# Replication: How the Party Commands the Gun: The Foreign—Domestic Threat Dilemma in China

Mattingly, Daniel (2022)

By Caesar Zhang

### Explaining the Original Work:

- Research Question: Who is more likely to be promoted to general and the Central Military Committee (CMC)?
- Hypothesis: There is a trade-off in loyalty and professionalism.
- Outcome variables:

Central Military Committee Member: Yes (1) vs. No (0)

Promoted to General: Yes (1) vs. No (0)

• Explanatory Variables:

Career Connection with Leader: Yes (1) vs. No (0)

Combat Experience after 1949: Yes (1) or No (0)

Ethnic Minority: Yes (1) or No (0)

Rural Birth: Yes (1) or No (0)

Princeling (parents joined PLA or Red Army): Yes (1) or No (0)

Education: 1=primary graduate, 2=college/military academy graduate, 3=postgraduate

#### Data Generation

• Original Dataset





- "extensive biographical data on nearly all officers who reached the level of deputy military region commander or deputy commissar"
- 1923 key-position officers from 1949 to 2019
- Specified on 779 officers, 1978 to 2019
- Four leaders' era: Deng, Jiang, Hu, Xi





#### Model Choice: OLS

- The author also ran the logit regression for the main table, but only OLS is included in the paper.
- The author ran OLS for the promotion & tie with different leaders, but did not run logit regression for it.
- The author ran OLS for post-Deng officers, but did not run logit regression for it.

• The OLS is chosen, but the author did not give a reason for the selection.

# Findings by Author: Promotion to General

Table 23: Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to General by CMC Chairman, Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.

$Dependent\ variable:$							
Promoted t	o General (Deng)	Promoted to General (Jiang)		Promoted to General (Hu)		Promoted to General (Xi)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
0.203** (0.040)	0.185** (0.043)						
		0.034 $(0.112)$	0.061 (0.110)				
				$0.090 \\ (0.251)$	-0.062 (0.238)		
						0.266** (0.097)	0.265** (0.097)
0.024 (0.018)	$-0.228^*$ (0.092)	0.232** (0.025)	-0.226 (0.323)	0.244** (0.031)	-0.161 (0.413)	0.119** (0.025)	-0.155 $(0.140)$
209	207	312	308	200	200	190	187
$0.110 \\ 0.105$	0.198 $0.144$	$0.0003 \\ -0.003$	0.141 $0.100$	$0.001 \\ -0.004$	$0.166 \\ 0.122$	0.038 $0.033$	$0.162 \\ 0.114$
	(1) 0.203** (0.040) 0.024 (0.018) 209 0.110	0.203**	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Promoted to General (Deng) Promoted to General (Jiang) (1) (2) (3) (4)  0.203** 0.185** (0.040) (0.043)  0.034 0.061 (0.112) (0.110)  0.024 -0.228* 0.232** -0.226 (0.018) (0.092) (0.025) (0.323)  209 207 312 308 0.110 0.198 0.0003 0.141	Promoted to General (Deng)   Promoted to General (Jiang)   Promoted to $(1)$ $(2)$ $(3)$ $(4)$ $(5)$ $(5)$ $(0.203^{**}$ $0.185^{**}$ $(0.040)$ $(0.043)$ $(0.034  0.061  0.112)$ $(0.110)$ $(0.110)$ $(0.251)$ $(0.024  -0.228^*  0.232^{**}  -0.226  0.244^{**}$ $(0.018)$ $(0.092)$ $(0.025)$ $(0.323)$ $(0.031)$ $(0.031)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$ $(0.0110)$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

# Findings by Author: Promotion to CMC (OLS)

Table 24: Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to CMC by CMC Chairman, Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.

	$Dependent\ variable:$							
	Promoted	to CMC (Deng)	Promoted to CMC (Jiang)		Promoted to CMC (Hu)		Promoted to CMC (Xi	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping	0.480** (0.043)	0.075* (0.030)						
Career Tie to Jiang Zemin			0.019 $(0.057)$	0.029 $(0.054)$				
Career Tie to Hu Jintao					-0.046 (0.149)	-0.098 (0.140)		
Career Tie to Xi Jinping							0.351** (0.063)	0.288** (0.059)
Constant	$0.020^{+}$ $(0.010)$	0.558** (0.048)	0.047** (0.012)	-0.145 (0.157)	0.046** (0.016)	0.991** (0.197)	0.034* (0.016)	0.373** (0.085)
Control variables		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>
Observations	325	321	311	307	177	177	189	186
$\mathbb{R}^2$	0.274	0.806	0.0004	0.204	0.001	0.194	0.144	0.329
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.272	0.797	-0.003	0.166	-0.005	0.146	0.139	0.291

### Findings by author, binary logit regression

Table 1: Promotion to full general-level position and to the CCP Central Military Commis-

			Dependen	t variable:			
	Prom	Promoted to General			Promoted to CMC		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Career Tie to Paramount Leader	0.200** (0.048)		0.133** (0.047)	0.176** (0.039)		0.128** (0.036)	
Combat Experience, Post-1949		0.348** (0.052)	0.248** (0.057)		0.153** (0.042)	$0.077^*$ $(0.039)$	
College-Level Education			0.129** (0.030)			0.049** (0.016)	
Long March Participant			$0.095 \\ (0.095)$			0.248** (0.075)	
Political Commissar Experience			0.106** (0.032)			-0.018 $(0.018)$	
Ethnic Minority			0.145 $(0.124)$			$0.070 \\ (0.070)$	
Princeling			0.010 (0.080)			-0.005 $(0.043)$	
Rural Birth			$0.071^{+}$ (0.042)			0.076** (0.027)	
Constant	0.218** (0.016)	0.217** (0.016)	$0.325^{+}$ $(0.173)$	0.045** (0.008)	0.055** (0.009)	0.250 $(0.157)$	
Birth cohort fixed effects			✓			✓	
Observations $R^2$ Adjusted $R^2$	764 $0.029$ $0.027$	779 0.071 0.069	755 0.160 0.144	764 0.061 0.060	779 0.039 0.037	755 0.231 0.216	

Table 25: Logistic Regression, Main Table: Promotion to full general and to the CCP Central Military Commission

