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This appendix contains several models that support the robustness of the results presented in the paper. Section 1 shows descriptive statistics and predicted probabilities with confidence intervals that correspond to Table 4 and discussed in the text. Section 2 displays various models employed as robustness tests, primarily to explore the relationship between inclusion and participation further and distinguish their independent effects on the adoption of horizontality. Table 1A below contains basic descriptive statistics for the variables in the models in the manuscript and in this appendix. Throughout, \* signifies statistical significance at p<0.10 (two-tailed), \*\* signifies statistical significance at p<0.05 (two-tailed), and \*\*\* signifies statistical significance at p<0.01 (two-tailed).

**Section I**

**Table 1A. Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Range** | **Mean/Mode** | **Std. Dev.** |
| *Inclusion-Aggregate* | 0-6 | 0 | N/A |
| *Inclusion- First Stage* | 0-2 | 0 | N/A |
| *Inclusion-Second Stage* | 0-2 | 0 | N/A |
| *Inclusion-Third Stage* | 0-2 | 0 | N/A |
| *Conflict Intensity* | 0-2 | 0.307 | 0.548 |
| *Participation-Aggregate* | 0-6 | 2 | N/A |
| *Participation- First Stage* | 0-2 | 0 | N/A |
| *Participation-Second Stage* | 0-2 | 0 | N/A |
| *Participation-Third Stage* | 0-2 | 2 | N/A |
| *Polyarchy* | 0.018-0.891 | 0.336 | 0.222 |
| *Ethnolinguistic* | 0-0.9302 | 0.529 | 0.246 |
| *Int’l Org. Miss.* | 0-1 | 0 | N/A |
| *Aid/GDP* | -0.001-0.467 | 0.079 | 0.101 |
| *British Colony* | 0-1 | 0 | N/A |
| *French Colony* | 0-1 | 0 | N/A |
| *Past Horizontality* | 0-1 | 0 | N/A |

**Table 2A. Increase in Probability Horizontality is Adopted Moving from No to Full Inclusion (with Confidence Intervals)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level of Inclusion | Lowest | Highest |
| Aggregate | 0.16 (0.06, 0.25) | 0.48 (0.34, 0.62) |
| First stage (Origination) | 0.17 (0.08, 0.26) | 0.51(0.35, 0.66) |
| Second stage (Deliberation) | 0.17 (0.07, 0.27) | 0.42 (0.30, 0.55) |
| Third stage (Ratification) | 0.17 (0.07, 0.27) | 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) |
|  |  |  |

**Table 3A. Decrease in Probability Horizontality is Adopted as Conflict Intensity Increases (with Confidence Intervals)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Level of Conflict Intensity | | | |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Maximum |
| Aggregate | 0.34 (0.24, 0.43) | 0.23 (0.15, 0.31) | 0.15 (0.06, 0.23) | 0.01 (-0.02,0.05) |
| First stage | 0.34 (0.24, 0.44) | 0.23 (0.15, 0.31) | 0.14 (0.06, 0.23) | 0.01 (-0.02, 0.04) |
| Second stage | 0.33 (0.23, 0.43) | 0.23 (0.14, 0.31) | 0.15 (0.05, 0.24) | 0.02 (-0.02, 0.05) |
| Third stage | 0.33 (0.24, 0.43) | 0.23 (0.15, 0.31) | 0.15 (0.07, 0.24) | 0.02 (-0.02, 0.05) |

Level 1(0), Level 2 (.3333333), Level 3 (.6666667), Level 4 (1), Level 5 (1.333333), level 6 (1.666667), and Maximum (2).

**Section II**

As discussed in the paper, we ran models with participation as a control at each stage of the constitution-making process (origination, Model 2; deliberation, Model 3; and ratification, Model 4) and in the aggregate model. Because inclusion and participation are highly correlated in the first stage (r=.985), origination (selection of the constituent assembly), participation is omitted in Model 2 due to collinearity. In all models, inclusion is significant and positive. Participation is not significant in models where it is not dropped. Table 4A on the next page displays the results. Table 5 displays the predicted probabilities.

