent party and Olszewski's PC in Poland, 1993, was not is two-fold. First, Meciar was the head of the movement, PAV, that clearly won the previous election; Olszewski's PC received only the 6<sup>th</sup> highest number of seats and less than 9% of the total. Second, Meciar ruled a stable coalition made up of the two largest parties in parliament that enjoyed a substantial majority, while Olszewski presided over a weak minority coalition that was losing support constantly throughout his brief tenure. Meciar was also in power for a considerably longer period of time than Olszewski *vis a vis* the government that.

<sup>13</sup> Out of fourteen ministers in the government, twelve were from the HZDS, with one independent and one member of the Slovak National Party (SNS), which was not technically part of the coalition but which generally provided tacit support (Pehe 1992d; Szomolanyi 1999).

<sup>14</sup> Although coalition talks began in the spring, the formal coalition was not concluded until the fall of 1993 (Szomolanyi 1999). See also Meseznikov 1994; Leff 1997; Szomolanyi 1997.

<sup>15</sup> Indeed, eight of the ministers in Meciar's government were either dismissed, voted down by votes of no confidence, or resigned in the 20 months the government was in power (Malova 1995, 72). Moreover, parliamentary defections continued even after the coalition with the SNS was formed, with MPs leaving the coalition in December, 1993 and again in February, 1994. For more on these events, see Fisher and Hrib 1994.

<sup>16</sup> The Alliance of Democrats was founded by deputies that left the MZDS in the spring of 1993, and the Democratic Union of Slovakia was made up of deputies that left MZDS in the spring of 1994; it had previously been a faction within MZDS called the Alliance for Political Realism. The National Democratic Party was founded by members of the SNS that were critical of Meciar in late 1993 (Fisher and Hrib 1994; Szajkowski 1994).

generally pursued pro-western policies and market oriented reforms (EECR 1994; Fisher 1994). Leff writes that:

The record it wished to establish was clearly one of responsibility, fence-mending, and good Eurocitizenship on key issues that would shape Slovakia's image at home and abroad . . . . In economic policy, the goal of the Moravcik government was to signal renewed commitment to marketization and privatization ... (Leff 1997, 151)

Since the two governments were of such a different nature and were composed of completely different parties, it seems a mistake to code one coalition as the incumbents and ignore the others. The rule of coding the most recent government as incumbents plus any other governments that were in power for a significant period of time since the previous election also points towards including both coalitions as incumbents, which is how it was ultimately coded. The reader will note, though that neither the Alliance of Democrats nor the National Democratic Party is listed as an incumbent, as the former had merged with the Democratic Union of Slovakia by the time of the election and the latter chose to run its candidates as part of the Democratic Union of Slovakia list (Henderson 1994).

#### *Clear Cut Cases*

The remaining elections yielded simple coding decisions. The 1994 Hungarian and 1996 Czech Republic elections each followed a four year period where one coalition had ruled the entire time since the previous election. In Hungary, this was the coalition of the MDF, ISP, and KDNP, while in the Czech Republic it was the ODS, ODA, and KDU (Oltay 1994a; Racz and Kukorelli 1995; Pehe 1996; Leff 1997).

#### **Primary Incumbent Parties**

In the text, two criteria are given for determining primary incumbent parties. In the 1996 Czech Republic election, the 1994 Hungarian election, and the 1993 Polish election, both criteria are met; the prime minister at the time of the election comes was a member of the party that had received the largest proportion of the vote in the previous election.<sup>17</sup> The coding of NDR and RC as the parties most closely

---

<sup>17</sup> In the Czech and Hungarian cases, a single coalition had ruled since the previous election. For Poland, the situation was different. As was discussed previously, two different coalitions ruled in the first seven months after

associated with President Yeltsin during the 1995 and 1993 Russian parliamentary elections, respectively, has already been addressed above, and both are clear choices for the Primary Incumbent parties (McFaul and Petrov 1995; White, Rose and McAllister 1997; Tucker and Brader 1998).<sup>18</sup>

There are three elections in the sample where the incumbent parties did not compete individually in the previous election but instead were part of an umbrella anti-communist coalition: the Polish 1991 and the Czech and Slovak 1992 elections. As was described above, two separate coalitions containing a total of six parties ruled between the 1989 and 1991 Polish parliamentary elections. The first government was headed by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who went on to be the original leader of the Democratic Union (UD), while the second was led by Jan Bielecki of the Congress of Liberal Democrats (KLD) (Jasiewicz 1992; Szajkowski 1994). However, both governments retained Leszek Balcerowicz as their Finance Minister. And it was the Balcerowicz Plan for radical economic reform that more than anything else distinguished Polish government policy between 1989 and 1991 (Przeworski 1993; Sachs 1993). As “the UD became the party most closely associated with the “shock therapy” of the liberal economic reforms of Finance Minister Leszek Balcerowicz”, the UD seems the appropriate choice for the Primary Incumbent party going into the 1991 Polish parliamentary elections (Szajkowski 1994, 332).

