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Abstract

The paper deals with the ideological position of a newly formed business-firm party called ANO in the contemporary political environment of the Czech Republic. Although the advent of the party was truly rapid and ANO is a fairly unique formation, it is possible to employ some conventional analytical tools to reveal the party’s ideological position. Firstly, I show that ANO is a vote-seeking party and it is therefore possible to analyse it in accordance with a Downsian spatial modelling. Next, I describe a roll call analysis method that is able to objectively identify the party’s ideological position based on legislators’ parliamentary votes. After I form several hypotheses, a data set consisting of 8,559 roll calls of 215 members of the Chamber of Deputies is depicted. Finally, the results show that ANO is located in the ideological centre, closer to social democrats rather than to right-wing parties. Besides this, ANO covers a smaller ideological space compared to traditional political parties. Finally, the results do not anticipate a potential split of ANO in the near future since the party’s legislators have acted cohesively in the parliament so far.
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1. Introduction

In 2011, Andrej Babiš, the owner of agriculture, food, and chemicals group Agrofert and one of the wealthiest businessmen in the Czech Republic, decided to establish a political movement (Foy 2016). The main proclaimed goal was to stand against corruption and existing political parties hindering the Czech political and economic system from prosperity. Thus, the political party was called Action of Dissatisfied Citizens – Akce nespokojených občanů or ANO in Czech (‘ano’ means ‘yes’ in English).
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Although the early stage of the party was rather gradual, the earthquake in Czech politics, which had begun in 2010 and escalated during the summer of 2013, opened the gate for the party’s success. The local electorate was shattered by the corruption affair surrounding Prime Minister Petr Nečas and ANO surprisingly received the second largest amount of votes in the 2013 preliminary parliamentary election (Havlík 2014). Furthermore, ANO formed a coalition cabinet with social democrats, the election’s winner, and Christian democrats, which was even more unexpected to some extent. Thanks to this, ANO has become one of the most important players in the contemporary Czech political arena.

Nonetheless, thanks to the party’s rapid advent, Czech political science has not sufficiently unveiled ANO’s ‘mystery’ yet. Is the party rather left-wing or right-wing? Is ANO ideologically concentrated or rather widely open? Is the party going to split? The answers to these questions are even more complicated since ANO cannot be considered as a classical political player but rather as a business-firm party (Hopkin, Paolucci 1999; Kopeček, Svačinová 2015; Arter 2016). However, it is still possible to employ conventional methods to discover ANO’s ideological position since ANO should be treated as a vote-seeking party (Strom 1990). Thus, the party has to follow an existing ideological dispersion of voters, which makes ANO more readable (Downs 1957; Stokes 1963; Adams, Somer-Topcu 2009).

Even though the issue could be addressed by several different methods, such as expert surveys or manifesto analyses, I employ a spatial analysis of roll call voting in the Czech lower parliamentary chamber (see, e.g., Laver et al. 2003; Laver 2014; Bakker et al. 2015; Barberá 2015; Schmitt et al. 2015; Volkens et al. 2015). Since the method is based on actual votes of MPs in parliament, it is possible to infer conclusions on the ideological positions of legislators and whole political parties as such. Therefore, I am able to properly answer the following research question: ‘What are the characteristics of ANO’s spatial ideological position in the VII Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic?’

Basically, there are several different methods to discover the coordinates of MPs’ spatial position according to their voting. Particularly, three of these methods are the most influential – Poole and Rosenthal’s NOMINATE (1985; 1991; 2001), Poole’s Optimal Classification (2000), and the Bayesian modelling that is represented here by IDEAL (Jackman 2001; Clinton et al. 2004; Clinton, Jackman 2009). Although all of these procedures have both advantages and disadvantages, I employ IDEAL as the main analytical tool.

To be more specific, I scrutinize every recorded vote since the first chamber’s plenary session, from 25th November 2013 to 14th July 2017. This period covers almost the entire four-year term of the chamber. Overall, there are 8,559 votes to be inspected, which is by far enough to responsibly reveal the spatial positions of all 215 legislators who have held the deputy mandate during the given time. It is important to say that the Czech parliament is quite exceptional in the number of recorded votes compared to other legislatures (Hix, Noury 2016). Thanks to the overwhelming amount of accessible data, it is possible to be truly precise about the estimations. However, the sole condition of enough data is not sufficient and robustness analyses therefore have to be conducted.

As a result, I show that the spatial political positions of legislators in the VII Chamber of Deputies are explainable by a two-dimensional model. One dimension reveals the institutional division in the legislative body (opposition-coalition) and the other unveils the ideological variance (left-right). Thus, the projection of ANO and other parties on this
ideological dimension proves that ANO is located in the ideological centre closer to social democrats compared to right-wing parties. Besides this, ANO covers a smaller ideological space compared to other more traditional political formations. Finally, the results do not anticipate a potential split of ANO in the near future since the party’s legislators have acted cohesively in the parliament thus far.

The paper is structured into several parts. Firstly, the situation before the 2013 parliamentary election and ANO’s features are depicted. This is followed by theories on spatial modelling in political science, which are relevant to the topic. Secondly, several different (and even contradictory) hypotheses are formed in order to build up a frame of analysis. Besides this, the data and employed methods are properly described. Thirdly, the results of the roll call analysis are presented in a form of conclusive plots, tables and other figures accompanied by descriptive comments. The hypotheses are assessed and the findings are critically evaluated in a robustness analysis. Finally, the results are discussed in a conclusion and several proposals for further research are sketched out.

2. ANO in the Politics of the Czech Republic


In order to fully understand the political situation during ANO’s success in 2013, it is necessary to look further into the past. To be more specific, the parliamentary election in 2010 was already labelled as a ‘political earthquake’ (Jarmara 2011; Bureš 2012; Kopeček, Švačinová 2015). To a great extent, it was the new political parties who promised to rid Czech politics of corruption that made this election so revolutionary (Hanley 2011). Besides this, the threat of the European financial crisis and a criticism of the increasing public debt were perceived as important electoral issues as well.

The party system in the Czech Republic was considered consolidated before 2010 (Havlík 2010; Charvát 2015). Nonetheless, traditional parliamentary parties, Civic Democratic Party (ODS), Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD), and Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSČM), gained only 67.50% of the mandates in the newly elected chamber in the 2010 election, as you can see in Table 1. Furthermore, the historically relevant subject of Christian and Democratic Union – Czechoslovak People’s Party (KDU-ČSL) even failed to enter the parliament for the very first time since the first free election in 1990. The rest of the mandates were occupied by two parties without any previous parliamentary experience – TOP 09 and Public Affairs (VV). As a result, the newly formed right-wing coalition cabinet consisted of ODS, TOP 09, and VV.

