

Tim Stap

Clark and Golder's main argument is that social heterogeneity will lead to an increase in the overall number of political parties only when acted upon by the electoral system that was put into place. The causal claim is that social heterogeneity AND a "permissive electoral system" are necessary to have more political parties. By "permissive electoral system," they mean systems that are more conducive towards having multiple parties, or proportional representation as opposed to single-member districts. If you separate both variables out (as I had initially done in my R-coding), it is extremely difficult to extrapolate any sort of relationship, but when taken together, there is a mixed relationship, but some evidence supporting the argument. While perhaps not as strong as imagined, there is a higher slope in the ENEP at around 10, but interestingly, there is still wide dispersion between the bottom 3rd of ENEG and the middle 3rd even in a Large-Magnitude PR system. On the one hand, at the top third of ENEG, there are more Electoral Parties in a Large Magnitude PR system than the other two alternatives, the data offers mixed support for the overall argument. While this may seem counter-intuitive or to completely break apart the Clark and Golder argument, I actually think it supports their overall claim. Social heterogeneity will ONLY lead to more parties IF the electoral system is more conducive towards it. Hence, in the Single-Member District, social heterogeneity does not really matter that much because the system does not "permit" (meaning lead to electorally successful parties) to exist. Meanwhile, in the Large-Magnitude PR, there is some degree of social heterogeneity and electoral system having some relationship, but it is interesting that those with low social heterogeneity and a PR system usually have a higher

number of effective parties than mid-tier. While the density of cases with low heterogeneity and PR is lower, it is still an interesting finding.

Ultimately, the histograms suggest there is a positive relationship between social heterogeneity, electoral system, and the number of effective parties, but it is much less straightforward. While the density is low, there are more cases of low social heterogeneity and large PR systems leading to a larger number of parties. While it may suggest that it is more the electoral system driving the relationship, there does seem to be some causal effect with heterogeneity added in (remember, the relationship between the variables is conditional: for heterogeneity to have any impact according to the argument, the right electoral system must be there). I would say that the histogram supports those results to a certain extent.