The 1992 Czech Republic election can also be coded fairly simply based on similar logic. The three descendents of the Civic Forum anti-communist umbrella groups – ODS, ODA, and OH – were all coded as incumbents for the election. As the parties had effectively competed under the same banner in

---

the 1991 election until Hanna Suchocka of the UD put together a multi-party coalition that ruled until the September, 1993, parliamentary elections. The previous section of this appendix addressed the decision to only code the members of the Suchocka coalition as incumbent parties. Within that coalition the UD meets the definition of a Primary Incumbent party by fulfilling both criteria: the UD received the largest share of the vote in the 1991 elections of any of the coalition members and Suchocka herself was a member of the UD (Koldys 1992; Sabbat-Swidlicka 1993; Jasiewicz 1994; Sabbat-Swidlicka 1994; Szajkowski 1994).

<sup>18</sup> The Russian cases point out one shortcoming of Degree of Incumbency hypothesis as it is currently constituted when analyzing parliamentary elections in presidential systems. While the coding of incumbent parties in parliamentary elections allows for multiple parties to be coded as incumbents – and thus the presence of plenty of primary and other incumbent parties in a sample – the coding of parliamentary incumbents in presidential systems is more likely to have fewer incumbents. With the data set employed in this paper, it does not appear to be too much of a problem, as most of the elections are not from presidential systems (plus the 1993 Russian parliamentary elections did result in two parties being coded as incumbents), but it could limit the testing of the model in a data set made up completely of parliamentary elections in presidential systems.

1990, it is impossible to identify one of the them as having received the highest vote proportion.

Moreover, the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia was actually a Slovak, and thus not a member of any of the three parties. Nevertheless, ODS clearly stands apart as the Primarily Coalition Partner for three reasons. First, prior to its dissolution, Civic Forum was headed by Vaclav Klaus, who went on to become the head of ODS (Pehe 1991a). Thus the last association that voters had with Civic Forum as a movement involved coincided with the leadership of Klaus. Second, from the point when Civic Forum split into its successor parties, ODS became and remained the strongest party in parliament (Pehe 1992c, 1992b, 1992a). Finally, and most importantly, was the role played by Finance Minister and head of the ODS Vaclav Klaus in guiding Czechoslovakia's, and by default the Czech Republic's, economic reform program (Wolchik 1994; Innes 1997).

The Slovak case is more complicated due to the fact that it had not one, but two distinctly different coalitions ruling in the period prior to the 1992 elections. Vladimir Meciar had served as the country's Prime Minister until April of 1991. At the time, he was still a member of the umbrella anti-communist organization Public Against Violence (PAV), but by the time of the 1992 election he and his supporters had left the PAV and formed the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HZDS). The rump membership of PAV entered the election as the Civic Democratic Union (ODU). However, the Prime Minister that succeeded Meciar was Jan Carnogursky, the leader of the Christian Democratic Movement (KDH) (Obrman 1992b; Pehe 1992d; Meseznikov 1994; Szomolanyi 1994). So there seems to be good reason for considering that all three of these parties could qualify as Primary Coalition Parties. HZDS was the party of the first Prime Minister and a successor of the party that won the previous election, KDH the party of the current prime minister at the time of the election, and ODU a successor to the party that won the previous election and a constant participant in the government. However, by the criteria established above, the nod has to go to the KDH. While Meciar served as Prime Minister originally, Carnogursky of the KDH was Prime Minister for the period of time leading up to the election, and he was

prime minister for a longer period of time than Meciar. Additionally, KDH became the strongest party in the parliament following the split of PAV (Pehe 1992b).<sup>19</sup>

The 1994 Slovak parliamentary elections also followed a period of two distinctly different ruling coalitions (Fisher 1994; Henderson 1994; Leff 1997; Szomolanyi 1999). Following the coding rules, the primary partner in the second coalition government should be classified as the Primary Incumbent party.<sup>20</sup> So the question becomes which of the three members of the second coalition that contested the 1994 election – the Democratic Union of Slovakia (DU), the Party of the Democratic Left (SDL), and the Christian Democratic Movement (KDH) – should be chosen as the primary party. Out of these three, the Democratic Union of Slovakia meets both of the primary criteria. The Prime Minister of Slovakia, Jozef Moravcik, was a leader and one of the founding members of the DU. By the time of the election, the DU also had more members of parliament running on its list than the KDH and almost as many as the SDL.<sup>21</sup>

Additionally, the fact that the DU was made up of people who had originally been associated with the Meciar government it strengthens the argument to code the DU as the Primary Coalition Partner. After all, Moravcik himself had been the Foreign Minister in the Meciar government prior to the March, 1994 crisis.<sup>22</sup> Thus while the DU could be said to have some responsibility for what went on in the Meciar government, the same could not be said about either the KDH or the SDL. Likewise, the HZDS and SNS could not be said to have any responsibility for the Moravcik government, which leaves the DU as the sole party with links to both governments.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> I am grateful to Abby Innes, John Gould, and Kevin Krause, who all gave lengthy written responses to my queries on this coding decision.