It is indubitable that the 2010 parliamentary election was held under unique political and economic circumstances, although this emergence of new parties could be considered a longer trend occurring all over Europe (see Harmel, Svåsand 1993; Hug 2001; Hanley 2011). However, this process was quite specific in post-communist countries where it was connected with an increasing personalization of politics (Innes 2002; Meyer-Sahling 2008; Koubek 2010; Bíba 2013; Pecháček 2013; Naxera 2014).
That was also the case of TOP 09 and VV. The success of the former party was closely related to the charm and skills of its founders Karel Schwarzenberg and Miroslav Kalousek. The latter formation was a classic example of a business-firm party led more or less visibly by its designer Vít Bárta (Hloušek 2012; Havlík, Hloušek 2014). Nevertheless, since the Czech political and partisan ideological system is rather unidimensional in the long term, new parties have to sooner or later line up on the basis of this setting (Enyedi 2005; Hloušek, Kopeček 2008; Deegan-Krause, Enyedi 2010; Vodička, Cabada 2011). On one hand, TOP 09 was an economically conservative and socially conservative-liberal party from its early beginning. Thus, the party has managed to become more or less a stable component of the Czech political environment. On the other hand, VV remained focused only on marketing slogans. Therefore, a lack of any ideological cohesion led to a split of the party in 2012, which then caused several troubles for the ruling cabinet (Hloušek 2012).

Nevertheless, if the parliamentary election in 2010 is an ‘earthquake’, the 2013 election will be then marked as an ‘Earthquake’ with the capital ‘E’, and the context was most important. Voters had long been frustrated by several domestic political corruption affairs, which culminated in the corruption case of the Prime Minister Petr Nečas’s (ODS) closest adviser (Kupka, Mochtáč 2014). Moreover, the crisis was escalated by the resignation of the cabinet, followed by the preliminary election in October, 2013 (Ondráčková, Vymětal 2015). Thus, it was inevitable for the coalition parties to see a decline. Then when ODS recorded the worst electoral result in history, TOP 09 took over the leadership of the right-hand side of the ideological spectrum and VV did not even run in the election (Havlík 2014).

On the other hand, there were several factors that turned ANO into the dark horse of the 2013 parliamentary election. Firstly, the party’s campaign was undoubtedly the most professional of the competitors, as it conducted well-employed targeting and regular polls, and it produced a modern design with catchy slogans (Gregor, Macková 2014). Secondly, ANO’s electoral program was smartly built around anti-corruption rhetoric and attacks against (all)
previous governments. This resonated with the voters’ frames of mind at that time (Štětka, Vochocová 2014). Moreover, the party’s manifesto was overloaded with the highest share of valence-issues compared to the other parties, and this made ANO electable for basically anyone (Eibl 2014). Finally, the image of Andrej Babiš as a successful businessman who was going to ‘manage the state as a firm’ was undoubtedly a marketing blockbuster. Furthermore, his group of companies controversially purchased the MAFRA media group (publishing two important dailies, MF DNES and Lidové noviny) four months before the 2013 election. Undoubtedly, this potentially worked in favour of Babiš’s political interests (Gawrecká 2013).

As a result of the 2013 election, ANO was supported by almost one million voters and reached the second highest number of mandates in the elected VII Chamber of Deputies. Additionally, one other new populist political group Tomio Okamura’s Dawn of Direct Democracy (ÚSVIT) joined the chamber too.3 Besides this, KDU-ČSL managed to re-enter the parliament after three years. Nonetheless, what was probably even more surprising was the fact that shortly after the election ANO formed a new centre-left coalition cabinet with KDU-ČSL and ČSSD, whose leader, Bohuslav Sobotka, is currently the ruling Prime Minister.

The thing is that more than 40% of people who voted for ANO in the 2013 election had actually voted for either ODS or TOP 09 in 2010 (Gregor 2014).4 Although these voters should be therefore considered right-wing supporters, ANO built the coalition cabinet with the social democrats. Since then, however, ANO has become even stronger and it leads the public opinion polls with a 20% margin ahead of ČSSD (CVVM 2017; TNS Aisa 2017). Almost nobody denies that ANO will come out victorious in the autumn 2017 election.

2.2. Vote-Seeking Business-Firm Party ANO

Political parties have undergone a long journey of evolution consisting of different partisan types. Maurice Duverger (1954) differentiated between elite-based and mass-based parties. The former parties were similar to rather small political groups based on personal contacts, whereas the latter parties depended on mass support. Later, Otto Kirchheimer (1966) defined catch-all parties as formations with a decreasing importance of membership and an ideological project, which allows a party to seek broad popular support. The next stage was depicted by Richard Katz and Peter Mair (1995). These are cartel parties which are significantly more dependent on state structures.

Nevertheless, this development does not show signs of stopping and scholars continue to describe other types of newly emerging parties. Basically, the circumstances of a party’s formation are still the most important factors (Duverger 1954; Mair 1999; Hug 2001; Sartori 2005). However, the political environment has become so unpredictable that it is truly hard to determine what category a particular party falls under (Arter 2016). Nonetheless, Bolleyer and Bytzek (2013) have drawn a line between two types of new parties – (1) rooted newcomers, supported by a societal group, and (2) entrepreneurial parties. The second type seems to be especially relevant in the case of ANO.

To be more specific, the category of the entrepreneurial party was first properly outlined by Hopkin and Paolucci (1999). They used the term ‘business firm model of party
organisation.’ This particular type was later further defined by André Krouwel (2006; 2012). The business-firm party is not dependent on state resources but it is instead financed by commercial entities. Ordinary members have only little or even no influence over the party’s actions, which are driven by a small group of people in the party’s leadership and by external experts. A businessman is the central point of the party and marketing is based on a message shadowing a policy that is at best of secondary importance (Arter 2016). Finally, business-firm parties try to maximize their electoral support in order to provide their members with opportunities for political offices (see ‘by-product’ theory by Olson 1965). Hopkin and Paolucci mention Silvio Berlusconi’s Forza Italia as an example of a business-firm party. This is highly interesting in the context of ANO since Andrej Babiš is quite often referred as ‘Babisconi’ thanks to his political activities and simultaneous media ownership (Foy 2016).

Nonetheless, the concept of a business-firm party is close to other related types. In the 1980s, Angelo Panebianco (1988) had already described the form of an electoral-professional party that is similar to catch-all parties but which contains the additional element of the professionalization of the party’s organization. This leads to an increasing dependence of the party on marketing consultants and opinion pollsters. Based on this, these political groups are formed as anti-establishment parties, since these are the feelings that resonate with the public (Abedi, Lundberg 2009). Finally, the feature of the specific individual leadership is close to the concepts of charismatic (Pedahzur, Brichta 2002) and personal vehicle parties (Lucardie 2000) too.