	$Dependent\ variable:$						
	Promoted to General			Promoted to CMC			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Career Tie to Paramount Leader	0.946** (0.208)		0.751** (0.246)	1.793** (0.291)		1.619** (0.385)	
Combat Experience, Post-1949		1.543** (0.223)	1.239** (0.281)		1.515** (0.300)	0.855 <sup>+</sup> (0.450)	
College-Level Education			0.879** (0.218)			1.135* (0.443)	
Long March Participant			0.375 $(0.474)$			$1.717^{+}$ $(1.025)$	
Political Commissar Experience			0.667** (0.194)			-0.273 $(0.374)$	
Ethnic Minority			0.784 (0.589)			1.273 (0.864)	
Princeling			0.083 (0.473)			-0.140 $(0.845)$	
Rural Birth			0.383 $(0.234)$			1.077** (0.379)	
Constant	$-1.277^{**}$ (0.096)	$-1.284^{**}$ (0.093)	-1.136 (0.820)	$-3.051^{**}$ (0.190)	$-2.852^{**}$ (0.169)	-3.045** (1.150)	
Birth cohort fixed effects			<b>√</b>			<b>√</b>	
Observations	764	779	755	764	779	755	
Log Likelihood	-419.616	-423.659	-366.939	-182.641	-195.206	-141.371	
Akaike Inf. Crit.	843.231	851.317	763.878	369.282	394.412	312.741	

#### My Contribution

- 1. Why we should use logit regression here, despite "the results remain robust" as in OLS?
- 2. Run logit regression on promotion & tie with different leaders
  ("Which leader is more likely to promote the "loyal"?")
  Run logit regression on post-Deng officers
  ("With what features is an officers more likely to be promoted in post-Deng era?")
- 3. Add three interaction effects in the main model:
- rural : minority
- combat\_post\_1949 : commissar
- minority : commissar
- 4. Possible Future Studies

# Contribution 1: logit regression, not OLS

• Outcome variables, promotion to general & promotion to CMC are binary;

• The coefficients in the OLS model can only tell direction, but we can't interpret individual coefficient (the partial effect).

#### Contribution 2

• logit regression on promotion & tie with different leaders ("Which leader is more likely to promote the "loyal"?")

• Run logit regression on post-Deng officers

("With what features is an officers more likely to be promoted in post-Deng era?")

# Promotion to General & Tie to leaders Original Code with OLS

```
lm1 <- lm(general_deng~deng.network, data=bio)</pre>
lm2 <- lm(general_deng~deng.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
            commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
lm3 <- lm(general_jiang~jiang.network, data=bio)</pre>
lm4 <- lm(general_jiang~jiang.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+</pre>
            commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
lm5 <- lm(general_hu~hu.network. data=bio)</pre>
lm6 <- lm(general_hu~hu.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
            commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
lm7 <- lm(general_xi~xi.network, data=bio)</pre>
lm8 <- lm(general_xi~xi.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
            commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
stargazer(lm1, lm2, lm3, lm4, lm5, lm6, lm7, lm8, type = "latex",
          omit=c("combat_post_1949", "college", "participated_long_march", "commissar",
                 "minority", "parent_CCP_leader", "rural", "cohort_decade").
          label = "table_a18".
          omit.stat=c("f", "ser"),
          dep.var.labels = c("Promoted to General (Deng)", "Promoted to General (Jiang)",
                              "Promoted to General (Hu)", "Promoted to General (Xi)"),
          title = "Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to General by CMC Chairman,
          Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.",
          covariate.labels = c("Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping", "Career Tie to Jiang Zemin",
                                "Career Tie to Hu Jintao", "Career Tie to Xi Jinping"),
          star.char = c("+", "*", "**"),
          notes.append=FALSE.
          notes = c("\$^{+}\p$<\$0.1; \$^{*}\p$<\$0.05; \$^{**}\p$<\$0.01}"),
          out = "Table_A18.tex")
```

### Promotion to General & Tie to leaders Replicate with logit regression

```
glm1 <- glm(general_deng~deng.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))</pre>
glm2 <- glm(general_deng~deng.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm3 <- glm(general_jiang~jiang.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm4 <- glm(general_jiang~jiang.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm5 <- glm(general_hu~hu.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm6 <- glm(general_hu~hu.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm7 <- glm(general xi~xi.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm8 <- glm(general_xi~xi.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+c
            ommissar+minority+parent CCP leader+rural+cohort decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
stargazer(glm1, glm2, glm3, glm4, glm5, glm6, glm7, glm8, type = "latex",
          omit=c("combat_post_1949", "college", "participated_long_march",
                 "commissar", "minority", "parent_CCP_leader", "rural", "cohort_decade"),
         label = "table_a18".
          omit.stat=c("f". "ser").
          dep.var.labels = c("Promoted to General (Deng)", "Promoted to General (Jiang)",
                             "Promoted to General (Hu)", "Promoted to General (Xi)"),
         title = "Logit Regression, Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to General by CMC Chairman,
          Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.",
          covariate.labels = c("Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping", "Career Tie to Jiang Zemin",
                               "Career Tie to Hu Jintao", "Career Tie to Xi Jinping"),
          star.char = c("+", "*", "**"),
         notes.append=FALSE,
         notes = c("\$^{+}\$p\$<\$0.1; \$^{*}\$p\$<\$0.05; \$^{**}\$p\$<\$0.01"),
          out = "Table_A18.tex")
```

# Promotion to General & Tie to leaders OLS vs. Logit Regression

Table 23: Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to General by CMC Chairman, Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans Term.

		$Dependent\ variable:$						
	Promoted t	o General (Deng)	Promoted to General (Jiang)		Promoted to General (Hu)		Promoted to General (Xi	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping	0.203** (0.040)	0.185** (0.043)						
Career Tie to Jiang Zemin			0.034 $(0.112)$	0.061 (0.110)				
Career Tie to Hu Jintao					$0.090 \\ (0.251)$	-0.062 (0.238)		
Career Tie to Xi Jinping							0.266** (0.097)	0.265** (0.097)
Constant	0.024 (0.018)	$-0.228^*$ (0.092)	0.232** (0.025)	-0.226 (0.323)	0.244** (0.031)	-0.161 (0.413)	0.119** (0.025)	-0.155 $(0.140)$
Observations R <sup>2</sup>	209 0.110	207 0.198	312 0.0003	308 0.141	200 0.001	200 0.166	190 0.038	187 0.162
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.105	0.144	-0.003	0.100	-0.004	0.122	0.033	0.114

Table 27: Logit Regression, Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to General by CMC Chairman, Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.

