

Appendix A: Aggregation Method Selection & Sensitivity Analysis

Power-Sharing Index Methodological Documentation

Jessa M. Agricola

2025-12-11

Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Relationship to Existing Approaches	3
2	Aggregation Methods: Theoretical Rationale	4
2.1	Additive (Arithmetic Mean)	4
2.2	Multiplicative (Geometric Mean)	4
2.3	Hybrid (Multiplicative × Polyarchy)	4
3	Comparing Aggregation Methods	5
3.1	Visual Comparison	5
3.2	Key Observations	6
3.3	Era-Level Summary Statistics	6
3.4	Correlation Across Methods	7
4	Why Hybrid? Theoretical Justification	9
4.1	1. Multiplicative Penalty for Exclusion	9
4.2	2. Procedural Democracy Cap	9
4.3	Empirical Demonstration	9
5	Sensitivity Analysis: Jackknife (Leave-One-Component-Out)	11
5.1	Interpretation	12
6	Alternative Specifications	13
6.1	Specifications Tested	14
7	Response to Historical Events	15

8 Summary	16
8.1 Key Findings	16
8.2 Recommended Specification	16
8.3 Comparison to Sigman & Lindberg (2019)	16
9 Session Info	17

1 Introduction

This appendix documents the aggregation method selection for the Power-Sharing Index (PSI) and presents sensitivity analyses demonstrating robustness to specification choices. The goal is to justify the selection of the hybrid aggregation method and show that substantive conclusions do not depend on arbitrary methodological decisions.

1.1 Relationship to Existing Approaches

This analysis follows the general framework established by Sigman and Lindberg (2019) for constructing composite democracy indices, with two key departures:

1. **Aggregation transparency:** Sigman and Lindberg do not present sensitivity analyses for their aggregation choices. This appendix explicitly compares three aggregation methods and demonstrates that results are robust across specifications.
2. **Component selection logic:** Sigman and Lindberg recommend avoiding V-Dem variables that appear in existing indices to prevent circularity. This concern does not apply here because PSI measures a conceptually distinct phenomenon—cross-group power transfer rather than procedural democracy quality. The discriminant validity analysis in Appendix B confirms this empirically: PSI shows a *negative* correlation with Electoral Democracy during the Herrenvolk era (1789-1899), demonstrating that it captures something qualitatively different from existing indices.

2 Aggregation Methods: Theoretical Rationale

Three aggregation approaches are considered, each with distinct theoretical implications for how exclusion across dimensions should be weighted.

2.1 Additive (Arithmetic Mean)

$$PSI_{add} = \frac{1}{5} \sum_{i=1}^5 X_{i,norm}$$

Theoretical logic: High scores in some dimensions can compensate for low scores in others. A society with strong gender equality but weak racial equality would score moderately.

Implication: Partial inclusion in some dimensions can “offset” exclusion in others.

2.2 Multiplicative (Geometric Mean)

$$PSI_{mult} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^5 X_{i,norm} \right)^{1/5}$$

Theoretical logic: Low values in *any* dimension pull down the overall score. A society cannot “average its way out of exclusion.”

Implication: Power-sharing requires inclusion across *all* dimensions simultaneously. Zero in any dimension produces zero overall.

2.3 Hybrid (Multiplicative \times Polyarchy)

$$PSI_{hybrid} = Polyarchy_{norm} \times \left(\prod_{i=1}^5 X_{i,norm} \right)^{1/5}$$

Theoretical logic: Combines the multiplicative penalty for exclusion with a procedural democracy cap. Even perfect inclusion cannot exceed the quality of democratic institutions.

Implication: Power-sharing is meaningful only within functioning democratic procedures. Authoritarian regimes with nominal inclusion still score low.


3 Comparing Aggregation Methods

3.1 Visual Comparison

```
usa_psi |>
  select(year, psi_additive, psi_multiplicative, psi_hybrid) |>
  pivot_longer(-year, names_to = "Method", values_to = "PSI") |>
  mutate(Method = case_when(
    Method == "psi_additive" ~ "Additive",
    Method == "psi_multiplicative" ~ "Multiplicative",
    Method == "psi_hybrid" ~ "Hybrid"
  ) |> factor(levels = c("Additive", "Multiplicative", "Hybrid"))) |>
  ggplot(aes(x = year, y = PSI, color = Method)) +
  geom_line(linewidth = 1) +
  geom_vline(xintercept = c(1865, 1920, 1965), linetype = "dashed", alpha = 0.4) +
  scale_color_manual(values = c("Additive" = "black", "Multiplicative" = "steelblue", "Hybrid" = "#D62728")) +
  scale_y_continuous(limits = c(0, 1), labels = percent) +
  labs(title = "PSI by Aggregation Method",
       subtitle = "All three methods show same substantive pattern; differ in magnitude",
       x = NULL, y = "Power-Sharing Index") +
  theme_minimal() +
  theme(legend.position = "bottom")
```

PSI by Aggregation Method

All three methods show same substantive pattern; differ in magnitude



3.2 Key Observations

All three methods produce the same substantive periodization:

- Near-zero scores throughout the Herrenvolk era (1789-1899)
- Gradual increase during partial inclusion (1900-1964)
- Sharp increase after the Voting Rights Act (1965)
- Decline following Shelby County (2013)

The methods differ in *magnitude* but not in *pattern*. This is the definition of robustness: substantive conclusions are invariant to aggregation choice.