Kopeček and Svačinová (2015) claim that ANO is a business-firm party and this is considered to be a basic fact throughout this paper. There are several factors that prove this assumption. To begin with, the party is highly centralized around its absolute leader and patron, Andrej Babiš, and a small group of his loyal colleagues. Especially in the beginning, the party was mostly financed by Andrej Babiš himself (Stauber 2015). Even Andrej Babiš claims: ‘The party is connected to my person. The party is me.’ (Foy 2016) For instance, in March 2015 during the party convention, Andrej Babiš was unprecedentedly confirmed as the leader of the party by all (!) valid votes (Kopeček, Svačinová 2015).

Moreover, the potential acceptance of new members is highly selective and the party is endowed with several powerful tools for controlling the party’s members, and ANO members can also be easily expelled. Thus, the number of party members is not more than several thousand people (the exact number has not been officially made public) (Stauber 2015). Finally, an essential role in ANO is held by political and marketing experts (Polášek et al. 2014; Perottino 2015).

To continue, what is even more important for the presented paper is to classify ANO in terms of the rational choice tradition, whether it is a vote-seeking, party-seeking, or office seeking party (Strom 1990). I completely agree with Kaare Strom that these types are closely related in the broad concept of competitive party behavior. Nevertheless, ANO could be treated as a vote-seeking party in the case of specific organizational and institutional conditions. Kaare Strom argues that ‘parties with unaccountable leaders, low degrees of intraparty democracy, and permeable recruitment channels’ are more likely to bring some necessary sacrifices in multiparty systems in order to seek votes in the first place (Strøm 1990: 592). This classification has further implications which makes it possible to employ the Downsian model of political space that is elaborated below (Downs 1957; Stokes 1963).
To summarize, ANO is an important and truly influential element of the contemporary Czech political and partisan system. Although one example of a business-firm party in the Czech political environment (VV) turned into a disaster, ANO has thus far seemed to represent a different case. This is in complete agreement with Arter (2016), who asserts that the charisma of a leadership and a party as such is not alone sufficient, as was the case of VV. However, a combination of a charismatic and an organisational (!) leadership can create something like a ‘resilient entrepreneurial party’. Undoubtedly, ANO has managed to reach this position and it has therefore turned from something temporary to something rather persistent.

3. Spatial Modelling of Party Positions

3.1. Theories on Parties in Policy Space

A spatial approach to partisan competition is ‘a universal phenomenon of modern politics’ (Stokes 1963: 368). Therefore, what initially seemed to be a rather simplistic description of a political reality has later become one of the most valuable analytical tools in political science. The field of spatial modelling of politics was introduced by Anthony Downs in his famous book *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, published in 1957. As Downs claims, he borrowed ‘an apparatus invented by Harold Hotelling’ (Hotelling 1929; Downs 1957: 115).

Hotelling’s theoretical model is based on two grocery stores in a street which converge at the same location, under an assumption that people are evenly spaced along a straight-line scale. Later, Arthur Smithies (1941) improved the model by saying that actors cannot move too far to the centre so that they can keep their extreme supporters as well. Otherwise, these people could, for instance, abstain from the next election in political terms.

Nonetheless, Downs still implies that if parties compete for the same or similar voters in a particular section of an ideological space, they should tend to find a balance of mutual convergence. Downsiian competition is based on a vote-maximizing model of party behaviour, which means that parties tend to be located near a concentration of masses. However, it is necessary to admit that Down’s models are more easily applied to a two-party system and that his assumption of unidimensional political space is at least questionable (Stokes 1963). Besides this, other critiques pointed out that there have been several instances in which the theoretical model has not corresponded with real practice (Riker 1962; Robertson 1976).

Nevertheless, although it is not possible to take Down’s findings as a universal law, his notions of spatial party competition have persisted. For example, in 1966, Otto Kirchheimer referred to Down’s model stressing that catch-all parties adopt policy positions in the centre of political spectrum where most of the voters in centripetal and moderate political systems are located (Krouwel 2003). Furthermore, these parties want to encompass as large a space as possible to attract more voters.

However, one has to keep in mind that partisan competition in a heterogeneous electorate works differently. To explain this, parties do not move then towards the centre of a
policy space but they rather seek support on its extreme ends (Bischoff 2005). Additionally, it is necessary to realize that parties do not react only to the policy positions of voters, but to the location of their competitors as well (Lee 2014). To be more specific, parties tend to shift their policy positions in the same direction that their opponents shifted their policies at the previous election (Adams, Somer-Topcu 2009). Moreover, these mechanisms are mostly observable within ideological families. Thus, left-wing parties respond to their leftist competitors and an equal reaction applies to right-wing parties.

3.2. Spatial Modelling Using a Roll Call Analysis

Overall, there are five basic methods which can possibly reveal parties’ spatial positions – expert surveys, surveys of legislators, surveys of voters, text analyses, and roll call analyses. The Chapel Hill expert survey, for instance, (Bakker et al. 2015) represents the first type of method, but it is still rather subjective, which I consider to be a major drawback. The very same problem is found in both legislator and voter surveys (see, e.g., Weßels 2011) as well (see, e.g., Schmitt et al. 2015). Text analyses, such as manifesto analyses, on the other hand, are based on more objective methods. Nevertheless, people conduct the coding process in many cases and it is always a question whether an analysis of a party’s manifesto truly exposes the party’s ideology (see, e.g., Laver et al. 2003; Volkens et al. 2015).

Although I appreciate particular aspects of the previously described methods, in the presented paper I employ a roll call analysis as the most precise analytical tool in general. However, not even a roll call analysis is a perfect procedure of estimation, which is a point that must be always raised (see Vandoren 1990; Clinton, Meirowitz 2001; Carrubba et al. 2008; Lauderdale 2010; Aldrich et al. 2014).

The idea behind any roll call analysis is always the same. Basically, legislators compare a status quo to a proposal that is the subject of voting. Besides this, each MP has its own utility function, which could be assumed as, for example, quadratic, normally distributed etc., and which is modelled as symmetric and single-peaked. Thus, each legislator in every single vote compares the proposal with the status quo based on his or her utility function which influences whether he or she votes either in favour of the proposal (Yea) or against (Nay). Therefore, since legislators demonstrate their opinion on tens, hundreds, and even thousands of votes, it is possible to derive their spatial position based on an objective measurement of their actual voting.