				Dependent v	variable:			
	Promoted t	o General (Deng)	Promoted to	Promoted to General (Jiang) Promoted			Promoted to General (Xi)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping	2.471** (0.621)	2.692** (0.796)						
Career Tie to Jiang Zemin			0.184 (0.600)	0.475 $(0.672)$				
Career Tie to Hu Jintao					0.440 (1.236)	-0.353 (1.252)		
Career Tie to Xi Jinping							1.535* (0.616)	2.159** (0.788)
Constant	-3.695** $(0.506)$	$-25.688 \\ (5,135.905)$	$-1.195^{**}$ (0.137)	$-19.186 \\ (2,795.266)$	-1.133** (0.166)	$-16.660 \\ (1,455.398)$	-2.005** $(0.232)$	$-21.553 \\ (3,982.260)$
Observations	209	207	312	308	200	200	190	187
Log Likelihood Akaike Inf. Crit.	-42.412 $88.824$	-30.839 $89.678$	-169.693 $343.386$	-144.408 $318.816$	$-111.295 \\ 226.590$	-92.642 $207.285$	-73.128 $150.255$	-56.742 $135.483$
Note:	00.021	00.010	010.000	010.010	220.000	201.200		<0.05; **n<0.01

# Promotion to CMC & Tie to leaders Original Code with OLS

```
lm1 <- lm(cmc_deng~deng.network, data=bio)</pre>
lm2 <- lm(cmc_deng~deng.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
           commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
lm3 <- lm(cmc_iiang~iiang.network. data=bio)</pre>
lm4 <- lm(cmc_jiang~jiang.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
           commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
lm5 <- lm(cmc_hu~hu.network, data=bio)</pre>
lm6 <- lm(cmc_hu~hu.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+commissar+
           minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade. data=bio)
lm7 <- lm(cmc_xi~xi.network, data=bio)</pre>
lm8 <- lm(cmc xi~xi.network+combat post 1949+college+participated long march+commissar+
           minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio)
stargazer(lm1, lm2, lm3, lm4, lm5, lm6, lm7, lm8, type = "latex",
         omit=c("combat_post_1949", "college", "participated_long_march", "commissar",
                "minority", "parent_CCP_leader", "rural", "cohort_decade"),
         label = "table_a19",
         omit.stat=c("f", "ser"),
         dep.var.labels = c("Promoted to CMC (Deng)", "Promoted to CMC (Jiang)",
                            "Promoted to CMC (Hu)", "Promoted to CMC (Xi)"),
         title = "Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to CMC by CMC Chairman.
         Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.",
         covariate.labels = c("Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping", "Career Tie to Jiang Zemin",
                              "Career Tie to Hu Jintao", "Career Tie to Xi Jinping"),
         star.char = c("+", "*", "**"),
         notes.append=FALSE.
         notes = c("\$^{+}\$p\$<\$0.1; \$^{*}\$p\$<\$0.05; \$^{**}\$p\$<\$0.01"),
         out = "Table_A19.tex")
```

# Promotion to CMC & Tie to leaders Replicate with logit regression

```
glm1 <- glm(cmc_deng~deng.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))</pre>
glm2 <- glm(cmc_deng~deng.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
alm3 <- glm(cmc iiang~iiang.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))</pre>
glm4 <- glm(cmc_jiang~jiang.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm5 <- glm(cmc_hu~hu.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))</pre>
glm6 <- glm(cmc_hu~hu.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm7 <- glm(cmc_xi~xi.network, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))</pre>
glm8 <- glm(cmc_xi~xi.network+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
              commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
stargazer(glm1, glm2, glm3, glm4, glm5, glm6, glm7, glm8, type = "latex",
          omit=c("combat_post_1949", "college", "participated_long_march", "commissar", "minority",
                 "parent_CCP_leader", "rural", "cohort_decade"),
          label = "table_a19",
          omit.stat=c("f", "ser"),
          dep.var.labels = c("Promoted to CMC (Deng)", "Promoted to CMC (Jiang)", "Promoted to CMC (Hu)".
                             "Promoted to CMC (Xi)").
          title = "logit regression Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to CMC by CMC Chairman.
          Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.".
          covariate.labels = c("Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping", "Career Tie to Jiang Zemin",
                                "Career Tie to Hu Jintao", "Career Tie to Xi Jinpina").
          add.lines=list(c("Control variables", "", "$\\checkmark$","", "$\\checkmark$","", "$\\checkmark$"),
          star.char = c("+", "*", "**"),
          notes.append=FALSE.
          notes = c("\$^{+}\$p\$<\$0.1; \$^{*}\$p\$<\$0.05; \$^{**}\$p$<\$0.01}")
          out = "Table A19.tex")
```

### Promotion to CMC & Tie to leaders OLS vs. Logit Regression

		$Dependent\ variable:$						
	Promoted	to CMC (Deng)	Promoted to CMC (Jiang)		Promoted to CMC (Hu)		Promoted to CMC (Xi	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping	0.480** (0.043)	0.075* (0.030)						
Career Tie to Jiang Zemin			0.019 $(0.057)$	0.029 $(0.054)$				
Career Tie to Hu Jintao					-0.046 $(0.149)$	-0.098 (0.140)		
Career Tie to Xi Jinping							0.351** (0.063)	0.288** (0.059)
Constant	$0.020^{+}$ $(0.010)$	0.558** (0.048)	0.047** (0.012)	-0.145 (0.157)	0.046** (0.016)	0.991** (0.197)	0.034* (0.016)	0.373** (0.085)
Control variables		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>
Observations	325	321	311	307	177	177	189	186
$\mathbb{R}^2$	0.274	0.806	0.0004	0.204	0.001	0.194	0.144	0.329
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.272	0.797	-0.003	0.166	-0.005	0.146	0.139	0.291

Table 24: Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to CMC by CMC Chairman, Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term. Table 28: logit regression Cross-Sectional Measure of Promotion to CMC by CMC Chairman, Restricted to Generals Eligible For Promotion During Each Chairmans' Term.

		$Dependent\ variable:$						
	Promoted	to CMC (Deng)	Promoted to CMC (Jiang)		Promoted to CMC (Hu)		Promoted to CMC (Xi)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Career Tie to Deng Xiaoping	3.915** (0.626)	$21.346 \\ (24,859.740)$						
Career Tie to Jiang Zemin			0.364 $(1.071)$	0.747 $(1.297)$				
Career Tie to Hu Jintao					-13.528 $(1,696.734)$	-18.893 (12,531.920)		
Career Tie to Xi Jinping							2.874** (0.705)	3.511** (1.091)
Constant	-3.915** $(0.412)$	7.095 (308,115.800)	-3.003** $(0.274)$	$-21.648 \\ (7,025.609)$	-3.039** $(0.362)$	4.584 (17,849.010)	-3.344** $(0.415)$	$-2.832^{+}$ $(1.572)$
Control variables		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>		✓
Observations	325	321	311	307	177	177	189	186
Log Likelihood	-42.028	-0.000	-60.056 $124.112$	-44.017 $118.033$	-32.497 $68.994$	-21.875 $65.750$	-34.831 $73.661$	-20.063