3.3 Era-Level Summary Statistics

PSI by Era and Aggregation Method

All methods show same pattern: near-zero → low → high

period	N	Additive Mean	Multiplicative Mean	Hybrid Mean
Herrenvolk (1789-1899)	111	0.042	0.004	0.000
Jim Crow (1900-1964)	65	0.186	0.034	0.016
Post-Civil Rights (1965+)	60	0.823	0.796	0.714

```
usa_psi |>
  mutate(period = case_when(
    year < 1900 ~ "Herrenvolk (1789-1899)",
    year < 1965 ~ "Jim Crow (1900-1964)",
    TRUE ~ "Post-Civil Rights (1965+)"
  ) |> factor(levels = c("Herrenvolk (1789-1899)", "Jim Crow (1900-1964)", "Post-Civil Rights (1965+)"),
  group_by(period) |>
  summarise(
    N = n(),
    `Additive Mean` = mean(psi_additive, na.rm = TRUE),
    `Multiplicative Mean` = mean(psi_multiplicative, na.rm = TRUE),
    `Hybrid Mean` = mean(psi_hybrid, na.rm = TRUE),
    .groups = "drop"
  ) |>
  gt() |>
  tab_header(
    title = "PSI by Era and Aggregation Method",
    subtitle = "All methods show same pattern: near-zero → low → high"
  ) |>
  fmt_number(columns = -c(period, N), decimals = 3)
```

3.4 Correlation Across Methods

```
tibble(
  Comparison = c("Additive vs. Multiplicative",
                 "Additive vs. Hybrid",
                 "Multiplicative vs. Hybrid"),
  Correlation = c(
    cor(usa_psi$psi_additive, usa_psi$psi_multiplicative, use = "complete.obs"),
    cor(usa_psi$psi_additive, usa_psi$psi_hybrid, use = "complete.obs"),
    cor(usa_psi$psi_multiplicative, usa_psi$psi_hybrid, use = "complete.obs"))
```

Correlation Across Aggregation Methods

High correlations indicate robust measurement

Comparison	Correlation
Additive vs. Multiplicative	0.980
Additive vs. Hybrid	0.972
Multiplicative vs. Hybrid	0.994

```
cor(usa_psi$psi_multiplicative, usa_psi$psi_hybrid, use = "complete.obs")
)
) |>
  gt() |>
    tab_header(
      title = "Correlation Across Aggregation Methods",
      subtitle = "High correlations indicate robust measurement"
    ) |>
      fmt_number(columns = Correlation, decimals = 3)
```

4 Why Hybrid? Theoretical Justification

The hybrid method is preferred for two theoretical reasons:

4.1 1. Multiplicative Penalty for Exclusion

The multiplicative component ensures that exclusion in *any* dimension reduces the overall score. This reflects the theoretical claim that power-sharing requires inclusion across multiple dimensions simultaneously.

Consider a hypothetical society with perfect gender equality (1.0) but complete racial exclusion (0.0):

- **Additive:** $(1.0 + 0.0 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5)/5 = 0.50$ (moderate score)
- **Multiplicative:** $(1.0 \times 0.001 \times 0.5 \times 0.5 \times 0.5)^{1/5} = 0.07$ (near-zero)

The multiplicative approach correctly identifies this as a society with minimal cross-group power-sharing.

4.2 2. Procedural Democracy Cap

The Polyarchy multiplier ensures that PSI cannot exceed the quality of democratic institutions. This addresses a potential concern: could an authoritarian regime with nominal inclusion score highly?

The hybrid formulation prevents this. A regime with Polyarchy = 0.2 cannot exceed PSI = 0.2, regardless of inclusion scores. Power-sharing is meaningful only within functioning democratic procedures.