Nonetheless, the basic methods of a roll call analysis are different in terms of how they estimate a legislator’s ideal points in space, although they produce substantively similar estimates (Carroll et al. 2009). To begin with, Poole and Rosenthal’s NOMINATE (1985; 1991; 2001) is an example of a multidimensional scaling method. The procedure assumes normally distributed utility functions of legislators and it basically shows a degree of agreement between particular MPs. Thus, legislators who vote similarly are located closer in the policy space. Overall, NOMINATE accurately recovers legislator configurations and roll call midpoints, which assign probabilities to each vote choice as a function of legislators’ ideal point and locations of alternatives associated with each roll call (Carroll et al. 2009). Over time, several types of NOMINATE have been developed, such as dynamic DNOMINATE (Poole,
Rosenthal 1991, 2001) or weighted WNOMINATE (Poole et al. 2011), which is probably the most used version nowadays.

What is truly interesting is the fact that NOMINATE derives a lot of information from errors that occur in voting. However, this assumption could be violated, especially in parliamentary systems with cohesive and disciplined parties (Rosenthal, Voeten 2004). Thus, Keith Poole proposed a nonparametric unfolding procedure called Optimal Classification (OC) (2000, 2005). OC is based on rank ordering of legislators’ spatial positions. This has several crucial implications since it is not possible to make any inferences on distances among legislators. Furthermore, OC maximizes the number of correct classifications of legislators’ choices, which is different from NOMINATE which maximizes the likelihood of legislator’s choices. Even though OC has its indisputable advantages, especially in parliamentary systems (Rosenthal, Voeten 2004; Hansen 2008), it is also true that the method cannot fully cope with a strict government-opposition setting because it is then hard to define an ideological continuum. Thanks to this, an assessment of OC seems to be quite contradictory but its potential application depends on the environment of a particular legislature and electoral term. Furthermore, possible use is closely related to a concrete research question and hypotheses.

Finally, the third method for revealing legislators’ spatial positions is based on the Bayesian approach to statistics (Hoff 2009). This procedure does not employ classical statistical inference based on an idea of repeated random samples but it rather asks ‘given data y, what should I now believe about the unknown quality θ’ (Clinton, Jackman 2009). In fact, this analytical format is more reasonable for social sciences and especially for roll call analysis since it is possible that a study will work with all (and not just a sample of) roll calls. Here, this group of Bayesian methods is represented by the IDEAL tool, which uses Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) to assign legislator and bill parameters from roll call voting data. IDEAL employs a quadratic utility function and the procedure is especially precise for legislators located in the middle of a continuum (Carroll et al. 2009). Overall, several scholars suggest using IDEAL compared to other previously mentioned methods because this Bayesian approach is more flexible in general (Clinton, Jackman 2009; Lyons, Lacina 2009).

In recent decades and years, studies applying roll call analyses have delivered several interesting findings. Undoubtedly, most of the studies are focused on the environment of US Congress. Therefore, we already know that this legislature is mostly driven by a single liberal-conservative dimension (Poole, Rosenthal 1991). Besides this, a polarization of the partisan system goes hand in hand with this particular feature (Aldrich et al. 2014). Additionally, the studies test the strength of the parties’ influence on how legislators vote (Ansolabehere et al. 2001; McCarty et al. 2001; Snyder, Groseclose 2001).

Nevertheless, there are several other papers interested in other parliaments as well. Therefore, we know that the European parliament is mostly explainable with a two-dimensional model (Hix et al. 2006). Moreover, the positions of European parliamentary groups on particular issues had already been unveiled (Hix, Høyland 2013). Concerning national parliaments, the institutional setting of particular political system seems to be one of the main drivers of the spatial positioning of legislators (Hix, Noury 2016). Finally, in the context of the presented paper, I have to mention a study by Lyons and Lacina (2009) analysing the Czech parliament. They argue that a roll call analysis in the European legislatures must
be accompanied by other empirical evidence, such as survey data, in order to properly inter-pret policy space in these bodies.

4. Research Design

4.1. Hypotheses

I form several hypotheses in order to construct an appropriate frame for the following analysis. Since the research question of the presented paper deals with general characteristics of the spatial ideological position of ANO, the hypotheses follow this conceptualization. I therefore construct four hypotheses on the issues of the party’s ideological location (hypotheses 1–2), a quantity of covered ideological space (hypothesis 3), and a potential split of the party (hypothesis 4).

To begin with, if someone wants to determine a party’s position in an ideological space, it is reasonable to follow its electorate. To explain this, each vote-seeking party, such as ANO, tends to be located near the maximum number of its (potential) voters where the maximum electoral gains are most likely (Downs 1957; Stokes 1963; Strøm 1990). In the 2013 parliamentary election, ANO’s electoral support consisted of those voters who voted in the 2010 election for ODS (23%) and TOP 09 (19%) (Gregor 2014). Furthermore, more than 50% of ANO’s current supporters place themselves on the right-centre or right-hand side of the ideological space (CVVM 2016). Therefore, the first hypothesis expects that ANO is ideologically located close to the right-wing parties in order to satisfy ANO’s right-wing supporters with the party’s potential to take over the rest of these voters:

Hypothesis 1a: Since ANO was in the 2013 election largely supported by the former voters of the right-wing parties ODS and TOP 09, ANO is located closer to these two parties compared to the other relevant parties in order to satisfy its right-wing voters.

Nevertheless, this is not the end of the story. Although ANO was mainly supported by right-wing voters, it formed a coalition cabinet with the left-wing ČSSD shortly after the election. Thus, there has to be at least some intersection of the two parties’ programs and ideological positions. Moreover, ANO nowadays defends its leadership in public opinion polls mainly against ČSSD, which suggests their competition for voters who are ideologically located between them (CVVM 2017; TNS Aisa 2017). Therefore, the second (contradictory) part of the first hypothesis is stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1b: Since ANO formed a coalition cabinet with the left-wing ČSSD and these two parties nowadays are the main competitors in public opinion polls, ANO is located closer to ČSSD compared to other relevant parties.

Besides this, ANO is an example of a vote-seeking party without strict ideological bonds (Strøm 1990; Kopeček, Svačinová 2015). Therefore, the party places itself in a location with
the highest number of potential voters where it is possible to maximize electoral gains (Downs 1957). The partisan ideological competition in the Czech Republic is unidimensional (based on distribution conflicts), single-peaked, and centripetal (Deegan-Krause 2006; Hloušek, Kopeček 2008; Hanley 2011; Vodička, Cabada 2011). Thus, ANO should be located in the centre of the Czech ideological space to attract most of the electorate:

**Hypothesis 2:** Since ANO is a vote-seeking party and the partisan competition in the Czech Republic is unidimensional and centripetal, ANO is located in the centre of the ideological space.

