

# Contents

<b>Figures and tables .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1. The research question and its relevance .....	13
1.2. Aim of the study, case selection, data and method.....	15
1.3. Short outlook: research contribution and results .....	16
1.4. Structure of the study .....	17
<b>2. Current state of research and research context .....</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1. Theoretical approaches and empirical background .....	19
2.1.1. Government formation as a subject of coalition research .....	19
2.1.1.1. Established democracies .....	19
2.1.1.2. Central and Eastern Europe.....	23
2.1.2. The formation of minority governments.....	29
2.1.2.1. Established democracies .....	29
2.1.2.2. Central and Eastern Europe.....	32
2.2. Methodological approaches.....	34
2.2.1. Approaches in coalition research: an overview .....	34
2.2.2. A Qualitative Comparative Analysis: placement of the study at hand .....	36
2.2.2.1. Three steps of a QCA.....	36
2.2.2.2. Purposes of a QCA.....	37
2.3. Summary: identification of the research gap.....	38
<b>3. Cases and data.....</b>	<b>39</b>
3.1. Definitions.....	39
3.2. Case selection.....	40
3.3. Data base .....	43
3.3.1. Election data .....	43
3.3.2. Information on government formation processes .....	43
3.3.3. Measuring policy preferences.....	44
3.3.3.1. Two main approaches: manifesto analyses and expert surveys.....	44
3.3.3.2. Author's approach.....	49

<b>4. Factors influencing the formation of minority governments: discussion of their transferability to Central and Eastern Europe .....</b>	<b>51</b>
4.1. Institutional context.....	51
4.1.1. Government formation rules.....	51
4.1.2. Government termination rules .....	53
4.1.3. Functioning of the parliament.....	54
4.2. Electoral decisiveness.....	57
4.3. Consensual democracy .....	58
4.4. Party system factors .....	59
4.4.1. Numerical dimension.....	60
4.4.2. Ideological dimension.....	62
4.5. Result: focus on five party system factors.....	69
4.5.1. Strong divide.....	70
4.5.2. Two-party dominance .....	71
4.5.3. Lack of policy closeness .....	71
4.5.4. High percentage of 'non-coalitionable' parties.....	72
4.5.5. Party near to majority .....	73
<b>5. Case descriptions.....</b>	<b>75</b>
5.1. Bulgaria.....	76
5.1.1. Bulgarian Election 1991 .....	76
5.1.2. Bulgarian Election 2001 .....	79
5.1.3. Bulgarian Election 2005 .....	83
5.1.4. Bulgarian Election 2009 .....	88
5.2. Czech Republic .....	92
5.2.1. Czech Election 1996.....	92
5.2.2. Czech Election 1998 .....	96
5.2.3. Czech Election 2002 .....	101
5.2.4. Czech Election 2006 .....	105
5.2.5. Czech Election 2010 .....	109
5.3. Estonia.....	112
5.3.1. Estonian Election 1992 .....	112
5.3.2. Estonian Election 1995 .....	115
5.3.3. Estonian Election 1999 .....	118
5.3.4. Estonian Election 2003 .....	121
5.3.5. Estonian Election 2007 .....	126
5.4. Latvia.....	131
5.4.1. Latvian Election 1993 .....	131
5.4.2. Latvian Election 1995 .....	135
5.4.3. Latvian Election 1998.....	139

5.4.4. Latvian Election 2002.....	142
5.4.5. Latvian Election 2006.....	147
5.4.6. Latvian Election 2010.....	150
5.5. Lithuania.....	154
5.5.1. Lithuanian Election 2000.....	154
5.5.2. Lithuanian Election 2004.....	159
5.5.3. Lithuanian Election 2008.....	162
5.6. Poland.....	166
5.6.1. Polish Election 1991.....	166
5.6.2. Polish Election 1993.....	170
5.6.3. Polish Election 1997.....	174
5.6.4. Polish Election 2001.....	177
5.6.5. Polish Election 2005.....	183
5.6.6. Polish Election 2007.....	189
5.7. Romania.....	193
5.7.1. Romanian Election 1992.....	193
5.7.2. Romanian Election 1996.....	196
5.7.3. Romanian Election 2000.....	200
5.7.4. Romanian Election 2004.....	205
5.7.5. Romanian Election 2008.....	210
5.8. Slovakia.....	214
5.8.1. Slovak Election 1994.....	214
5.8.2. Slovak Election 1998.....	217
5.8.3. Slovak Election 2002.....	220
5.8.4. Slovak Election 2006.....	226
5.8.5. Slovak Election 2010.....	230
<b>6. The formation of minority governments in Central and Eastern Europe: a Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA).....</b>	<b>235</b>
6.1. The analytic moment.....	235
6.1.1. Threshold setting: presence and absence of conditions.....	235
6.1.2. Summary of the data: truth table.....	236
6.1.2.1. Errors: contradictory configurations.....	238
6.1.2.2. Missing empirical equivalence: logical remainders.....	240
6.1.3. Minimisation of the data: solution term.....	240
6.1.3.1. Three equifinal paths.....	242
6.1.3.2. Explanatory power of the solution term: consistency and coverage.....	243
6.1.3.3. Bifurcation of the party system as a 'necessary condition'.....	245

6.1.3.4. Country- or time-specific aspects.....	246
6.1.3.5. Different paths to formation, different degrees of stability? .....	247
6.2. Downstream: interpretation.....	247
6.2.1. A closer look at single conditions.....	248
6.2.1.1. Strong divide.....	248
6.2.1.2. Lacking policy closeness.....	249
6.2.2. A closer look at single cases.....	251
6.2.2.1. Czech Republic 1998: the ‘prime example’!?	251
6.2.2.2. Czech Republic 2002: Contradictory configuration Part 1 .....	253
6.2.2.3. Romania 2000: Contradictory configuration Part 2.....	254
6.2.2.4. Latvia 1998: a minority government behaving like a majority government .....	255
6.2.2.5. Latvia 1993: a case ‘falling between two stools’ .....	255
6.2.2.6. A common denominator: the influence of personal relationships .....	256
6.3. Summary .....	257
<b>7. Conclusion and outlook.....</b>	<b>259</b>
7.1. Conclusion: the formation of minority governments in Central and Eastern Europe .....	259
7.1.1. Party system features as explanatory factors .....	259
7.1.2. QCA as a compelling approach for the study of government formation .....	262
7.2. Outlook.....	264
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>271</b>