4.3 Empirical Demonstration

```
usa_psi |>
  ggplot(aes(x = year)) +
  geom_line(aes(y = psi_multiplicative, color = "Multiplicative (uncapped)", linewidth = 0.8),
            size = 1) +
  geom_line(aes(y = psi_hybrid, color = "Hybrid (Polyarchy-capped)", linewidth = 0.8),
            size = 1) +
  geom_line(aes(y = polyarchy_norm, color = "Polyarchy (cap)", linewidth = 0.6, linetype = "dashed"),
            size = 1) +
  scale_color_manual(values = c("Multiplicative (uncapped)" = "steelblue",
                                "Hybrid (Polyarchy-capped)" = "darkred",
                                "Polyarchy (cap)" = "gray50")) +
  scale_y_continuous(limits = c(0, 1), labels = percent) +
  labs(title = "How the Hybrid Method Works",
```

```

subtitle = "Multiplicative score is capped by procedural democracy quality",
x = NULL, y = "Index Value", color = NULL) +
theme_minimal() +
theme(legend.position = "bottom")

```




5 Sensitivity Analysis: Jackknife (Leave-One-Component-Out)

To assess whether any single component is driving results, each component is dropped in turn and the index is recalculated.

```
usa_psi |>
  mutate(
    Full = psi_additive,
    `Drop: Social Group` = (v2pepwrgen_norm + v2clsocgrp_norm + v2cltort_norm + v2clkill_norm) / 4,
    `Drop: Gender` = (v2pepwrsoc_norm + v2clsocgrp_norm + v2cltort_norm + v2clkill_norm) / 4,
    `Drop: Civil Liberties` = (v2pepwrsoc_norm + v2pepwrgen_norm + v2cltort_norm + v2clkill_norm) / 4,
    `Drop: Torture` = (v2pepwrsoc_norm + v2pepwrgen_norm + v2clsocgrp_norm + v2clkill_norm) / 4,
    `Drop: Killings` = (v2pepwrsoc_norm + v2pepwrgen_norm + v2clsocgrp_norm + v2cltort_norm) / 4
  ) |>
  select(year, Full, starts_with("Drop")) |>
  pivot_longer(-year, names_to = "Version", values_to = "PSI") |>
  mutate(Version = factor(Version, levels = c("Full", "Drop: Social Group", "Drop: Gender",
                                              "Drop: Civil Liberties", "Drop: Torture", "Drop: Killings")))
  ggplot(aes(x = year, y = PSI, color = Version, linewidth = Version)) +
  geom_line() +
  scale_color_manual(values = c("Full" = "black", "Drop: Social Group" = "#1b9e77", "Drop: Gender" = "#7570b3",
                               "Drop: Civil Liberties" = "#7570b3", "Drop: Torture" = "#e72f2f", "Drop: Killings" = "#e72f2f"))
  scale_linewidth_manual(values = c(1.5, rep(0.6, 5))) +
  scale_y_continuous(limits = c(0, 1), labels = percent) +
  labs(title = "Jackknife Sensitivity Analysis",
       subtitle = "Dropping any single component does not change substantive pattern",
       x = NULL, y = "PSI (Additive)") +
  theme_minimal() +
  theme(legend.position = "bottom") +
  guides(linewidth = "none")
```

Jackknife Sensitivity Analysis

Dropping any single component does not change substantive pattern



5.1 Interpretation

When a “Drop” line is *higher* than the full index, that component was pulling the score *down*.

Key findings:

- **Gender and Civil Liberties** pull scores down most in early periods (as expected—women’s exclusion and racial exclusion)
- **Torture** pulls scores down in middle periods
- No single component drives the overall pattern
- Substantive conclusions (three eras, post-1965 shift) are invariant to component exclusion


6 Alternative Specifications

Beyond the three primary methods, additional specifications are tested to ensure robustness.

```
usa_psi |>
  mutate(
    Additive = psi_additive,
    Geometric = psi_multiplicative,
    Hybrid = psi_hybrid,
    Minimum = pmin(v2pepwrsoc_norm, v2pepwrgen_norm, v2clsocgrp_norm, v2cltort_norm, v2clkill_norm),
    `Weighted (2x Power)` = (2*v2pepwrsoc_norm + 2*v2pepwrgen_norm + v2clsocgrp_norm + v2cltort_norm) / 4
  ) |>
  select(year, Additive, Geometric, Hybrid, Minimum, `Weighted (2x Power)`) |>
  pivot_longer(-year, names_to = "Specification", values_to = "PSI") |>
  ggplot(aes(x = year, y = PSI, color = Specification)) +
  geom_line(linewidth = 0.7) +
  scale_y_continuous(limits = c(0, 1), labels = percent) +
  labs(title = "Alternative Specifications",
       subtitle = "All specifications show same substantive pattern",
       x = NULL, y = "PSI") +
  theme_minimal() +
  theme(legend.position = "bottom")
```

Alternative Specifications

All specifications show same substantive pattern



6.1 Specifications Tested

Specification	Formula	Rationale
Additive	Arithmetic mean of 5 components	Standard approach
Geometric	Geometric mean of 5 components	Penalizes any-dimension exclusion
Hybrid	Geometric \times Polyarchy	Adds procedural cap
Minimum	Lowest component score	Maximum penalty for exclusion
Weighted (2x Power)	Double-weights power distribution	Tests sensitivity to weighting

All specifications produce the same substantive periodization, differing only in magnitude.