**Table 4A. Inclusion and Participation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| **Central Variables of Interest** | | | | |
| Inclusion-Aggregate | 0.29\*  (0.15) | --- | --- | --- |
| Inclusion-  First Stage | --- | 1.14\*\*\*  (0.39) | --- | --- |
| Inclusion-  Second Stage | --- | --- | 0.76\*  (0.42) | --- |
| Inclusion-  Third Stage | --- | --- | --- | 0.88\*\*\*  (0.34) |
| Conflict  Intensity | -2.21\*\*\*  (0.79) | -2.18\*\*\*  (0.72) | -2.02\*\*\*  (0.76) | -2.00\*\*\*  (0.71) |
| **Control Variables** | | | | |
| Participation-  Aggregate | 0.17  (0.23) | --- | --- | --- |
| Participation-  First Stage | --- | Omitted-  Collinearity | --- | --- |
| Participation-  Second Stage | --- | --- | 0.17  (0.44) | --- |
| Participation-  Third Stage | --- | --- | --- | 0.17  (0.30) |
| Polyarchy | -0.19  (1.52) | -0.31  (1.51) | 0.16  (1.52) | 0.25  (1.58) |
| Ethnolinguistic | -0.75  (1.27) | -0.56  (1.28) | -0.58  (1.32) | -0.38  (1.24) |
| Int’l Org. Miss. | -1.23  (1.65) | -0.92  (1.50) | -1.50  (1.83) | -1.29  (1.69) |
| Aid/GDP | 2.96  (2.72) | 3.14  (2.88) | 3.18  (2.68) | 2.75  (2.57) |
| British Colony | 1.35\*\*  (0.66) | 1.37\*\*  (0.65) | 1.13\*  (0.62) | 1.23\*  (0.66) |
| French Colony | -2.21\*  (1.34) | -2.21  (1.42) | -2.08\*  (1.24) | -2.15\*  (1.23) |
| Past Horizontality | 1.06  (0.76) | 1.28  (0.80) | 0.94  (0.76) | 0.93  (0.76) |
| Constant | -1.72\*  (0.95) | -1.58\*  (0.96) | -1.56  (1.00) | -1.87\*  (1.05) |
| N | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Adj. R2 | 0.35 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.35 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses; GDP=gross domestic product

**Table 5A. Increase in Probability Horizontality is adopted Moving from No to Full Inclusion, Controlling for Participation (with Confidence Intervals)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level of Inclusion | Lowest | Highest |
| Aggregate | 0.18 (0.07, 0.29) | 0.43 (0.25, 0.62) |
| First stage (Origination) | 0.17 (0.08, 0.26) | 0.51 (0.35, 0.66) |
| Second stage (Deliberation) | 0.18 (0.07, 0.29) | 0.41 (0.24, 0.57) |
| Third stage (Ratification) | 0.17 (0.07, 0.27) | 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) |