# Post-Deng General Promotion OLS vs. Logit regression: Code

```
lm1 <- lm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1)</pre>
lm2 <- lm(general~combat_post_1949, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1)</pre>
lm3 <- lm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949+
            college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1)
lm4 <- lm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1)</pre>
lm5 <- lm(cmc~combat_post_1949, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1)</pre>
1m6 <- lm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
          +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1)
rob.fit1
                <- coeftest(lm1, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))</pre>
rob.fit2
                <- coeftest(lm2, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
                <- coeftest(lm3, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit3
rob.fit4
                <- coeftest(lm4, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit5
                <- coeftest(1m5, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit6
                <- coeftest(1m6, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
stargazer(lm1, lm2, lm3, lm4, lm5, lm6, type = "latex",
          se = list(rob.fit1[,"Std. Error"], rob.fit2[,"Std. Error"],
                    rob.fit3[,"Std. Error"], rob.fit4[,"Std. Error"],
                    rob.fit5[."Std. Error"]. rob.fit6[."Std. Error"]).
          omit=c("cohort_decade"),
          label = "table_a11".
          omit.stat=c("f", "ser"),
          dep.var.labels = c("Promoted to General", "Promoted to CMC"),
          title = "Post-Deng Officers Only: Promotion to full general-level
          position and to the CCP Central Military Commission",
          star.char = c("+", "*", "**"),
          notes.append=FALSE.
          notes = c("\$^{+}\$p\$<\$0.1; \$^{*}\$p\$<\$0.05; \$^{**}\$p\$<\$0.01}"),
          covariate.labels = c("Career Tie to Paramount Leader",
                                "Combat Experience, Post-1949", "College-Level Education",
                                "Long March Participant", "Political Commissar Experience",
                                "Ethnic Minority", "Princeling", "Rural Birth"),
          out = "Table A11.tex"
```

# Post-Deng CMC Promotion OLS vs. Logit regression: Code

```
glm1 <- glm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1, family=binomial(link="logit"))</pre>
glm2 <- glm(general~combat_post_1949, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm3 <- glm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
             commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm4 <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm5 <- glm(cmc~combat_post_1949, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1, family=binomial(link="logit"))
glm6 <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949+college+participated_long_march+
             commissar+minority+parent_CCP_leader+rural, data=bio, subset=post_deng==1, family=binomial(link="logit"))
rob.fit1
                <- coeftest(glm1, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit2
                <- coeftest(qlm2, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit3
                <- coeftest(qlm3, function(x) vcovHC(x, tvpe="HC3"))</pre>
rob.fit4
                <- coeftest(qlm4, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit5
                <- coeftest(glm5, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))
rob.fit6
                <- coeftest(g1m6, function(x) vcovHC(x, type="HC3"))</pre>
stargazer(glm1, glm2, glm3, glm4, glm5, glm6, type = "latex",
          se = list(rob.fit1[,"Std. Error"], rob.fit2[,"Std. Error"],
                    rob.fit3[."Std. Error"], rob.fit4[."Std. Error"],
                    rob.fit5[."Std. Error"]. rob.fit6[."Std. Error"]).
          omit=c("cohort_decade"),
          label = "table_a11".
          omit.stat=c("f", "ser"),
          dep.var.labels = c("Promoted to General", "Promoted to CMC"),
          title = "glm, Post-Deng Officers Only: Promotion to full general-level
          position and to the CCP Central Military Commission",
          star.char = c("+", "*", "**"),
          notes.append=FALSE.
          notes = c("\$^{+}\p$<\$0.1; \$^{*}\p$<\$0.05; \$^{**}\p$<\$0.01}"),
          covariate.labels = c("Career Tie to Paramount Leader",
                                "Combat Experience, Post-1949", "College-Level Education",
                                "Long March Participant", "Political Commissar Experience",
                                "Ethnic Minority", "Princeling", "Rural Birth"),
          out = "Table A11.tex")
```

### Post-Deng General & CMC Promotion OLS vs. Logit regression: Output

+p<0.1; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table 17: Post-Deng Officers Only: Promotion to full general-level position and to the CCP Central Military Commission

			Depender	nt variable:			
	Pro	Promoted to General			Promoted to CMC		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Career Tie to Paramount Leader	0.169** (0.055)		0.125* (0.055)	0.129** (0.041)		0.100** (0.038)	
Combat Experience, Post-1949		0.349** (0.066)	0.245** (0.072)		$0.117^*$ $(0.047)$	0.058 $(0.043)$	
College-Level Education			0.133** (0.031)			0.039** (0.015)	
Long March Participant			0.459** (0.159)			0.429* (0.214)	
Political Commissar Experience			0.110** (0.034)			-0.017 $(0.017)$	
Ethnic Minority			0.022 (0.131)			0.017 $(0.069)$	
Princeling			-0.014 (0.078)			0.007 $(0.044)$	
Rural Birth			$0.088^{+}$ $(0.048)$			$0.055^{+}$ $(0.031)$	
Constant	0.203** (0.017)	0.207** (0.017)	$0.040 \\ (0.024)$	0.034** (0.008)	0.042** (0.008)	-0.0005 $(0.011)$	
Observations R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	648 0.019 0.017	663 0.057 0.056	648 0.114 0.103	648 0.040 0.038	663 0.024 0.022	648 0.110 0.099	

Note:

Table 18: glm, Post-Deng Officers Only: Promotion to full general-level position and to the CCP Central Military Commission

		$Dependent\ variable:$					
	Pro	Promoted to General			Promoted to CMC		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Career Tie to Paramount Leader	0.845** (0.249)		$0.707^*$ $(0.284)$	1.715** (0.377)		1.497** (0.425)	
Combat Experience, Post-1949		1.568** (0.277)	1.262** (0.336)		1.468** (0.406)	$0.740 \\ (0.545)$	
College-Level Education			0.937** (0.240)			1.153* (0.487)	
Long March Participant			$2.679^{+}$ (1.433)			$2.374^{+}$ $(1.291)$	
Political Commissar Experience			0.693** (0.206)			-0.403 (0.430)	
Ethnic Minority			0.171 $(0.707)$			0.434 $(1.275)$	
Princeling			-0.070 (0.469)			0.151 (0.777)	
Rural Birth			$0.508^{+}$ $(0.262)$			0.929* (0.464)	
Constant	-1.369** (0.105)	-1.345** (0.101)	-2.569** (0.243)	-3.353** (0.234)	-3.135** (0.205)	-4.436** (0.478)	
Observations Log Likelihood Akaike Inf. Crit.	648 -340.195 684.390	663 -348.983 701.965	648 -310.012 638.024	648 -121.236 246.473	663 -131.489 266.979 1	648 -109.285 9 236.570	
Note:				+1	o<0.1; *p<0.0	5; **p<0.01	

#### Contribution 3:

• Add three interaction effects in the main model:

- rural : minority
- combat\_post\_1949 : commissar
- minority : commissar

### Interaction 1 Minority: Rural

```
## additive model: general promotion
glm_general <- glm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
                    +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                      parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(glm_general)
starqazer(qlm_qeneral, titile = "logit model, additive: general")
                                                                           test <- anova(glm_gen, glm_int_gen_mr, test="LRT")</pre>
                                                                            test
                                                                            stargazer(test, title="Test: Interactive Model or not, general, minority: rural")
## interaction model: general promotion
glm_int_general <- glm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
                        +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                          parent CCP leader+rural+cohort decade +
                          minority: rural, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(glm_int_general)
stargazer(glm int general, titile = "logit model, additive; general")
## additive model: cmc promotion
glm_cmc <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
              +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade. data=bio. family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(qlm)
stargazer(glm, title = "logit model, additive: cmc")
                                                                             test <- anova(glm_cmc, glm_int_cmc_mr, test="LRT")
                                                                              test
                                                                              stargazer(test, title="Test: Interactive Model or not, cmc, minority : rural")
## interaction model: cmc promotion
glm_int_cmc <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
                  +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                    barent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade + minority : rural, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(glm_int)
stargazer(glm_int, title = "logit model, interaction: cmc")
```

#### Additive vs. Interaction: General Promotion

Holding other covariates constant, if an officer from ethnic minority background is born in rural China, the log odds of that officer being promoted to general are by 0.516 larger than those officers from ethnic minority families and born in urban on average.

But the interaction effect is not significantly different from 0.

Therefore, the effect of being born in rural China does not have a different effect (that statistically significantly different from 0) between officers from Han ethnicity and ethnic minority on being promoted to general or not.

Table 11: logit model, additive: general

Table 11. logic mov	dei, additive: general
	Dependent variable:
	general
cmc_chair_connection_current	0.751***
	(0.237)
combat_post_1949	1.239***
	(0.274)
college	0.879***
	(0.217)
participated_long_march	0.375
F	(0.446)
commissar	0.667***
	(0.188)
minority	0.784
	(0.538)
parent_CCP_leader	0.083
parent 2001 20000	(0.451)
rural	0.383*
	(0.232)
cohort_decade1	-0.782
	(0.706)
cohort_decade2	-1.751**
	(0.754)
cohort_decade3	-1.397*
	(0.742)
cohort_decade4	-1.608**
	(0.733)
cohort_decade5	-1.139
	(0.729)
cohort_decade6	-2.087**
	(0.944)
Constant	-1.136
	(0.736)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood	-366.939
Akaike Inf. Crit.	763.878
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.05

Table 12: logit model, interaction, general

	Dependent variable:
	general
cmc_chair_connection_current	0.755***
	(0.237)
1 1040	1.234***
combat_post_1949	(0.274)
college	0.880***
	(0.217)
participated_long_march	0.372
	(0.447)
commissar	0.670***
	(0.188)
minority	0.694
minority	(0.599)
	, ,
parent_CCP_leader	0.093
	(0.452)
rural	0.372
	(0.234)
cohort_decade1	-0.784
	(0.706)
cohort_decade2	-1.765**
conort_decade2	(0.755)
1 . 1 . 1 . 1	1.000+
cohort_decade3	-1.398* (0.742)
cohort_decade4	-1.614**
	(0.733)
cohort_decade5	-1.143
	(0.729)
cohort_decade6	-2.085**
	(0.943)
min onitronnol	0.516
minority:rural	(1.446)
Constant	-1.131
	(0.736)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood	-366.874
Akaike Inf. Crit.	765.747 ∠∠
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

lote: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

#### Additive vs. Interaction: CMC Promotion

Holding other covariates constant, if an officer from ethnic minority background is born in rural China, the log odds of that officer being promoted to CMC are by 1.055 larger than those officers from ethnic minority families and born in urban on average.

But the interaction effect is not significantly different from 0.

Therefore, the effect of being born in rural China does not have a different effect between officers from Han ethnicity and ethnic minority on being promoted to CMC or not.

Table 9: logit model, additive: cmc

	Dependent variable:
	cmc
cmc_chair_connection_current	1.619*** (0.356)
combat_post_1949	0.855** (0.425)
college	1.135*** (0.440)
participated_long_march	1.717** (0.741)
commissar	-0.273 (0.350)
minority	1.273 (0.845)
parent_CCP_leader	-0.140 $(0.815)$
rural	1.077*** (0.386)
cohort_decade1	-1.924** (0.847)
cohort_decade2	-3.041*** (1.063)
cohort_decade3	-1.886* (1.016)
cohort_decade4	-1.279 (0.955)
cohort_decade5	-1.257 $(0.957)$
cohort_decade6	-1.519 (1.373)
Constant	-3.045*** $(0.974)$
Observations Log Likelihood Akaike Inf. Crit.	755 -141.371 312.741
Note:	*n<0.1: **n<0.05: ***n<0.

Table 10: logit model, interaction: cmc

	Dependent variable:
	cmc
cmc_chair_connection_current	1.630***
	(0.356)
combat_post_1949	0.868**
	(0.426)
college	1.129**
	(0.440)
participated_long_march	1.717**
	(0.745)
commissar	-0.278
	(0.350)
minority	0.933
	(1.111)
parent_CCP_leader	-0.100
	(0.815)
rural	1.051***
	(0.390)
cohort_decade1	-1.943**
	(0.848)
cohort_decade2	-3.111***
	(1.077)
cohort_decade3	-1.870*
	(1.017)
cohort_decade4	-1.283
	(0.956)
cohort_decade5	-1.257
	(0.958)
cohort_decade6	-1.502
	(1.374)
minority:rural	1.055 (1.851)
	(1.651)
Constant	-3.028***
	(0.975)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood	-141.207
Akaike Inf. Crit.	314.415
	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

### Model Comparison with "LRT"

- P-value > 0.05 # General Promotion
- P-value > 0.05 # CMC Promotion

• We cannot deny the null hypothesis that the interaction model is not better than the additive model in explaining the general and CMC promotion.