Next, an advantageous spatial ideological position is based not only on the location but also on the quantity of the covered space. The larger an ideological space occupied by a party is, the higher the chances are of attracting new voters who can choose from the supply more easily. Although this particular strategy has its limits and it does not work ultimately, it appropriately reacts to the notes made by Smithies (1941). Moreover, this particular feature should be compared with ČSSD, one of the vote-seeking parties that have dominated the Czech political environment in previous years, and the party which has a similar number of MPs today. Then, since ANO wants to be stretched in order not to abandon anyone, the third hypothesis is formed as follows:

**Hypothesis 3a:** ANO is a vote-seeking party without strict ideological bonds and it therefore covers larger ideological space compared to ČSSD, the traditional party which has dominated the Czech partisan competition in previous years.

On the other hand, ANO is autocratically led by its unquestioned leader Andrej Babiš (Kopeček, Svačinová 2015; Perottino 2015; Foy 2016). Therefore, it is natural for ANO's legislators to be ideologically located close to the party’s leadership in order to ensure their real impact and potential future political prospects. Thus, I again construct the second (contradictory) part of this hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 3b:** ANO is a business-firm party autocratically led by its founder Andrej Babiš and it is therefore more concentrated compared to ČSSD.

Finally, scholars anticipate that business-firm parties and anti-political establishment parties, such as ANO, are more politically incoherent (Hopkin, Paolucci 1999; Abedi, Lundberg 2009). To explain this, it is usual that some members want to emphasize office-seeking goals while others want the party to remain true to its anti-political establishment status. Furthermore, an autocratic style of leadership can be suddenly refused by some of the party’s members, which can lead to a potential party split. Therefore, I form the last hypothesis as follows:

**Hypothesis 4:** Since ANO is a business-firm and anti-political establishment party, the party is ideologically incoherent (a density plot of the spatial positions of ANO's legislators should not be single-peaked).
Although it seems doubtful that several hypotheses are contradictory, the frame of the analysis is constructed properly. The problem is not in existing theories and assumptions about the political reality as such. Instead, the ambiguity is based on ANO’s vague ideological background and its specific type of organization. Furthermore, the presented study on ANO’s ideological spatial position is a pioneer in the topic and it is therefore necessary to scrutinize all reasonable outcomes. Although some hypotheses overlap slightly, the vision of creating a complex picture of ANO is the first priority of this paper.

4.2. Data and Method

I utilize a roll call analysis of legislators’ parliamentary voting during the VII Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic. During the term, 215 legislators have held the mandate of deputy and the analysis is conducted for all of them with some further restrictions mentioned below. Since 25 November 2013, until 14 July 2017, 8,559 roll calls were recorded and the data were obtained from the official electronic database of the legislative body (Parlament České republiky 2017). This period covers almost the entire four-year term of the chamber.

It is important to say that parliamentary voting in the Czech Republic is exceptionally public compared to other legislatures and the data are easily accessible (Lyons, Lacina 2009; Hix, Noury 2016). The possibility of a secret vote is used just in a few specific cases of the election to the chamber’s presidency and some positions outside the legislative body (Syllová et al. 2008). Therefore, any roll call analysis of the Czech parliament is not influenced by selection bias, which occurs only when some particular votes are recorded (Carrubba et al. 2008; Clinton 2012). Nonetheless, it is necessary to realize that no analysis of votes alone can describe a political reality and its spatial picture in a truly complex way. Although it is possible to scrutinize almost all parliamentary votes, the results reflect only voting behaviour – nothing more and nothing less.

The electronic system of the Chamber of Deputies differentiates several outcomes of legislators’ voting behaviour. To be more specific, it is recorded for each vote whether a legislator voted yes, no, or abstained from voting. Besides this, a deputy could possibly miss a vote because of either an excused or an unexcused absence. For the purpose of the roll call dataset, I code ‘Yea’ as each vote for which a deputy supported the proposal by voting yes. On the other hand, ‘Nay’ is represented by voting no and by an abstention from voting. To explain this, an abstention from voting while the deputy is present in the plenary session means that he or she increases a margin of the simple majority that needs to be met to pass the proposal. Thus, an abstention is an example of a ‘soft no’ and it is therefore considered as a negative vote (Wintr 2010). Finally, an absence is coded as missing data (see Lyons, Lacina 2009).

To continue, I select IDEAL as the most suitable tool to evaluate the hypotheses stated above. Firstly, it is not reasonable to employ OC since the procedure is based on order rankings. The presented analysis deals with ANO’s concrete spatial position compared to other parties in a matter of ideological distance, which is something that OC cannot truly reveal. Secondly, I prefer IDEAL instead of WNOMINATE mainly because the former procedure
estimates with greater and more realistic variation, while the latter tool places quite serious constraints on the positions of extreme legislators (Lyons, Lacina 2009). Furthermore, this decision is in agreement with other scholars who prefer IDEAL and the Bayesian approach as the most flexible tool in general (Clinton, Jackman 2009; Lyons, Lacina 2009). Nonetheless, even though the analysis is conducted and the results are presented in IDEAL estimation, I employ WNOMINATE to analyse the robustness of the results (see the appendix).

Finally, it is necessary to make some restrictions on the dataset of MPs and their roll calls. Firstly, legislators who joined fewer than 25 votes are not taken into account. Thus, the dataset is limited from 215 to 213 deputies. Secondly, roll calls with a minority consisting of only five or fewer legislators are dropped since these votes are not considered as informative. Thanks to this, 7,355 votes out of 8,559 are employed in the final analysis. This applies for both IDEAL and WNOMINATE. Nevertheless, this amount of data is still by far enough to properly estimate the legislators’ spatial positions.

5. Results

I employ a two-dimensional model to estimate the MPs’ spatial positions based on their roll calls. Firstly, two-dimensional spatial models of politics usually proved to be the most appropriate for parliamentary multiparty systems (Hix, Noury 2016). Secondly, using more than just two dimensions is hardly interpretable. Finally, the selection of the two-dimensional model is supported by the descriptive statistics of the analysis using the WNOMINATE tool.

To be more specific, the sequence of eigenvalues clearly suggests that an ‘elbow’ is identifiable between the second and the third number in a row. This proves that the first two dimensions explain the largest variance compared to further dimensions. Besides this, the aggregate proportional reduction in error (APRE) rises from 0.31 (unidimensional model) to 0.52 (two-dimensional model). To summarize, the two-dimensional model correctly classifies 88.83% of votes.

