Table 1: Aggregate voters volatility in Poland 1991 - 97

		91/93		93/97	
TV	(general)		34.9		19.34
	(citizens)		22.7		15.24
FTV	(general)	18.52		12.49	
	(citizens)	16.01		12.16	
BV		**FBV**	**PBV**	**FBV**	**PBV**
		13.54	19.7	3.97	8.91
WBV		**FWBV**	**PWBV**	**FWBV**	**PWBV**
		0.93	9.59	6.72	12.87

The following acronyms stand for:
TV – total volatility
FTV - 'family' total volatility
BV - block volatility
WBV - within-block volatility
FBV - 'family' block volatility
FWBV - 'family' within-block volatility
PBV - party block volatility
PWBV - party within-block volatility

Notes: (1) The volatility indices are calculated following Pedersens (1979) formula – it is half the sum of the absolute value of differences between the vote shares of each party in two consecutive elections. The data are aggregate, net volatilities;
(2) In new democracies with fluctuating not only individual preferences but merges, dissolutions, splits of parties themselves, it is worth distinguishing between volatility that stems from both factors. In table 1, the overall volatility, labelled 'general' accounts for both sources of volatility; the one labelled 'citizens' excludes the second source of volatility, i.e. the one that is determined by party system offer changes (some parties merging, other going out of business etc. etc...)

Table 2: Strength of association between party preference and selected social background variables in Poland 1991 – 97 and other countries

Country	Residence	Education	Age	Church Attendance	*White collar*	Worker	Farmer
Poland 91	.07	.06	.02	.03	.04	.01	.04
Poland 93	.06	.06	.02	.03	.02	.02	.09
Poland 97	.04	.03	.01	.06	.01	.01	.04
Czech R.	.02	.02	.03	.06	.01	.01	.02
Slovakia	.02	.03	.03	.08	.01	.01	.01
Hungary	.02	.03 .	.07	.05	.01	.00	.01
USA	.02	02	.01	.01	.01	.01	.00
G. Britain	na	.02	.01	.02	.04	.04	na
Germany	.02	.05	.06	.05	.00	.01	.01
Italy	.02	.03	.02	.05	.00	.01	na

Explanation: (1) table's entries are 'uncertainty coefficients'
(2 the 'na' data are due either to too small N or to recoding problems which unable comparison
(3) data for Poland 91 and other East Central European countries come from comparative project entitled *Political Consequences of Dismantling Social Safety Net in East Central Europe* initiated and financed by Institute for East – West Security Studies (New York--Praha)
Data for Poland 93 and other East Central European countries are from longitudinal comparative project *The Development of Party Formation and Electoral Alignments in East Central Europe*, initiated and financed by Central European University
(4) the remaining data are from ISSP series on the *The Role of Government,*
Distributor: Zentralarchive, Kõln

Table 8: Percentage magnitude of selected statements' approval

	SATDEM	SATGOV	A	J	B	L	K
92	19	72	70	92	91	90	18
93	22	58	74	91	93	91	15
94	24	40	73	92	91	91	19
95	35	57	82	90	85	81	26
97	54		73	83	80	77	32

SATDEM - EUROBAROMETER question on 'satisfaction with democracy'
SATGOV - satisfaction with incumbents
A - "In election in Poland voters have a real choice"
B - "Generally speaking, those we elect to Parliament lose touch with the people pretty quickly"
J - "People like me have no say in what government does"
K - "The way things are in Poland people like me and my family have a good chance of getting ahead in life"
L - "Parties are only interested in people's votes, but not their opinions"

Table 9a: Correlation between satisfaction with the functioning of democracy and selected variables

	POLEFF	WINLOS	PARTWINL	VOTER
SATDEM 93	.19	.38	-.13	-.04
	p=[.00]	[.00]	[.00]	[.17]
SATDEM 97	.23	.33	.04	-.12
	[.00]	[.00]	[.07]	[.00]

Table 9b: Determinants of satisfaction with democracy (results of regression analysis)

Year	Explained Variance of:	
	Model 1	**Model 2**
	16 %	**4 %**
1993	PARTWIN corr. (.13) beta (.09) WINLOS corr. (.39) beta (.38)	POLEFF corr. (.20) beta (.20) VOTER corr. (.04) beta (.04)
	11%	**6%**
1997	PARTWIN corr. (.04) beta (.03) WINLOS corr. (.33) beta (.33)	POLEFF corr. (.23) beta (.21) VOTER corr. (.12) beta (.08)

POLEFF - political efficacy index
VOLATPRT - voter's volatility in the last elections
WINLOS - index of winners / losers of the transformation
PARTWIN - respondents party preference: for winning or losing parties
VOTER - participation in the last election

Table 10: Polish party system: polarization, “stretch” , dimensions and salience

Years	Polarization index	Universe/ /idegl. stretch	Competitive stretch	Ideological salience	Competitive Salience
92	RS. 30 EC. 31 LR. 36	1.62 .66	2.23 1.65	17.4 11.4	34.9 24.3
93	RS. 38 EC. 38 LR. 51	1.27 1.43	1.71 2.07	12.2 25.4	35.9 23.8
95	RS. 44 EC. 52 LR. 69	1.70 .80	2.31 1.93	16.8 11.1	50.6 18.5
97	RS. 62 EC.41 LR .91	1.54 1.17	1.57 2.23	17.7 8.4	54.3 24.8

Table 11: Direct effects on / and explained variances of "left – right" placement by religious vs secular and economic protectionism vs market liberal dimensions

Years: →	**92**	**93**	**95**	**97**
R^2	**.08**	**.15**	**.25**	**.03**
RS %	17.4	12.2	16.8	17.7
$RS_{beta\ (corr.)}$	.23 (.23)	.33 (.33)	.48 (.48)	.13 (.13)
EC %	11.4	25.4	11.1	8.4
$EC_{beta\ (corr.)}$	-.07 (-.08)	-.19 (-.19)	-.12 (-.14)	-.12 (-.12)

Entries are:
in row **R^2** - explained variance of the regression model
in row **%** - explained variance of a given dimension, a result of factor analysis
in row **'beta'** - the magnitude of net, direct effect of the dimension on "left – right" self-placement

Table 12. Mean voters-elite distances / proximities in two points in time on three ideological dimensions (four relevant parties).

	DIMENSION **RS**		DIMENSION **EC**		DIMENSION **CN**		**LR** - identification
	93/94	**97/98**	**93/94**	**97/98**	**93/94**	**97/98**	**97/98**
SLD	0.60	0.24	0.20	0.54	0.46	0.04	0.18
PSL	0.12	0.02	0.70	0.37	0.37	0.70	0.01
UW	0.48	0.21	0.36	0.59	0.52	0.14	0.00
AWS	0.15	0.20	0.76	0.21	0.24	0.24	0.24
mean:	***0.34***	***0.17***	***0.51***	***0.43***	***0.40***	***0.28***	***0.11***