<sup>20</sup> One reason not to code in this manner would be if the Moravcik government functioned merely as a caretaker government. However, the government was quite active and behaved as if it expected to be in power past the 1994 election.

<sup>21</sup> If the SDL had markedly more members in parliament, then that would be an argument for considering it the Primary Incumbent party despite the fact that the DU had the Prime Minister. Since they were close, though, it is not a good enough reason to not code the DU as the Primary Incumbent party.

<sup>22</sup> And Moravcik was not the only minister in both coalitions. See Fisher 1994) for details.

<sup>23</sup> By the election the DU had merged with the Alliance of Political Realities and had members of the National Democratic Party running on its list, the two other “breakaway” parties that could be said to have ties with the Meciar government (Henderson 1994).

## WORKS CITED IN APPENDIX

- Colton, Timothy J. 1996. "Economics and Voting in Russia." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 12 (4): 289-318.
- EECR, Staff. 1994. "Constitution Watch: Slovakia." *East European Constitutional Review* 3 (3/4): 21-22.
- Fisher, Sharon. 1994. "New Slovak Government Formed after Meciar's Fall." *RFE/RL Research Report* 3 (13): 7-13.
- Fisher, Sharon and Stefan Hrib. 1994. "Political Crisis in Slovakia." *RFE/RL Research Report* 3 (10): 20-26.
- Florczyka, Andrzej, ed. 1993. *Wybory do Sejmu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*. Warsaw, Panstowa Komisja Wyborcza.
- Henderson, Karen. 1994. "The Slovak Republic" In *Political Parties of Eastern Europe, Russia, and the Successor States*. Bogdan Szajkowski, Ed. Essex, United Kingdom, Longman Information and Reference: 525-555.
- Innes, Abby. 1997. "The Breakup of Czechoslovakia: The Impact of Party Development on the Separation of the State." *East European Politics and Societies* 11 (3): 393-435.
- Jasiewicz, Krzysztof. 1992. "From Solidarity to Fragmentation." *Journal of Democracy* 3 (2): 55-69.
- Jasiewicz, Krzysztof. 1994. "Poland: Walesa's Legacy to the Presidency" In *Postcommunist Presidents*. Ray Taras, Ed. Cambridge, England, Oxford University Press: 130-167.
- Koldys, Gregory. 1992. *Politics and Political Development in Post-Communist Poland*, mimeo.
- Leff, Carol Skalnik. 1997. *The Czech and Slovak Republics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Malova, Darina. 1995. "Parliamentary Rules and Legislative Dominance: Slovakia." *East European Constitutional Review* 4 (2): 71-77.
- Martin, Peter. 1990. "The New Governments." *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Report on Eastern Europe* July 27, 1990: 9-13.
- McFaul, Michael and Sergei Markov. 1995. "Parties and Electoral Blocs" In *Previewing Russia's 1995 Parliamentary Elections*. Michael McFaul and Nikolai Petrov, Eds. Moscow, Russia, Carnegie Moscow Center: 15-100.
- McFaul, Michael and Nikolai Petrov. 1995. *Previewing Russia's 1995 Parliamentary Elections*. Moscow, Russia: Carnegie Moscow Center.
- Meseznikov, Grigorij. 1994. "The Programs of Political Parties in Slovakia: In Practice and Declarations" In *The Slovak Path of Transition - To Democracy?* Sona Szomlanyi and Grigorij Meseznikov, Eds. Bratislava, Slovakia, Slovak Political Science Association: 83-110.