The two-dimensional space estimated by IDEAL is depicted in Figure 1 below. The legislators are distinguished according to which party electoral list they stood as candidates. The visual inspection of the figure shows that it appropriately describes the VII Chamber of Deputies. Firstly, the coalition government of ČSSD, ANO, and KDU-ČSL is identified as a collective voting group. Similarly, the right-wing opposition, consisting of ODS and TOP 09, is clearly differentiable from the ruling parties. Besides this, these right-wing legislators’ positions are again estimated in the joint block, suggesting that ODS and TOP 09 vote together on most of the votes.

On the other hand, KSČM represents the left-wing opposition and the party’s deputies are therefore placed far from both the coalition and the right-wing opposition. Moreover, KSČM is still considered an anti-systemic party, which is also presented in the figure, where the communists are slightly isolated from the rest of the parties. Last but not least, ÚSVIT’s legislators are located somewhere in the featureless centre of the model with a significant dispersion. This confirms the party’s disunity. Finally, the figure alludes to the fact that parties
vote more or less cohesively, which is a rational finding in the case of the Czech parliamentary democracy (Sieberer 2006).

To continue, even this very basic form of spatial model could be used to roughly (!) interpret the dimensions driving the contemporary partisan competition in the parliament. Nonetheless, it is necessary to keep in mind that these original and unedited dimensions arising from the analysis are only abstractions (Rosenthal, Voeten 2004: 625). Therefore, a rigorous interpretation of the dimensions is conducted later by employing more sophisticated methods (see below).

However, the first (horizontal) dimension of the basic model in Figure 1 still reasonably describes the institutional division in the chamber, since the coalition parties are located on the right-hand side of the dimension while the opposition groups are placed on the other one. Then, the second (vertical) dimension is nearly able to distinguish left-wing parties from the right-wing formations, which is thus considered the ideological dimension.

Figure 1: Legislator’s Spatial Coordinates in the VII Chamber of Deputies, 2013–2017

Note: The calculation was conducted in R using IDEAL, ‘pscl’ package (Jackman 2015).
Source: Author.
Therefore, I argue that the political competition in the present lower parliamentary chamber has two main drives – the institutional and the ideological. Even though this is ‘just’ an assumption of the research logic, it is in agreement with findings and conventional assertions of other studies (Lyons, Lacina 2009; Vodička, Cabada 2011; Hix, Noury 2016). The roll call analysis model suggests that these dimensions are to some extent orthogonal to each other. This is mostly caused by the differences in the opposition camp which is divided into left-wing and right-wing groups. Furthermore, a principal component analysis shows that two perpendicular dimensions in the model are responsible for almost the same proportion of the overall variance in general (50.98% and 49.02%). Thus, the institutional and the ideological dimensions also have about the same explanatory value.

Since the hypotheses deal with ANO’s spatial ideological position, I continue with an analysis of the ideological dimension. Although the second (vertical) dimension of the basic model almost precisely depicts the ideological division in the parliament, the estimates need to be adjusted to get the exact results. Therefore, I draw a line between average coordinates of the legislators of KSČM and TOP 09, which defines a true ideological dimension. Then, I rotate all the coordinates so that the line defining the left-right ideological dimension is parallel to the original second dimension of the model. Thanks to this procedure, it is possible to project the rotated coordinates of the deputies on the original second dimension to unveil their positions in the ideological left-right spectrum. In other words, it is also possible to say that it is the original second dimension which has been actually rotated and the result is the very same.

Density plots of the legislators’ coordinates projected on the left-right ideological dimension are depicted in Figure 2. The graph sensibly shows that most of the legislators

![Figure 2: Density Plots of the Legislators’ Coordinates Projected on the Left-Right Ideological Dimension](image)

Note: The MPs’ coordinates were estimated using IDEAL.

Source: Author.
(parties) are located in the centre of the ideological dimension, which confirms that the ideological space in the Czech Republic is centripetal. Besides this, KSČM occupies the most extreme ideological position compared to other parties, while the similarly distant ideological position on the right-hand side of the dimension is abandoned. TOP 09 and ODS are located closer to the ideological centre compared to the communists.

The main objective of the presented paper is to assess the ideological position of Andrej Babiš’s ANO. According to the first hypothesis, ANO is clearly placed closer to ČSSD compared to other parties, especially ODS and TOP 09. To be more specific, it is possible to confront the average coordinates of the particular parties’ legislators calculated in Table 2 below. Then, the ideological distance between ANO and ODS (TOP 09) is 109.65% (123.68%) larger compared to the distance between ANO and ČSSD. Thus, ANO is ideologically closer to the left-wing social democrats, which is nevertheless rational since these two parties have cooperated in the cabinet for more than three years now. However, ANO is not therefore able to take over the rest of the voters of ODS and TOP 09 under this particular spatial setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Legislators’ Coordinates Projected on the Left-Right Ideological Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÚSVIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSČM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The MPs’ coordinates were estimated using IDEAL. The parties are lined up according to the values of the standard deviation.

Source: Author.

The second hypothesis argues that ANO is located in the centre of the ideological dimension since it is a vote-seeking party struggling for the support of the masses. According to Table 2, this statement is proved to be right because ANO’s median legislator is placed tightly close to the centre of the dimension. Furthermore, all of ANO’s MPs surround the centre from both of its ideological sides, which is noticeable in Figure 3 below. Nevertheless, what is even more interesting is the fact that ANO’s spatial position and distribution is so similar to ÚSVIT’s. This finding suggests that the two parties share more features than is usually anticipated.

The third hypothesis deals with the ideological space that is covered by ANO’s deputies. To evaluate this, look at the parties’ standard deviations in Table 2, which is also graphically depicted in Figure 3. Compared to ČSSD, which has dominated the partisan competition as the vote-seeking party in the recent past, ANO covers a 13.64% smaller ideological space.
The value is especially informative because these two parties have a similar number of deputies and they are both in the cabinet. Thus, ANO’s autocratic leadership possibly affects the legislators’ concentration on the ideological dimension.

