

Online Appendix I: The Effect of W/S

Although Bueno de Mesquita et. al. 1999a utilize both W and S separately, selectorate theory suggests that the ratio of W to S – what they refer to as the “loyalty norm” – is the most important variable in explaining leadership survival. This appendix replicates the tables from the main article using the ratio of W to S (as calculated in the latest version of Bueno de Mesquita et. al.’s replication data). Note that W/S does not have a disproportional relationship over time (Harrell's rho $p > .9$)

Table A.I.1: Testing the Robustness of Bueno de Mesquita et. al.’s Findings for W/S

	Model 1: Replication
W/S	1.247 (.001)
Observations	13,382
Subjects	2,689
Failures	2,424
Log-likelihood	-16677.185
Wald-test	10.49 (.001)

Note: Reported statistics are hazard ratios with p-values in parentheses. All tests are 1-tailed, except the p-value for the Wald-test.

Table A.I.2: Testing the Loyalty Norm, Controlling for Democracy/Election Indexes

	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
W/S	1.531 (.000)	.289 (.000)	.668 (.001)	.820 (.183)	.590 (.000)
W/S * ln(t+1)	---	.795 (.027)	---	---	---
WS:DemRes	1.089 (.000)	---	---	---	---
WS:DemRes * ln(t+1)	1.021 (.001)	---	---	---	---
Polity2	---	1.078 (.000)	---	---	---
Polity2 * ln(t+1)	---	1.024 (.000)	---	---	---
Election	---	---	1.306 (.003)	---	---
Election * ln(t+1)	---	---	1.347 (.000)	---	---
FHPR	---	---	---	.996 (.470)	---
FHCL	---	---	---	1.019 (.372)	---
FHCL * ln(t+1)	---	---	---	.864 (.000)	---
ACLP	---	---	---	---	.732 (.021)
ACLP * ln(t+1)	---	---	---	---	.647 (.000)
Observations	12,520	12,520	12,520	4,619	4,793
Subjects	2,570	2,570	2,570	873	919
Failures	2,315	2,315	2,315	716	786
Log-likelihood	-15622.917	-15626.033	-15766.394	-3976.844	-4499.892
Wald-test	396.15 (.000)	389.92 (.000)	109.20 (.000)	87.38 (.000)	88.56 (.000)

Note: Reported statistics are hazard ratios with p-values in parentheses. All tests are 1-tailed, except the p-value for the Wald-test.

Table A.I.3: Effect of W/S Accounting for Elections

	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9
WoverS	.669 (.090)	.540 (.000)	1.315 (.130)
Election	Stratified	Election = 0	Election = 1
Observations	12,520	8,098	4,422
Subjects	2,689	1,460	1,270
Failures	2,424	1,228	1,087
Log-likelihood	-14208.995	-7617.851	-6586.963
Wald-test	11.73 (.001)	20.81 (.001)	1.28 (.258)

Note: Reported statistics are hazard ratios with p-values in parentheses. All tests are 1-tailed, except the p-value for the Wald-test.

Table A.I.4: Effect of W/S Accounting for Military Regimes and Time

	Model 10	Model 11	Model 12	Model 13	Model 14
WoverS	1.170 (.091)	1.816 (.000)	1.242 (.206)	1.434 (.001)	1.368 (.001)
WoverS * ln(t+1)	1.513 (.000)	---	---	---	---
Military_regime	1.104 (.185)	Military = 0	Military = 1	---	---
Military_regime * ln(t+1)	1.581 (.000)	---	---	---	---
Time	---	---	---	Year < 1945	Year ≥ 1945
Observations	13,377	11,814	1,563	5,174	8,208
Subjects	2,689	2,449	520	1,217	1,488
Failures	2,424	2,053	371	1,115	1,309
Log-likelihood	-16624.321	-13868.367	-1737.342	-6766.535	-8224.530
Wald-test	116.40 (.000)	47.26 (.000)	0.66 (.415)	11.99 (.001)	11.09 (.001)

* The reported statistics are hazard ratios, with p-values reported in parentheses.