- Millard, Frances. 1992. "The Polish Parliamentary Elections of October 1991." *Soviet Studies* 44 (5): 837-855.
- Myagkov, Mikhail, Peter Ordeshook and Alexander Sobyenin. 1997. "The Russian Electorate, 1991-1996." *Post Soviet Affairs* 13 (2): 134-66.
- Obrman, Jan. 1992a. "The Czechoslovak Elections: A Guide to the Parties." *RFE/RL Research Report* May 29, 1992: 10-16.
- Obrman, Jan. 1992b. "Czechoslovakia's New Governments." *RFE/RL Research Report* July 17, 1992: 1-8.
- Oltay, Edith. 1994a. "The Former Communists' Election Victory in Hungary." *RFE/RL Research Report* 3 (25): 1-6.
- Oltay, Edith. 1994b. "Hungarian Socialists Prepare for Comeback." *RFE/RL Research Report* 9 (4): 21-26.
- Orttung, Robert W. 1995. "Divided Democrats Face Uncertain Prospects." *Transitions* 1 (22): 32-34.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1991a. "The Civic Forum Becomes a Political Party." *Report on Eastern Europe* February 1, 1991: 1-4.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1991b. "The Realignment of Political Forces." *Report on Eastern Europe* May 24, 1991: 1-5.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1992a. "Czechoslovakia: Parties Register for Elections." *RFE/RL Research Report* May 1, 1992: 20-25.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1992b. "Czechoslovakia's Changing Political Spectrum." *RFE/RL Research Report* January 31, 1992: 1-7.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1992c. "Czech-Slovak Conflict Threatens State Unity." *RFE/RL Research Report* January 3, 1992: 83-87.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1992d. "The New Slovak Government and Parliament." *RFE/RL Research Report* 1 (28): 32-36.
- Pehe, Jiri. 1996. "Election Results in Surprise Stalemate." *Transitions* 2 (13): 36-37.
- Pittaway, Mark and Nigel Swain. 1994. "Hungary" In *Political Parties of Eastern Europe, Russia, and the Successor States*. Bogdan Szajkowski, Ed. Essex, United Kingdom, Longman Information and Reference: 185-245.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1993. "Economic Reforms, Public Opinion, and Political Institutions: Poland in the Easter European Perspective" In *Economic Reforms in New Democracies*. Luiz Carlos Bresser Pereira, Jose Maria Maravall and Adam Przeworski, Eds. Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Pres: 132-98.
- Racz, Barnabas. 1993. "The Socialist-left Opposition in Post-Communist Hungary." *Europe-Asia Studies* 45 (4): 647-70.

- Racz, Barnabas and Istvan Kukorelli. 1995. "The 'Second Generation' Post-communist Elections in Hungary in 1994." *Europe-Asia Studies* 47 (2): 251-279.
- Sabbat-Swidlicka, Anna. 1993. "Poland: A Year of Three Governments." *RFE/RL Research Report* 3 (1): 102-107.
- Sabbat-Swidlicka, Anna. 1994. "Poland: The End of the Solidarity Era?" *RFE/RL Research Report* 3 (1): 81-6.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. 1993. *Poland's Jump to the Market Economy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Sakwa, Richard. 1995. "The Russian Elections of December 1993." *Europe-Asia Studies* 47 (2): 195-227.
- Swain, Nigel. 1993. "Hungary" In *Developments in East European Politics*. Stephen White, Judy Batt and Paul G. Lewis, Eds. Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press: 66-82.
- Szajkowski, Bogdan, Ed. 1994. *Political Parties of Eastern Europe, Russia, and the Successor States*. Essex, United Kingdom, Longman Information and Reference.
- Szomolanyi, Sona. 1994. "Old Elites in the New Slovak State and their Current Transformations" In *The Slovak Path of Transition - To Democracy?* Sona Szomolanyi and Grigorij Meseznikov, Eds. Bratislava, Slovakia, Slovak Political Science Association: 63-82.
- Szomolanyi, Sona. 1997. "Identifying Slovakia's Emerging Regime" In *Slovakia: Problems of Democratic Consolidation and the Struggle for the Rules of the Game*. John Gould and Sona Szomolanyi, Eds. Bratislava, Slovakia, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung/Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- Szomolanyi, Sona. 1999. "Slovakia's Transition Path and the 1998 Elections" In *The 1998 Parliamentary Elections and Democratic Rebirth in Slovakia*. Martin Butorova, Grigorij Meseznikov, Zora Butorova et al, Eds. Bratislava, Slovakia, Institute for Public Affairs: 25-47.
- Tokes, Rudolf L. 1996. *Hungary's Negotiated Revolution: Economic Reform, Social Change and Political Succession*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tucker, Joshua A. and Ted Brader. 1998. "Congratulations! It's a Partisan: The Growth of Mass Partisanship in Russia from 1993-96." Paper Presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Vinton, Louisa. 1990. "Solidarity's Rival Offspring: Center Alliance and Democratic Action." *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Report on Eastern Europe* September 21, 1990: 15-25.
- White, Stephen, Richard Rose and Ian McAllister. 1997. *How Russia Votes*. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.
- Wightman, Gordon. 1993. "The Czech and Slovak Republics" In *Developments in East European Politics*. Stephen White, Judy Batt and Paul G. Lewis, Eds. Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press: 51-65.
- Wolchik, Sharon. 1994. "The Czech Republic: Havel and the Evolution of the Presidency since 1989" In *Postcommunist Presidents*. Ray Taras, Ed. Cambridge, England, Oxford University Press: 168-194.
- Zubek, Voytek. 1993. "The Fragmentation of Poland's Political Party System." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 26 (1): 47-71.