

Tables and Figures

TABLES

1.1 Polish Sejm election result, October, 2015 (national figures)	<i>page 5</i>
1.2 Votes for the leading candidates for election for members of Polish Sejm from the district of Konin, October 2015	7
2.1 Allocation of six seats by D'Hondt divisors (1, 2, 3, ...)	38
2.2 Allocation of seats in a six-seat district, by various quota and divisor formulas	39
3.1 Possible seat allocation rules in a single-seat district	42
3.2 Example of basic seat allocation options in a single-seat district	44
3.3 Example of seat allocation by Single Transferable Vote (STV) in a five-seat district	52
3.4 Example of an election under MMP: New Zealand, 2008	56
3.5 Example of an election under MMP: Japan, 2012	59
4.1 Examples of hypothetical party systems and resulting values for an effective number of parties	65
4.2 Mean values of effective number of parties (seats and votes) by electoral system and executive binary categories	67
5.1 Recent elections in Israel	75
5.2 Election results in Trinidad and Tobago, 2000–2010	79
5.3 District-level results in Trinidad and Tobago, 2007 and 2010 (selected)	81
5.4 Election results in India, 2009, by alliance and party	83
6.1 Examples of election results under districted PR in Finland and Portugal	87
6.2 Results of selected districts in Portugal, 2005	88
6.3 The intraparty dimension in Finland: Southern Savo (Etelä-Savo), 2007	94
7.1 District magnitude and the number of seat-winning parties	111

7.2 Nationwide effects of the Seat Product, parliamentary democracies	112
7.3 How assembly parties and seat product connect	113
7.A1 Impact of formula on ratios of actual values to Seat Product predictions	124
8.1 Regression for the effective number of vote-earning parties (N_V)	135
9.1 Deviation from PR tends to decrease with increasing Seat Product MS	141
9.2 Nationwide equations for the Seat Product Model	149
9.3 Average expectations at various levels of MS	150
9.A1 Regressions for Deviation from Proportionality (D_2)	152
10.1 District level equations for the Seat Product Model	172
10.2 Average expectations at various levels of M , when $S=270$	173
10.A1 How district magnitude shapes the number of parties, with and without embeddedness	178
10.A2 Comparing regression results for parliamentary and presidential systems	179
11.A1 Regression tests of models for presidential systems: the effect of the Seat Product (MS) on the effective number of presidential candidates (N_P) and the effective number of vote-earning parties (N_V) in assembly elections	196
12.1 Asymmetry between assembly elections in late counter-honeymoon and early honeymoon	205
12.A1 Regressions for party system outcomes according to elapsed time in the presidential term	210
12.A2 Regressions for the impact of elapsed time in the presidential term on the presidential vote ratio	210
13.A1 Regression results for number of candidates and district magnitude	232
13.A2 Regression results for first winner	233
13.A3 Regression results for last winner	233
14.1 Actual and effective numbers of lists and suballiance parties in Southern Savo, Finland, 2007	246
14.A1 Seats won by list or part and vote concentration, OLPR and SNTV	255
14.A2 Regressions for number of list and parties at district level, systems with alliance lists	256
14.A3 Seats won by party and vote concentration, big versus small parties under OLPR in Brazil	257
15.1 The extended Seat Product Model, including upper tiers, ethnic fragmentation, and systems with presidential executives	264
15.2 Three regressions for the effective number of vote-earning parties (N_V), including two-tier systems and the effective number of ethnic groups (N_E)	268

15.3	Comparing the logical model and the regression that includes ethnic effects	269
15.A1	The effect of two-tier systems on Deviation from Proportionality	282
15.A2	Regressions for basic tier of two-tier systems: district level	283
15.A3	Regressions on basic-tier effective number of seat-winning parties and deviation from PR	284
16.1	Single-tier systems with complex formulas: actual versus predicted effective number of seat winning parties (N_S) and seat share of largest party (s_1)	287
16.2	Comparing model predictions to actual values for single-tier systems that have legal thresholds	298
16.3	Comparing model predictions to actual values for two-tier compensatory systems that have legal thresholds	300
16.4	Comparing model predictions to actual values for two-tier noncompensatory systems that have legal thresholds	302
16.5	Example of how independents were elected in one Turkish district: Van, 2011	305