Table 34: Test: Interactive Model or not, general, minority: rural

Statistic	Ν	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Resid. Df	2	739.500	0.707	739	740
Resid. Dev	2	733.813	0.093	733.747	733.878
Df	1	1.000		1	1
Deviance	1	0.131		0.131	0.131
Pr(>Chi)	1	0.718		0.718	0.718

Table 35: Test: Interactive Model or not, cmc, minority: rural

Statistic	Ν	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Resid. Df	2	739.500	0.707	739	740
Resid. Dev	2	282.578	0.231	282.415	282.741
Df	1	1.000		1	1
Deviance	1	0.326		0.326	0.326
Pr(>Chi)	1	0.568		0.568	0.568

# Interaction 2 combat\_post\_1949 : commissar

```
## interaction model (combat_post_1949 : commissar): general promotion
glm_int_gen_cc <- glm(general~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
                       +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                         parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade +
                         combat_post_1949 : commissar, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(glm_int_gen_cc)
stargazer(glm_int_gen_cc, title = "logit model, interaction (combat_post_1949 : commissar): general")
## interaction model (combat_post_1949 : commissar): cmc promotion
glm_int_cmc_cc <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949
                   +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                     parent CCP leader+rural+cohort decade +
                     combat_post_1949 : commissar, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(glm_int_cmc_cc)
stargazer(glm_int_cmc_cc, title = "logit model, interaction (combat_post_1949 : commissar): cmc")
test <- anova(glm_gen, glm_int_gen_cc, test="LRT")
test
stargazer(test, title="Test: Interactive Model or not, general, combat : commissar")
test <- anova(glm_cmc, glm_int_cmc_cc, test="LRT")
test
stargazer(test, title="Test: Interactive Model or not, cmc, combat : commissar")
```

#### Additive vs. Interaction: General Promotion

Holding other covariates constant, if an officer with combat experience after 1949 has commissar experience at the same time, the log odds of that officer being promoted to general are by 0.371 smaller than those combat experienced officers without commissar experience.

But the interaction effect is not significantly different from 0.

Therefore, the effect of having combat experience does not have a different effect (that statistically significantly different from 0) between officers with commissar experience and those without commissar experience.

Table 11: logit model, additive: general

	Dependent variable:
	general
cmc_chair_connection_current	0.751***
	(0.237)
combat_post_1949	1.239***
	(0.274)
college	0.879***
	(0.217)
participated_long_march	0.375
	(0.446)
commissar	0.667***
	(0.188)
minority	0.784
*	(0.538)
parent_CCP_leader	0.083
	(0.451)
rural	0.383*
	(0.232)
cohort_decade1	-0.782
	(0.706)
cohort_decade2	-1.751**
	(0.754)
cohort_decade3	-1.397*
	(0.742)
cohort_decade4	-1.608**
	(0.733)
cohort_decade5	-1.139
	(0.729)
cohort_decade6	-2.087**
	(0.944)
Constant	-1.136
	(0.736)
Observations	755
	100
Log Likelihood Akaike Inf. Crit.	-366.939 763.878

Table 13: logit model, interaction (combatpost 1949: commissar): general

	Dependent variable:
	general
cmc_chair_connection_current	0.753***
	(0.237)
combat_post_1949	1.377***
	(0.337)
college	0.873***
0-	(0.217)
participated_long_march	0.360
F	(0.445)
commissar	0.722***
Commissar	(0.204)
	, ,
minority	0.746 (0.542)
	(0.342)
parent_CCP_leader	0.081
	(0.453)
rural	0.387*
	(0.232)
cohort_decade1	-0.791
	(0.708)
cohort_decade2	-1.773**
contriguedado	(0.756)
cohort_decade3	-1.390*
conort_decadeo	(0.743)
cohort_decade4	-1.620**
conort_decade4	(0.734)
	, ,
cohort_decade5	-1.157
	(0.731)
cohort_decade6	-2.092**
	(0.945)
combat_post_1949:commissar	-0.371
comparapostaro to	(0.525)
Constant	-1.147
Constant	(0.737)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood Akaike Inf. Crit.	-366.691 $765.381$
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
	20

#### Additive vs. Interaction: CMC Promotion

Holding other covariates constant, if an officer with combat experience after 1949 also has career experience in commissar, the log odds of that officer being promoted to CMC are by 0.221

experiences but have no experience in commissar.

But the interaction effect is not significantly different from 0.

larger than those officers with combat

Therefore, the effect of being born in rural China does not have a different effect (that statistically significantly different from 0) between officers from Han ethnicity and ethnic minority on being promoted to CMC or not.

Table 9: logit model, additive: cmc

	Dependent variable:
	cmc
cmc_chair_connection_current	1.619***
	(0.356)
combat_post_1949	0.855**
	(0.425)
ollege	1.135***
	(0.440)
participated_long_march	1.717**
ar or pared_tong_mmen	(0.741)
ommissar	-0.273
Ommisser	(0.350)
ninority	1.273
	(0.845)
arent_CCP_leader	-0.140
arene_cor_leader	(0.815)
ural	1.077***
	(0.386)
ohort_decade1	-1.924**
	(0.847)
ohort_decade2	-3.041***
	(1.063)
ohort_decade3	-1.886*
	(1.016)
ohort_decade4	-1.279
	(0.955)
ohort_decade5	-1.257
	(0.957)
ohort_decade6	-1.519
	(1.373)
Constant	-3.045***
	(0.974)
bservations	755
	100
og Likelihood	-141.371