In Tables 6A and below, we explore the distinct effects of inclusion and participation in nested models. For each stage of the constitution-making process and for the aggregate measures, the first column displays results for bivariate regressions with only inclusion or participation (note that the adjusted R squared is 0.00 because there is only one predictor in these models). The second column for each set (aggregate, and the stages of constitution-making) is the regressions without the lagged dependent variable. As noted in the paper, inclusion remains significant and positive in all models. Participation is not significant alone in the aggregate model, and is not significant in the third stage in either model. In Table 8A, we provide the results for the full model when participation in the aggregate and at each stage of the constitution-making process is included rather than inclusion variables. Again, participation is not significant in the third stage. We also calculated predicted probabilities for participation, excluding the third stage, where it was not significant. We note that the confidence intervals overlap in the second stage. Thus, while participation seems to have some impact on the probability that horizontality is adopted, it is not consistently significant. In contrast, inclusion is consistently significant and positive.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6A. Nested Models of Inclusion** | | | | | | | | |
| Variables | Model 5 | Model 6 | Model 7 | Model 8 | Model 9 | Model 10 | Model 11 | Model 12 |
| **Central Variables of Interest** | | | | | | | | |
| Inclusion-Aggregate | 0.20\*\*\* (0.08) | 0.33\*\*\* (0.12) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inclusion-  First Stage | --- | --- | 0.62\*\*\*  (0.23) | 0.97\*\*\* (0.36) | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inclusion-  Second Stage | --- | --- | --- | --- | 0.45\*\*  (0.22) | 0.78\*\* (0.35) | --- | --- |
| Inclusion-  Third Stage | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 0.51\*\*  (0.22) | 0.80\*\*\* (0.31) |
| Conflict  Intensity | --- | -2.06\*\*\* (0.67) | --- | -2.14\*\*\* (0.68) | --- | -1.96\*\*\* (0.69) | --- | -1.97\*\*\* (0.65) |
| **Control Variables** | | | | | | | | |
| Polyarchy | --- | 0.32  (1.51) | --- | 0.33  (1.50) | --- | 0.63  (1.46) | --- | 0.58  (1.53) |
| Ethnolinguistic | --- | -0.65  (1.31) | --- | -0.73  (1.31) | --- | -0.57  (1.28) | --- | 0.39  (1.30) |
| Int’l Org. Miss. | --- | -1.17  (1.46) | --- | -0.92  (1.49) | --- | -1.28  (1.54) | --- | -1.19  (1.43) |
| Aid/GDP | --- | 2.44  (2.56) | --- | 2.65  (2.71) | --- | 2.74  (2.59) | --- | 2.29  (2.46) |
| British Colony | --- | 1.00\*  (0.60) | --- | 1.06\*  (0.60) | --- | 0.95  (0.62) | --- | 0.91  (0.61) |
| French Colony | --- | -1.95  (1.19) | --- | -1.92  (1.19) | --- | -2.00\* (1.18) | --- | -1.97\* (1.17) |
| Past Horizontality | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Constant | -1.42\*\*\* (0.29) | -1.31  (1.09) | -1.37\*\*\* (0.27) | -1.18  (1.08) | -1.32\*\*\* (0.29) | -1.37  (1.05) | -1.39\*\*\* (0.30) | -1.41  (1.09) |
| N | 127 | 97 | 127 | 97 | 127 | 97 | 127 | 97 |
| Adj. R2 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.27 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses; GDP=gross domestic product. | | | | | | | | |
| **Table 7A. Nested Models of Participation** | | | | | | | | |
| Variables | Model 13 | Model 14 | Model 15 | Model 16 | Model 17 | Model 18 | Model 19 | Model 20 |
| **Central Variables of Interest** | | | | | | | | |
| Participation-Aggregate | 0.17  (0.12) | 0.40\*\* (0.18) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participation -  First Stage | --- | --- | 0.54\*\* (0.23) | 0.97\*\*\* (0.36) | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participation -  Second Stage | --- | --- | --- | --- | 0.44\*  (0.26) | 0.57\*  (0.34) | --- | --- |
| Participation -  Third Stage | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -0.13  (0.21) | 0.18  (0.30) |
| Conflict  Intensity | --- | -2.38\*\*\* (0.84) | --- | -2.14\*\*\* (0.68) | --- | -2.12\*\*\* (0.76) | --- | -1.92\*\* (0.79) |
| **Control Variables** | | | | | | | | |
| Polyarchy | --- | 0.88  (1.42) | --- | 0.33  (1.50) | --- | 1.10  (1.41) | --- | 1.74  (1.31) |
| Ethnolinguistic | --- | -0.99  (1.31) | --- | -0.73  (1.31) | --- | -0.60  (1.36) | --- | -0.22  (1.29) |
| Int’l Org. Miss. | --- | -0.74  (1.42) | --- | -0.92  (1.48) | --- | -1.04  (1.42) | --- | -0.69  (1.27) |
| Aid/GDP | --- | 2.97  (2.78) | --- | 2.65  (2.71) | --- | 3.02  (2.60) | --- | 3.32  (2.77) |
| British Colony | --- | 1.14\*  (0.61) | --- | 1.06\*  (0.60) | --- | 0.74  (0.60) | --- | 0.89  (0.61) |
| French Colony | --- | -2.18\* (1.19) | --- | -1.92  (1.19) | --- | -1.99\* (1.17) | --- | -2.12\* (1.16) |
| Past Horizontality | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Constant | -1.30\*\*\* (0.35) | -1.48  (0.93) | -1.31\*\*\* (0.26) | -1.18  (1.08) | -1.14\*\*\*  (0.25) | -1.08  (0.99) | -0.79\*\*\* (0.29) | -1.54  (0.98) |
| N | 127 | 97 | 127 | 97 | 127 | 97 | 127 | 97 |
| Adj. R2 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses; GDP=gross domestic product. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8A. Impact of Participation on Horizontality** | | | | |
| Variables | Model 21  (Aggregate) | Model 22  (First Stage) | Model 23  (Second Stage) | Model 24  (Third Stage) |
| **Central Variables of Interest** | | | | |
| Participation-  Aggregate | 0.42\*\*  (0.19) | --- | --- | --- |
| Participation-  First Stage | --- | 1.14\*\*\*  (0.39) | --- | --- |
| Participation-Second Stage | --- | --- | 0.61\*  (0.36) | --- |
| Participation- Third Stage | --- | --- | --- | 0.15  (0.30) |
| Conflict Intensity | -2.39\*\*\*  (0.88) | -2.18\*\*\*  (0.72) | -2.15\*\*\*  (0.81) | -1.89\*\*  (0.79) |
| **Control Variables** | | | | |
| Polyarchy | 0.61  (1.40) | -0.31  (1.51) | 0.78  (1.46) | 1.51  (1.31) |
| Ethnolinguistic | -0.84  (1.29) | -0.56  (1.28) | -0.45  (1.36) | -0.04  (1.31) |
| Int’l Org. Miss. | -0.86  (1.66) | -0.92  (1.50) | -1.19  (1.71) | -0.75  (1.37) |
| Aid/GDP | 3.48  (3.02) | 3.14  (2.89) | 3.47  (2.74) | 3.65  (2.89) |
| British Colony | 1.33\*\*  (0.65) | 1.37\*\*  (0.65) | 0.89  (0.58) | 1.00\*  (0.61) |
| French Colony | -2.21\*  (1.22) | -2.21  (1.42) | -2.01\*  (1.18) | -2.08\*  (1.15) |
| Past Horizontality | 0.81  (0.75) | 1.28  (0.80) | 0.79  (0.77) | 0.64  (0.74) |
| Constant | -1.79\*  (0.93) | -1.58\*  (0.96) | -1.33  (0.94) | -1.74\*  (0.99) |
| N | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Adj. R2 | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses; GDP=gross domestic product | | | | |