Besides this, it is not possible to ignore another interesting result of Table 2, which is the value of KSČM’s standard deviation. Although one would expect that the party’s MPs are rather disciplined, especially on the socio-economic dimension, the party seems to feature the highest level of ideological plurality compared to other parties. There are two possible explanations for this. Firstly, the rotated second dimension is assumed to be the representative left-right ideological dimension. Nevertheless, it is still a multi-layered descriptive tool. For instance, if one followed strict economic voting, it is highly likely that KSČM’s deputies would vote almost unanimously. Secondly, KSČM does not take serious part in a potential alternation between governing and opposition parties, which demands obedience from the MPs of such parties. As a result, KSČM can afford to be paradoxically more pluralist than democratic pro-system parties.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis deals with ANO’s ideological cohesion and its potential split. On one hand, ANO’s legislators are rather concentrated around its centre compared to other parties and ANO’s density plot is single-peaked, which suggests that the party is ideologically cohesive. On the other hand, these findings are also valid for ÚSVIT, which has already fallen apart. However, it is necessary to take the number of the parties’ legislators into account because ANO has three times more deputies compared to ÚSVIT. Therefore, the numbers are hardly comparable since the particular standard deviation of ÚSVIT’s
density plot ‘is enough’ to explain its split but the very same standard deviation in the case of ANO suggests its cohesiveness.

Nonetheless, the difference between ANO and ÚSVIT is visibly evident in Figure 1. Although ÚSVIT’s legislators are dispersed in the space, especially along the institutional dimension, ANO remains a solid block of deputies. Since ANO does not show any significantly different form of its spatial dispersion compared to other parties, I do not anticipate the party’s split in the near future. This claim is in agreement with the previous finding that Andrej Babiš and his closest colleagues hold the party under their full control.¹¹

Finally, it is reasonable to run the robustness analysis to confirm the previous findings (see the appendix). The calculations were conducted in the very same way using the WNOIMINATE parametric method. According to the first hypothesis, ANO’s distance to ODS (TOP 09) is 10.19% smaller (36.73% larger) compared to the distance between ANO and ČSSD. Although these figures are contradictory, they still partially support the previous results. Besides this, ANO occupies the ideological centre even in the spatial model calculated by WNOIMINATE. Next, it is reasonable to compare ANO and ČSSD in order to evaluate the amount of covered ideological space since these two parties have a similar number of deputies and they are both coalition parties. Then, ANO encompasses only 93.24% of the ideological space compared to ČSSD, which is in agreement with the previous finding. Last but not least, ANO seems to be a spatially cohesive relative to ČSSD, which finally suggests that all previously presented inferences were proved to be right.¹²

6. Conclusion

ANO is one of the most influential political powers in contemporary politics of the Czech Republic. Thus, it is necessary to put the party to the analysis because our knowledge about ANO’s features and prospects are for now regrettably limited. It is true that ANO cannot be considered to be a classic subject of the political environment. It is a business-firm party owned by one of the wealthiest entrepreneurs interconnecting all economic, political and media powers, which overwhelmingly succeeded in its very first election and joined the coalition cabinet shortly after that – this is fairly unusual even in the turbulent political space of post-Communist Europe.

Nonetheless, even ANO is forced to line up along the traditional political milieu of Czech politics. Then, it is possible to employ conventional theories and tools, with a respect to ANO’s uniqueness, in order to unveil ANO’s ‘mystery’. In the presented paper, I scrutinize roll calls of the deputies in the lower chamber of the Czech parliament to estimate the legislator’s and the parties’ spatial positions. Since ANO is a vote-seeking party, it follows the distribution of the voters along the ideological dimension and the party places itself in the location nearby masses and other rival parties. Therefore, ANO’s ideological position relative to other political formations reveals ANO’s true face.

To summarize, I show that ANO is positioned ideologically closer to the left-wing ČSSD compared to the right-wing parties. This is undoubtedly caused by the partnership of ANO and ČSSD in the coalition cabinet. Thanks to this, it is a chance for ODS and TOP 09 to
follow true right-wing policies because ANO is too far left to take over these issues. To elaborate on this, ANO is located almost precisely in the centre of the ideological space, which potentially attracts most of the voters in the centripetal Czech politics. On the other hand, ANO abandons distant ends of the ideological spectrum, which explains why the party’s support is no longer growing and especially why the right-wing parties still persist.

This finding is closely related to the fact that ANO’s legislators are more concentrated on the ideological dimension compared to other relevant parties. One of the reasonable explanations for this is that the party and its deputies are strictly supervised by Andrej Babiš and his close colleagues. Thanks to this, it is not possible to anticipate any potential split of the party since the deputies vote truly cohesively.

Nonetheless, it is necessary to mention the limits of the presented study. Firstly, the employed method reveals legislators’ spatial positions based only on their parliamentary roll calls – nothing more, nothing less. However, it still shows enough variance among all legislators and parties to form the conclusions. Secondly, the findings proceed from the projection of the deputies’ coordinates on the ideological dimension. Nevertheless, both relative and absolute locations of the parties and their potential dispersion could be different in the case of a projection on an institutional dimension. Thirdly, the depicted models and results are static rather than dynamic. It is reasonable to expect that the legislators’ ideological views are on move which is not captured by the aggregate analysis.13 Furthermore, some of the deputies have become independent during the parliamentary term, which is again not taken into account in this particular study.

Therefore, there are several possibilities for future research. Firstly, it would be interesting to assess the formulated hypotheses by a different method of defining parties’ spatial ideological position and compare the results. For instance, I suggest surveys of voters, experts or even legislators conducted exclusively in the environment of the Czech Republic, with the knowledge of these methods’ limitations. Secondly, in order to properly reveal the effect of ANO’s leadership on the party’s disciplined voting, it is sensible to look at a more detailed level of particular deputies. Then, it would be valuable to compare the parliamentary ideological position of Andrej Babiš himself and other influential party members with ANO’s ordinary MPs. Finally, it is important to employ a roll call analysis in the following years to analyse whether ANO’s spatial position has changed, especially under a different, future parliamentary setting.

Footnotes:

1. Andrej Babiš was originally born in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia in 1954. Today, his fortune is worth €2.4 bn. and the group owned by him is the third-largest company by revenue in the Czech Republic (Foy 2016).
2. Nevertheless, the early beginnings of dissatisfaction with old parties had already begun in 2002 after the era of the Opposition Agreement institutionalizing cooperation of two major parties, ČSSD and ODS (Linek 2002; Kopeček 2015).
3. ÚSVIT entered the parliament promising the establishment of elements of direct democracy in the Czech Republic. Nevertheless, it was rather curious ‘party’ from the very beginning because the
number of attained deputy mandates was higher than the number of official party members (Kopeček, Svačinová 2015). Furthermore, it was basically the party of a single man, Tomio Okamura, whose name was even included in the party’s official title. Moreover, the party’s description is written in the past tense as the party imploded in 2015.

4. Overall, in the 2013 parliamentary election ANO was voted in by people who in the 2010 parliamentary election did not vote (23%), voted for ODS (23%), TOP 09 (19%), VV (19%), ČSSD (4%), KSČM (1%) and other parties with a single share lower than 1% (11% in total). These data are based on the Bayesian hierarchical model of ecological inference (Gregor 2014).

