

## **Replication attempt to evaluate a claim from Andrews\_BritJournPoliSci\_2009\_Ryq7**

**Replication team:** Esteban Méndez Chacón and Marco Ramljak

**SCORE RR ID:** 95my

**OSF Project:** <https://osf.io/jegqs>

### **Description of generalizability**

Deviations from the original study:

1. The original study uses the Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP), from 1945 to 1999, and includes the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

The CMP is also used in the replication; however, more recent years (2000-2019) are added to the original sample, and nine more countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, and Slovakia.

2. The original study does not indicate the source for the type of electoral system. In the replication, the source is the Comparative Political Data Set (CPDS).
3. There is a difference of nine extra elections between the reproduction analysis (N=284) and the original study (N = 275). The difference can be due to an update of the CPM dataset; or because the CPDS dataset includes more elections than the source used by the authors.

## Replication results

Table R.1 contains the results of the linear regression model.

Table R.1 OLS Regression of (Natural Log of) Number of Parties in Party System v. Electoral Rules on (Natural Log of) Distance between Extreme Parties (Dispersion) along Economic Dimension.

	Replication (1)	Reproduction (2)
Log count of parties in system	<b>0.32*</b> <b>(0.13)</b>	<b>0.40*</b> <b>(0.16)</b>
Single member district systems	-0.02 (0.08)	0.04 (0.11)
Lagged log dependent variable	0.40* (0.08)	0.39* (0.08)
Constant	0.07 (0.19)	-0.01 (0.24)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.23	0.26
N	455	284
Number of countries	29	20

Note: Robust standard errors, clustered by country, reported in parentheses.

\* Coefficients that fall within a 95% confidence interval.

## Claim evaluation

### Single-trace claim

**Coded claim 4 text (original paper):** “The authors find that as the number of parties in the system increases, party dispersion increases and the effect is statistically significant for both policy dimensions (economic policy dimension is selected for the SCORE program) (coefficient on log count of parties in system term = 0.39, robust SE clustered by country = 0.14, coefficient falls within a 95% confidence interval).”

## Replication outcome: Simple test

**Inferential criteria:** Criteria for a successful replication attempt for the SCORE project is a statistically significant effect for the predictor COUNT\_PARTIES (alpha = .05, two tailed) in the same pattern as the original study on the focal hypothesis test ( $H^*$ ).

**Result:** Column (1) of Table R.1 shows that as the log count of parties in the system (variable COUNT\_PARTIES) increases, party dispersion in the economic dimension increases. **Coefficient on log count of parties in system term = 0.32, robust SE clustered by country = 0.13. The effect is statistically significant at the 5% level ( $p = 0.021$ ), two-tailed test. Consequently, this claim was replicated.**

**Deviations from the preregistration:** None.

## Reproduction analysis

While the previous result is obtained by using all the available observations, a second analysis restricted to observations that were used in the original analysis is also performed.

**Reproduction criteria:** Criteria for a successful reproduction attempt for the SCORE project is a statistically significant effect for the predictor COUNT\_PARTIES (alpha = .05, two tailed) in the same pattern as the original study on the focal hypothesis test ( $H^*$ ).

**Result:** Column (2) of Table R.1 shows that as the log count of parties in the system (variable COUNT\_PARTIES) increases, party dispersion in the economic dimension increases. **Coefficient on log count of parties in system term = 0.40, robust SE clustered by country = 0.16. The effect is statistically significant at the 5% level ( $p = 0.023$ ), two-tailed test. Consequently, the reproduction was successful.**

**Deviations from the preregistration:** None.

## Description of materials provided

The following materials are publicly available on the OSF site:

- The **preregistration file**:
  - [Andrews\\_BritJournPoliSci\\_2009\\_Ryq7\\_95my Preregistration.pdf](#) (Ramljak\_Méndez-Chacón)
- The **Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP) and the Comparative Political Data Set (CPDS)** codebooks. Filenames:
  - [Codebook\\_MPDataset\\_MPDS2019b.pdf](#)
  - [Codebook-CPDS-1960-2017-Update-2019.pdf](#)

- The **R code to clean the CMP and the CPDS datasets**. Filename:

- [ANDREWS code.r](#)

Note that this code also cleans the Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES), which is a dataset proposed by the data finder but not required for the final analysis.

- The **data dictionary for the cleaned CMP and CPDS datasets**. Filename:

- [Codebook andrews.xlsx](#)

- The **code for replication and reproduction**. Along with the cleaned CMP and CPDS datasets, these are the only files required to replicate and reproduce the original study. To replicate/reproduce the study, just change the working directory to where the data is in your computer and run the files using Stata (the codes were written using Stata 16.1). Filenames:

- [Andrews-Money\\_Replication.do](#)

- [Andrews-Money\\_Reproduction.do](#)

- The **output** from the Stata analyses, available in two formats: smcl (Stata output) and a pdf file. Filenames:

- [Andrews-Money\\_Replication.pdf](#)

- [Andrews-Money\\_Replication.smcl](#)

- [Andrews-Money\\_Reproduction.pdf](#)

- [Andrews-Money\\_Reproduction.smcl](#)

The data sources used in the analysis are the Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP) (version 2019b) and the Comparative Political Data Set (CPDS) (version 1960-2017). The CMP **raw data** and the **cleaned dataset** are not uploaded directly to OSF. The data can be accessed from the Manifesto Project website (<https://manifestoproject.wzb.eu/datasets?archived=yes>) provided a brief registration. The CPDS is uploaded to OSF (files: [raw.CPDS\\_1960-2017\\_Update\\_2019.xlsx](#), [CPDS.final.rds](#), and [CPDS\\_final.dta](#)), but also it can be downloaded from the CPDS website (<https://www.cps-data.org/index.php/data#CPDS>).

## References

Andrews, J., & Money, J. (2009). The Spatial Structure of Party Competition: Party Dispersion within a Finite Policy Space. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(4), 805-824. doi:10.1017/S0007123409990172

Armingeon, Klaus, Virginia Wenger, Fiona Wiedemeier, Christian Isler, Laura Knöpfel, David Weisstanner and Sarah Engler. 2019. Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2017. Zurich: Institute of Political Science, University of Zurich.

Volken, Andrea / Krause, Werner / Lehmann, Pola / Matthieß, Theres / Merz, Nicolas / Regel, Sven / Weßels, Bernhard (2019): The Manifesto Data Collection. Manifesto Project (MRG/CMP/MARPOR). Version 2019b. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB). <https://doi.org/10.25522/manifesto.mpds.2019b>