**Table 9A. Increase in Probability Horizontality is Adopted Moving from No to Full Participation (with Confidence Intervals)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level of Participation | Lowest | Highest |
| Aggregate | 0.15 (0.05, 0.26) | 0.51 (0.33, 0.70) |
| First stage (Origination) | 0.17 (0.08, 0.26) | 0.51 (0.35, 0.66) |
| Second stage (Deliberation) | 0.22 (0.13, 0.32) | 0.42 (0.26, 0.58) |

Tables 10A, 11A and 12A display the results of the interaction between inclusion and participation. The interaction term is never significant. The constituent terms for the level of inclusion are consistently significant, while the constituent term for participation is not. We note where the predicted probabilities are significant. Confidence intervals overlap.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table10A. Interaction of Inclusion and Participation** | | | | |
| Variables | Model 25  (Aggregate) | Model 26  (First Stage) | Model 27  (Second Stage) | Model 28  (Third Stage) |
| **Central Variables of Interest** | | | | |
| Incl. Agg.-  Part. Agg. | -0.06 (0.08) | --- | --- | --- |
| Incl. First-  Part. First | --- | -1.23 (0.85) | --- | --- |
| Incl. Second-Part. Second | --- | --- | -0.46 (0.67) | --- |
| Incl. Third- Part. Third | --- | --- | --- | -0.19 (0.29) |
| Conflict Intensity | -2.28\*\*\* (0.78) | -2.43\*\*\* (0.74) | -2.07\*\*\* (0.73) | -2.06\*\*\* (0.71) |
| **Constituent Variables** | | | | |
| Incl. Agg. | 0.43\* (0.23) | --- | --- | --- |
| Part. Agg. | 0.39 (0.38) | --- | --- | --- |
| Incl. First | --- | 3.56\*\* (1.76) | --- | --- |
| Part. First | --- | Omitted | --- | --- |
| Incl. Second | --- | --- | 0.86\*\* (0.41) | --- |
| Part. Second | --- | --- | 0.94 (1.27) | --- |
| Incl. Third | --- | --- | --- | 1.09\*\* (0.47) |
| Part. Third | --- | --- | --- | 0.35 (0.41) |
| **Control Variables** | | | | |
| Polyarchy | -0.12 (1.54) | -0.66 (1.67) | 0.18 (1.57) | 0.26 (1.53) |
| Ethnolinguistic | -0.74 (1.31) | -0.23 (1.30) | -0.54 (1.35) | -0.46 (1.25) |
| Int’l Org. Miss. | -1.32 (1.69) | -1.10 (1.44) | -1.40 (1.80) | -1.19 (1.66) |
| Aid/GDP | 2.55 (2.77) | 1.57 (3.26) | 3.20 (2.62) | 2.52 (2.64) |
| British Colony | 1.52\*\* (0.71) | 1.44\*\* (0.69) | 1.19\*\* (0.61) | 1.31\* (0.67) |
| French Colony | -2.09 (1.29) | -2.37\* (1.43) | -2.04\* (1.23) | -2.07\* (1.20) |
| Past Horiz. | 1.05 (0.75) | 1.32 (0.83) | 0.97 (0.75) | 0.91 (0.74) |
| Constant | -2.08\* (1.15) | -1.71\* (0.97) | -1.71\* (1.04) | -2.04\* (1.11) |
| N | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Adj. R2 | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.27 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses; GDP=gross domestic product. | | | | |