5. Discrepancies among the methods arise for a number of reasons (Carroll et al. 2009). For instance, procedures differ in their behavioural models with different utility functions (Gaussian, quadratic etc.). Next, restrictions across the methods are not the same and especially scaling can be incomparable. Besides this, different procedures employ different estimation techniques (MCMC vs. maximum likelihood).

6. For instance, roll call votes represent approximately just one third of all votes held in the European parliament (Hix et al. 2006). Furthermore, there is some evidence that roll calls are employed on some issues more than others, from which a potential selection bias arises (Carrubba et al. 2008).

7. APRE is derived as a comparison of classification errors of a model with a naïve benchmark assuming that all deputies vote with the majority.

8. As a robustness analysis, it is reasonable to alternatively code an abstention not as a negative vote but as a missing value. The reason for this is an assumption that legislators abstain not only to say a ‘soft no’ but they can, for instance, leave a parliamentary session and (unintentionally) stay registered. This is a rational belief, although every deputy is responsible for his or her voting behaviour. Overall, the robustness analysis finally delivers surprisingly similar results to these presented in the paper which used the original coding. Therefore, different ways of coding an abstention do not cause a substantial change.

9. Even though it is natural to consider KSČM as the left-wing end of the ideological dimension, the things get more complicated on the right-wing side of the spectrum. It is true that both the Manifesto Project and the Chapel Hill expert survey define ODS as the most right-wing party in the contemporary parliament. However, at the same time, the Manifesto Project, for instance, set ÚSVIT and ANO to the right of TOP 09, which makes this data inappropriate to use because these findings do not correspond with the reality (Bakker et al. 2015; Volkens et al. 2015). Moreover, the estimated roll call analysis model itself suggests that TOP 09 is located to the right of ODS. Besides this, if ODS is employed as the most right-wing party of the partisan competition, the ideological dimension would be then distorted because in some models ČSSD significantly overlaps with KSČM, which is not ideologically reasonable at all. Since this is not the case when TOP 09 represents the right-hand side of the ideological dimension, I finally employ TOP 09 as being the opposite element on the ideological dimension compared to KSČM.

10. It is interesting to confront this statement with the findings made by Jan Rovny (2013) who claims that it is hardly possible to place radical right parties on a classical ideological (left-right) dimension.

11. Despite many differences, a lot of similarities between ANO and ÚSVIT raise a question on possible resemblances between these two parties. The truth is that both political formations are new and more or less business-firm and even populist parties (Kopeček, Svačinová 2015). Nonetheless, it is likely that the two parties would differ in other aspects, such as their position on a cultural or a pro-European dimension. Unfortunately, the general research design of the presented paper does not make it possible to discover these dissimilarities since concrete topics of the votes are not distinguished.

12. It is obvious that in the WNOMINATE spatial model more parties seem to be spatially cohesive and with little standard deviation on the ideological dimension. Nevertheless, it is one of the features of WNOMINATE that legislators (parties) voting cohesively and extremely in most of the votes compared to others are located on the very edge of the spatial model. Therefore, a comparison of the parties’ dispersion and the ideological concentration is reasonable only in the case of similarly posi-
tioned parties, such as ČSSD and ANO, which are both located in the middle of the ideological space with a similar number of deputies.

13. In order to moderate this drawback, the analysed dataset was divided into two parts containing an equal number of votes. Thanks to this, potential changes in deputies’ spatial positions between the first and the second half of the voting term could be revealed. Nonetheless, these moves are only slight according to a graphic comparison and the presented results are therefore sufficiently valid for both of these periods. To be more specific, the most visible change in the deputies’ positions was caused by a switch of some legislators from their original to another political group.
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Appendix: Results of the Spatial Estimation Model Using WNOMINATE

Since every procedure of a roll call analysis has its specific features, it is reasonable to scrutinize one method’s results relative to values given by another analytical tool. The appendix presents outcomes of the WNOMINATE procedure estimating a legislator’s spatial coordinates, which confirms the previously elaborated findings. The reason for this is that both IDEAL and WNOMINATE are parametric methods of analysis, which makes their results comparable to deal with spatial distances among the legislators. However, it is necessary to be aware of the described differences between the two methods. Generally, the major drawback of WNOMINATE is that the tool makes quite severe constraints on the positions of extreme legislators (Lyons, Lacina 2009).

Firstly, Figure A1 delivers a two-dimensional spatial model of legislators’ positions. Again, it is possible to differentiate the coalition parties (ČSSD, ANO, and KDU-ČSL) and both left-wing (KSČM) and right-wing (ODS, TOP 09) opposition parties. The first (horizontal) dimension of the basic model is close to the institutional division in the contemporary partisan competition, the second (vertical) dimension rather indicates the ideological spectrum.
Legislators’ spatial positions are again projected on the second dimension, which is rotated so that it is parallel to the line between KSČM and TOP 09. Table A1 numerically and Figure A2 graphically depict characteristics of these projections. Based on the first hypothesis, ANO’s distance to ODS (TOP 09) is 10.19% smaller (36.73% larger) compared to the distance between ANO and ČSSD. According to the second hypothesis, ANO occupies the ideological centre, which is in agreement with the anticipated assumption and previous findings. As for the third hypothesis, ANO encompasses only 93.24% of the ideological space compared to ČSSD, which is a comparable party because of its number of deputies and its presence in the coalition. Nonetheless, the comparison can be confusing because of WNOMINATE’s spatial restrictions distorting a variance of ANO’s legislators. Finally, according to the fourth hypothesis ANO seems to be spatially cohesive relative to ČSSD. This suggests that all previously elaborated findings were proved to be right based on both IDEAL and WNOMINATE analytical procedures.
Table A1: Descriptive Statistics of the Legislators' Coordinates Projected on the Left-Right Ideological Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSČM</td>
<td>-0.859</td>
<td>-0.821</td>
<td>-0.809</td>
<td>-0.591</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÚSVIT</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANO</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>-0.479</td>
<td>-0.402</td>
<td>-0.378</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP09</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The MPs' coordinates were estimated using WNOMINATE. The parties are lined up according to the values of the standard deviation.

Source: Author.

Figure A2: Positions of the Parties' Deputies Projected on the Left-Right Ideological Dimension

Note: The MPs' coordinates were estimated using WNOMINATE. The parties are represented by the mean of their legislators' coordinates projected on the ideological dimension (the model's rotated second dimension). Furthermore, two standard deviations are depicted on each side.

Source: Author.