Table 14: logit model, interaction (combat post 1949 : commissar): cmc

(0.357)  combat_post_1949		
cmc_chair_connection_current         1.624***		Dependent variable:
(0.357)  combat_post_1949		cmc
combat_post_1949         0.787 (0.496)           college         1.137*** (0.440)           participated_long_march         1.719** (0.740)           commissar         -0.324 (0.402)           minority         1.304 (0.853)           parent_CCP_leader         -0.139 (0.815)           rural         1.074*** (0.387)           cohort_decade1         -1.924** (0.847)           cohort_decade2         -3.044*** (1.065)           cohort_decade3         -1.901* (1.018)           cohort_decade4         -1.278 (0.955)           cohort_decade5         -1.250 (0.958)           cohort_decade6         -1.525 (1.373)           combat_post_1949:commissar         0.221 (0.828)           Constant         -3.031*** (0.976)           Observations         755 (0.976)           Observations         755 (1.335)           Log Likelihood         -141.335 (1.314.671)	cmc_chair_connection_current	1.624***
(0.496)  college		(0.357)
(0.496)  college	combat_post_1949	0.787
(0.440)  participated_long_march		
(0.440)  participated_long_march (0.740)  commissar (0.740)  commissar -0.324 (0.402)  minority 1.304 (0.853)  parent_CCP_leader -0.139 (0.815)  rural 1.074*** (0.387)  cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847)  cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065)  cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018)  cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955)  cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958)  cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755 Log Likelihood -141.335 Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671	college	1.137***
(0.740)  commissar (0.740)  minority 1.304 (0.853)  parent_CCP_leader -0.139 (0.815)  rural 1.074*** (0.387)  cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847)  cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065)  cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018)  cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955)  cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958)  cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755 Log Likelihood -141.335 Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671		(0.440)
commissar -0.324 (0.402) minority 1.304 (0.853) parent_CCP_leader -0.139 (0.815) rural 1.074*** (0.887) cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847) cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065) cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018) cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955) cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958) cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373) combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828) Constant -3.031*** (0.976) Observations 755 Log Likelihood -141.335 Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671	participated_long_march	1.719**
minority 1.304 (0.853)  parent_CCP_leader -0.139 (0.815)  rural 1.074*** (0.387)  cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847)  cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065)  cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018)  cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955)  cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958)  cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755  Log Likelihood -141.335  Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671		(0.740)
minority 1.304 (0.853)  parent_CCP_leader -0.139 (0.815)  rural 1.074*** (0.387)  cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847)  cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065)  cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018)  cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955)  cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958)  cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755 Log Likelihood -141.335 Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671	commissar	-0.324
(0.853)  parent_CCP_leader		(0.402)
(0.853)  parent_CCP_leader	minority	1.304
(0.815) rural (0.815) rural (1.074*** (0.387)  cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847)  cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065)  cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018)  cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955)  cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958)  cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755  Log Likelihood -141.335  Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671	•	(0.853)
(0.815) rural (0.815) rural (1.074*** (0.387)  cohort_decade1 -1.924** (0.847)  cohort_decade2 -3.044*** (1.065)  cohort_decade3 -1.901* (1.018)  cohort_decade4 -1.278 (0.955)  cohort_decade5 -1.250 (0.958)  cohort_decade6 -1.525 (1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar 0.221 (0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755  Log Likelihood -141.335  Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671	parent_CCP_leader	-0.139
(0.387)  cohort_decade1		(0.815)
cohort_decade1	rural	1.074***
(0.847)  cohort_decade2		(0.387)
cohort_decade2	cohort_decade1	-1.924**
(1.065)  cohort_decade3		(0.847)
cohort_decade3	cohort_decade2	-3.044***
(1.018)  cohort_decade4		(1.065)
cohort_decade4	cohort_decade3	-1.901*
(0.955)  cohort_decade5		(1.018)
cohort_decade5         -1.250           (0.958)         (0.958)           cohort_decade6         -1.525           (1.373)         (0.221)           combat_post_1949:commissar         0.221           (0.828)         (0.828)           Constant         -3.031***           (0.976)         (0.976)           Observations         755           Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671	cohort_decade4	-1.278
(0.958)  cohort_decade6		(0.955)
cohort_decade6         -1.525           (1.373)         (1.373)           combat_post_1949:commissar         0.221           (0.828)         (0.828)           Constant         -3.031***           (0.976)         (0.976)           Observations         755           Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671	cohort_decade5	-1.250
(1.373)  combat_post_1949:commissar  0.221 (0.828)  Constant  -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations  755  Log Likelihood  -141.335  Akaike Inf. Crit.  314.671		(0.958)
combat_post_1949:commissar         0.221           (0.828)         (0.828)           Constant         -3.031***           (0.976)         (0.976)           Observations         755           Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671	cohort_decade6	-1.525
(0.828)  Constant -3.031*** (0.976)  Observations 755  Log Likelihood -141.335  Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671		(1.373)
Constant         -3.031*** (0.976)           Observations         755           Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671	combat_post_1949:commissar	0.221
(0.976)  Observations 755  Log Likelihood -141.335  Akaike Inf. Crit. 314.671		(0.828)
Observations         755           Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671	Constant	-3.031***
Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671		(0.976)
Log Likelihood         -141.335           Akaike Inf. Crit.         314.671	Observations	755
	Log Likelihood	-141.335
Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.0	Akaike Inf. Crit.	314.671
	Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

### Model Comparison with "LRT"

- P-value > 0.05 # General Promotion
- P-value > 0.05 # CMC Promotion

• We cannot deny the null hypothesis that the interaction model is not better than the additive model in explaining the general and CMC promotion.

Table 31: Test: Interactive Model or not, general, combat: commissar

Statistic	Ν	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Resid. Df	2	739.500	0.707	739	740
Resid. Dev	2	733.630	0.351	733.381	733.878
Df	1	1.000		1	1
Deviance	1	0.497		0.497	0.497
Pr(>Chi)	1	0.481		0.481	0.481

Table 28: Test: Interactive Model or not, cmc, combat: commissar

Statistic	Ν	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Resid. Df	2	739.500	0.707	739	740
Resid. Dev	2	282.706	0.050	282.671	282.741
Df	1	1.000		1	1
Deviance	1	0.071		0.071	0.071
Pr(>Chi)	1	0.791		0.791	0.791

### My Further Thoughts

- Overall, officers with combat experiences are more likely to be promoted to CMC if they have experience in commissar, but they are less likely to be promoted to general if they are former commissars.
- Theoretically coherent and relevant: CMC is the military decision-making organ, so the promotion is more politicalised.

(Loyalty to the regime is essential, and experienced commissars will be preferred because their careers are binding with the regime.)

• But this interaction model is not better than additive.

# Interaction 3 commissar: minority

```
## interaction model (minority: commissar): general promotion
glm_int_gen_mc <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
                      +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                        parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade +
                        minority : commissar, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(glm_int_gen_mc)
stargazer(glm_int_gen_mc, title = "logit model, interaction (minority : commissar): general")
## interaction model (minority: commissar): cmc promotion
glm_int_cmc_mc <- glm(cmc~cmc_chair_connection_current+combat_post_1949</pre>
                      +college+participated_long_march+commissar+minority+
                        parent_CCP_leader+rural+cohort_decade +
                        minority: commissar, data=bio, family=binomial(link="logit"))
summary(qlm_int_cmc_mc)
stargazer(glm_int_cmc_mc, title = "logit model, interaction (minority : commissar): cmc")
test <- anova(glm_gen, glm_int_gen_mc, test="LRT")
test
stargazer(test, title="Test: Interactive Model or not, general, minority: commissar")
test <- anova(glm_cmc, glm_int_cmc_mc, test="LRT")
test
stargazer(test, title="Test: Interactive Model or not, cmc, minority: commissar")
```

#### Additive vs. Interaction: General Promotion

Holding other covariates constant, if an officer from ethnic minority background has commissar experience, the log odds of that officer being promoted to general are by 0.458 larger than other ethnic minority officers without commissar experience.

But the interaction effect is not significantly different from 0.

Therefore, the effect of having commissar experience does not have a different effect (that statistically significantly different from 0) between officers from Han ethnicity and ethnic minority on being promoted to general or not.