**Table 11A. Increase in Probability Horizontality is Adopted Moving from No to Full Inclusion, Participation at its Minimum and Maximum (with Confidence Intervals)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Participation at Minimum | | Participation at Maximum | |
| Level of Inclusion | Lowest | Highest | Lowest | Highest |
| Aggregate | 0.11\*\*  (0.00, 0.22) | 0.45\*\*\* (0.10, 0.81) | 0.42  (-0.12, 0.96) | 0.47\*\*\*  (0.26, 0.68) |
| First stage (Origination) | 0.15\*\*\* (0.06, 0.24) | Not estimable | Not estimable | 0.46\*\*\* (0.32, 0.60) |
| Second stage (Deliberation) | 0.16\*\*\* (0.06, 0.26) | 0.41\*\*\* (0.20, 0.62) | 0.44  (-0.36, 1.23) | 0.42\*\*\* (0.25, 0.59) |
| Third stage (Ratification) | 0.13\*\*  (0.01, 0.25) | 0.44\*\*\* (0.25, 0.62) | 0.21\*\*\* (0.07, 0.36) | 0.43\*\*\* (0.25, 0.61) |
|  | | | | |

**Table 12A. Increase in Probability Horizontality is Adopted Moving from No to Full Participation, Inclusion at its Minimum and Maximum (with Confidence Intervals)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Inclusion at Minimum | | Inclusion at Maximum | |
| Level of Participation | Lowest | Highest | Lowest | Highest |
| Aggregate | 0.11\*\*  (0.00, 0.22) | 0.42  (-0.12, 0.96) | 0.45\*\*\* (0.10, 0.81) | 0.47\*\*\* (0.26, 0.68) |
| First stage (Origination) | 0.15\*\*\* (0.06, 0.24) | Not Estimable | Not Estimable | 0.46\*\*\* (0.32, 0.60) |
| Second stage (Deliberation) | 0.16\*\*\* (0.06, 0.26) | 0.44  (-0.36, 1.24) | 0.41\*\*\* (0.20, 0.62) | 0.42\*\*\* (0.25, 0.59) |
| Third stage (Ratification) | 0.13\*\*  (0.01, 0.25) | 0.21\*\*\* (0.07, 0.36) | 0.44\*\*\* (0.25, 0.62) | 0.43\*\*\* (0.25, 0.61) |

We also conducted sensitivity analyses by running a model without variables for inclusion and participation, and compared the R squared to that of the models for each stage and the aggregate for each of the measures. The adjusted R-squared increases when inclusion and participation are each added to their separate models, indicating that their addition improves the model more than would be expected by chance. However, the addition of inclusion is associated with a greater increase in adjusted R-squared than is participation in the second and third stages. This suggests that inclusion and participation play unique roles.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 13A. Sensitivity Analysis, Model with Conflict Intensity and Controls Only** | |
| Conflict Intensity | -1.80\*\*\*  (0.69) |
| Polyarchy | 1.44  (1.31) |
| Ethnolinguistic | 0.07  (1.29) |
| Int’l Org. Miss. | -0.83  (1.36) |
| Aid/GDP | 3.56  (2.77) |
| British Colony | 0.92  (0.60) |
| French Colony | -2.00\*  (1.14) |
| Past Horizontality | 0.69  (0.74) |
| Constant | -1.61\*  (0.95) |
| N | 97 |
| Adj. R2 | 0.04 |

Below, we have listed again, for the reader’s convenience, the adjusted R squared in each model with inclusion and participation added.

**Table 14A. R Squared Comparison**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Aggregate | First Stage | Second Stage | Third Stage |
| Inclusion | 0.31 | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.27 |
| Aggregate | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.08 |