FIGURES

1.1	Science walks on two legs: observation and thinking	9
1.2	Two ways of visualizing the relationship between district magnitude (M) and the number of seat-winning parties (N'_{S0})	11
1.3	A common way of seeing the impact of the electoral system on votes and seats	17
1.4	The opposite impacts of electoral rules and current party politics	18
2.1	Population and assembly size	30
2.2	Contrasting effects of plurality and PR rules at the same district magnitude	33
4.1	Mean district magnitude (M) and deviation from proportionality (D_2)	69
7.1	Relation of the nationwide effective number of seat-winning parties (N_S) to the seat product (MS)	102
7.2	How the actual number of seat-winning parties (N_{S0}) relates to the seat product (MS), national level	104
7.3	How the largest seat share (s_1) relates to the number of seat-winning parties (N_{S0}), left panel, and the seat product (MS), right panel	107
7.4	Relationship of the effective number of seat-winning parties (N_S) to the largest seat share (s_1)	108
7.5	The opposite impacts of current politics and electoral systems	120
8.1	The effective number of vote-earning parties and the Seat Product	126
8.2	How the effective numbers are related to the largest shares of seats and votes	130

8.3	How the largest seat and vote shares relate to the number of seat-winning parties	131
8.4	The effective numbers of parties, votes versus seats	132
8.5	How current politics and the electoral system are shaped by political culture	136
9.1	Deviation from proportionality (D_2) versus the difference between the largest party's seat and vote shares ($s_1 - v_1$)	143
9.2	Difference between the largest party's seat and vote shares ($s_1 - v_1$) and the seat product (MS)	145
9.3	Deviation from proportionality (D_2) and the seat product (MS)	146
9.4	Deviation from proportionality (D_2) and effective number of seat-winning parties (N_S)	147
9.5	Schematic of quantities deriving from the Seat Product	149
10.1	How the magnitude of a district shapes the effective number of seat-winning parties	155
10.2	How the assembly size shapes the effective number of vote-winning parties in single-seat districts	156
10.3	The number of seat-winning parties and the seat share of the largest party, district level	163
10.4	The seat share of the largest party and district magnitude, district level	165
10.5	The actual number of seat-winning parties (N'_{S0}) and the effective number of vote-earning parties (N'_V), with incorporation of district-embeddedness function (k)	168
10.6	District magnitude and the effective number of vote-earning parties (N'_V), with incorporation of district-embeddedness function (k)	169
11.1	The impact of the Seat Product (MS) on the effective number of presidential candidates (N_P , left panel) and the effective number of vote-earning parties (N_V , right panel)	184
11.2	Relationship between the effective number of vote-earning parties in assembly elections (N_V) and the effective number of presidential candidates (N_P)	188
12.1	The effect of elapsed time between presidential elections on the ratio of observed effective number of parties to predicted value; seats (N_S , left panel) and votes (N_V , right panel)	199
12.2	Relationship of elapsed time (E) between presidential elections on the presidential vote ratio (R_P)	201
12.3	Effect of <i>Elapsed time</i> (E) on the ratio of the effective number of vote-earning assembly parties (N_V) to the effective number of presidential candidates (N_P)	204
13.1	Candidates nominated by district magnitude under open list proportional representation (OLPR, left panel) and single nontransferable vote (SNTV, right panel)	221

13.2	First winner's share under OLPR and SNTV: Logical models and data	226
13.3	Last winning candidate under SNTV	228
13.4	Last winning candidate under OLPR	230
14.1	Share of votes for winning candidates (W) by number of seats (s), OLPR (left panel) and SNTV (right panel)	237
14.2	Number of lists winning seats (N'_{LS0}) against district magnitude	242
14.3	The effect of a district's magnitude (M) and embeddedness (k) on the number of seat-winning parties (N''_{s0}), whether running alone or on alliance lists	244
14.4	The effect of a district's magnitude (M) and embeddedness (k) on the effective number of seat-winning parties (N''_s), whether running alone or on alliance lists	246
14.5	Nomination behavior of big and small parties in alliance lists: Brazil and Finland	249
14.6	Share of party vote concentrated on winning candidates for parties in alliances: Big versus small parties in Brazil	251
15.1	Comparing predictions from the institutions-only model to the predictions when considering ethnic fragmentation	266
15.2	Effective number of seat-winning parties and (since 1998) alliances in India over time	272
15.3	Deviation from proportionality (D_2) in two-tier compensatory PR systems	275
15.4	How the magnitude of a district shapes the effective number of seat-winning parties in the basic tier of two-tier systems, compared to simple systems	277
15.5	The impact of basic tier seat product (MS_B) on the effective number of seat-winning parties (N_{SB}) and deviation from proportionality (D_2)	279
16.1	The effect of legal threshold on the seat share of the largest party (s_1 , left panel), while the right panel shows the effective number of seat-winning parties (N_s , right panel)	296
17.1	Expected and actual effective number of seat-winning parties (N_s) over time in long-term democracies with single-tier electoral systems	313
17.2	Expected and actual effective number of seat-winning parties (N_s) over time in long-term democracies with two-tier electoral systems	315
17.3	Today's social sciences too often try to hop on one leg, observation and empirical analysis, with no predictions beyond directional	325