Table 11: logit model, additive: general

	$Dependent\ variable:$
	general
cmc_chair_connection_current	0.751***
	(0.237)
combat_post_1949	1.239***
	(0.274)
college	0.879***
	(0.217)
participated_long_march	0.375
	(0.446)
commissar	0.667***
	(0.188)
minority	0.784
	(0.538)
parent_CCP_leader	0.083
	(0.451)
rural	0.383*
	(0.232)
cohort_decade1	-0.782
	(0.706)
cohort_decade2	-1.751**
	(0.754)
cohort_decade3	-1.397*
	(0.742)
cohort_decade4	-1.608**
	(0.733)
cohort_decade5	-1.139
	(0.729)
cohort_decade6	-2.087**
	(0.944)
Constant	-1.136
	(0.736)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood	-366.939
Akaike Inf. Crit.	763.878
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

'able 15: logit model, interaction (minority: commissar): general

	$Dependent\ variable:$
	general
cmc_chair_connection_current	0.752***
	(0.237)
combat_post_1949	1.252***
-	(0.275)
college	0.875***
	(0.217)
participated_long_march	0.373
	(0.447)
commissar	0.654***
	(0.191)
minority	0.555
	(0.774)
parent_CCP_leader	0.093
	(0.451)
rural	0.387*
	(0.232)
cohort_decade1	-0.788
	(0.706)
cohort_decade2	-1.752**
	(0.754)
cohort_decade3	-1.391*
	(0.742)
cohort_decade4	-1.602**
	(0.733)
cohort_decade5	-1.139
	(0.729)
cohort_decade6	-2.100**
	(0.946)
commissar:minority	0.458
	(1.083)
Constant	-1.132
	(0.736)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood	-366.849
Akaike Inf. Crit.	765.698
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
	21

31

#### Additive vs. Interaction: CMC Promotion

Holding other covariates constant, if an officer from ethnic minority background is born in rural China, the log odds of that officer being promoted to CMC are by 0.285 larger than those officers from ethnic minority born in urban on average.

But the interaction effect is not significantly different from 0.

Therefore, the effect of being born in rural China does not have a different effect (that statistically significantly different from 0) between officers from Han ethnicity and ethnic minority on being promoted to CMC or not.

Table 9: logit model, additive: cmc

	$Dependent\ variable:$
	cmc
cmc_chair_connection_current	1.619***
	(0.356)
combat_post_1949	0.855**
	(0.425)
college	1.135***
	(0.440)
participated_long_march	1.717**
	(0.741)
commissar	-0.273
	(0.350)
minority	1.273
	(0.845)
parent_CCP_leader	-0.140
	(0.815)
rural	1.077***
	(0.386)
cohort_decade1	-1.924**
	(0.847)
cohort_decade2	-3.041***
	(1.063)
cohort_decade3	-1.886*
	(1.016)
cohort_decade4	-1.279
	(0.955)
cohort_decade5	-1.257
	(0.957)
cohort_decade6	-1.519
	(1.373)
Constant	-3.045***
	(0.974)
Observations	755
Log Likelihood	-141.371
Akaike Inf. Crit.	312.741
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 15: logit model, interaction (minority: commissar): cmc

	Dependent variable
	cmc
emc_chair_connection_current	1.619***
	(0.356)
combat_post_1949	0.865**
ons are some unit.) ■ lass a line contest al-to-	(0.429)
college	1.129**
	(0.441)
participated_long_march	1.713**
P	(0.742)
commissar	-0.285
ommisser .	(0.358)
ninority	1.148
innority	(1.155)
parent_CCP_leader	-0.122
Jarent 2001 Lieader	(0.820)
rural	1.076***
urar	(0.386)
cohort_decade1	-1.930**
conort_decade1	(0.848)
cohort_decade2	-3.040***
.onore_decade2	(1.063)
cohort_decade3	-1.883*
conort_decades	(1.017)
cohort_decade4	-1.278
conort_decade4	(0.955)
cohort_decade5	-1.262
conort_decades	(0.958)
cohort_decade6	-1.533
.onor_decadeo	(1.376)
	0.285
commissar:minority	(1.727)
7	
Constant	-3.036*** (0.975)
	(0.0.0)
Observations Log Likelihood	755 $-141.357$

32

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

### Model Comparison with "LRT"

- P-value > 0.05 # General Promotion
- P-value > 0.05 # CMC Promotion

• We cannot deny the null hypothesis that the interaction model is not better than the additive model in explaining the general and CMC promotion.

Table 33: Test: Interactive Model or not, general, minority: commissar

Statistic	Ν	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	$_{\rm Max}$
Resid. Df	2	739.500	0.707	739	740
Resid. Dev	2	733.788	0.127	733.698	733.878
Df	1	1.000		1	1
Deviance	1	0.180		0.180	0.180
Pr(>Chi)	1	0.671		0.671	0.671

Table 30: Test: Interactive Model or not, cmc, minority: commissar

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Resid. Df	2	739.500	0.707	739	740
Resid. Dev	2	282.728	0.019	282.714	282.741
Df	1	1.000		1	1
Deviance	1	0.027		0.027	0.027
Pr(>Chi)	1	0.869		0.869	0.869

### My Further Thoughts

• Overall, officers from ethnic minority are more likely to be promoted to genera and CMC if they have experience in commissar.

• Theoretically coherent and relevant: loyalty to the regime may be the prior concern for promotion regarding the officers from ethnic minority.

• But this interaction model is not better than additive.

### Contribution 4: Further Research Can be Done with More Data

- Who is more likely to be promoted to general and CMC?

  Officers from Army, Navy, Air Force or the Second Artillery (1966-2015, Rocket Force since 2015), Strategic Support Force (2015-today)?
- Hypothesis 1: Army officers will be more likely to promoted to general and CMC before Xi's era.
- Hypothesis 2: Navy officers will be more likely to promoted to general and CMC in Xi's era.
- Theory: Leader's preference in geopolitical strategy (land vs. sea) determines the promotion of top officers

### Bibliography

• Mattingly, Daniel. "How the Party Commands the Gun: The Foreign-Domestic Threat Dilemma in China." American Journal of Political Science. Forthcoming.

#### Picture Link

- https://www.google.com/imgres?imgurl=https%3A%2F%2Fstatic01.nyt.com%2Fimages%2F2017%2F05%2F09%2Fworld%2F09Jiang1%2F09Jiang1-master1050.jpg&tbnid=upa6fspon99UXM&vet=12ahUKEwjxjPeJ1o7-AhUEoVwKHbGhDccQMygiegUIARDUAQ..i&imgrefurl=https%3A%2F%2Fcn.nytimes.com%2Fobits%2F20221130%2Fjiang-zemin-dead%2F&docid=jCEs7Z8vBSQ7xM&w=1050&h=846&q=%E6%B1%9F%E6%B3%BD%E6%B0%91&ved=2ahUKEwjxjPeJ1o7-AhUEoVwKHbGhDccQMygiegUIARDUAQ
- http://www.81.cn/jpdbf/jwsj/9429938.html
- http://news.cctv.com/special/wozaiaomen/20091220/102065.shtml
- http://m.news.cctv.com/2019/04/24/ARTI51XnrKMUYCPE0QHrokEK190424.shtml

### Q&A