7 Response to Historical Events

A properly constructed index should respond to known historical events that affected cross-group power distribution.

```
events <- tribble(
  ~Event, ~Year_Before, ~Year_After, ~Expected,
  "19th Amendment (1920)", 1919, 1921, "Increase",
  "Voting Rights Act (1965)", 1964, 1966, "Major Increase",
  "Shelby County v. Holder (2013)", 2012, 2014, "Decline"
)

get_psi <- function(yr, method = "additive") {
  if (method == "additive") {
    val <- usa_psi$psi_additive[usa_psi$year == yr]
  } else if (method == "hybrid") {
    val <- usa_psi$psi_hybrid[usa_psi$year == yr]
  }
  if (length(val) == 0) NA_real_ else val
}

events |>
  rowwise() |>
  mutate(
    PSI_Before = get_psi(Year_Before),
    PSI_After = get_psi(Year_After),
    Change = PSI_After - PSI_Before,
    Direction = if_else(Change > 0, "↑", "↓")
  ) |>
  ungroup() |>
  select(Event, Expected, PSI_Before, PSI_After, Change, Direction) |>
  gt() |>
  tab_header(
    title = "PSI Response to Historical Events",
    subtitle = "Index moves in expected direction for all major events"
  ) |>
  fmt_number(columns = c(PSI_Before, PSI_After, Change), decimals = 3)
```

All three events produce changes in the expected direction, providing construct validity evidence.

PSI Response to Historical Events

Index moves in expected direction for all major events

Event	Expected	PSI_Before	PSI_After	Change	Direction
19th Amendment (1920)	Increase	0.109	0.172	0.062	↑
Voting Rights Act (1965)	Major Increase	0.359	0.446	0.087	↑
Shelby County v. Holder (2013)	Decline	0.961	0.944	-0.017	↓

8 Summary

8.1 Key Findings

- Robustness:** All aggregation methods produce the same substantive pattern. Conclusions do not depend on methodological choices.
- Jackknife stability:** No single component drives results. The index is not an artifact of any particular variable.
- Construct validity:** The index responds appropriately to known historical events (19th Amendment, VRA, Shelby County).

8.2 Recommended Specification

Hybrid (Multiplicative × Polyarchy) is recommended because:

- Multiplicative aggregation correctly penalizes exclusion in any dimension
- Polyarchy cap ensures power-sharing is measured within democratic procedures
- Results are robust to alternative specifications

8.3 Comparison to Sigman & Lindberg (2019)

Aspect	Sigman & Lindberg	This Analysis
Sensitivity analysis	Not presented	Full jackknife and alternative specifications
Aggregation choice	Single method	Three methods compared, robustness demonstrated
Component selection	Avoid existing indices	Selection based on conceptual fit; distinctiveness shown empirically

9 Session Info

```
R version 4.5.2 (2025-10-31)
Platform: aarch64-apple-darwin20
Running under: macOS Tahoe 26.1

Matrix products: default
BLAS:      /System/Library/Frameworks/Accelerate.framework/Versions/A/Frameworks/vecLib.framework
LAPACK:   /Library/Frameworks/R.framework/Versions/4.5-arm64/Resources/lib/libRlapack.dylib; 

locale:
[1] en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8/C/en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8

time zone: America/Indiana/Indianapolis
tzcode source: internal

attached base packages:
[1] stats      graphics    grDevices utils      datasets   methods     base

other attached packages:
[1] knitr_1.50      scales_1.4.0      gt_1.1.0        lubridate_1.9.4
[5]forcats_1.0.0    stringr_1.5.1      dplyr_1.1.4      purrr_1.0.4
[9]readr_2.1.5      tidyverse_2.0.0    pacman_0.5.1
[13]tidyverse_2.0.0 pacman_0.5.1

loaded via a namespace (and not attached):
[1] gtable_0.3.6      jsonlite_2.0.0      compiler_4.5.2      tinytex_0.57
[5] tidyselect_1.2.1    xml2_1.3.8        yaml_2.3.10       fastmap_1.2.0
[9] R6_2.6.1          labeling_0.4.3      generics_0.1.4      pillar_1.10.2
[13] RColorBrewer_1.1-3 tzdb_0.5.0        rlang_1.1.6        stringi_1.8.7
[17] xfun_0.54         fs_1.6.6          timechange_0.3.0    cli_3.6.5
[21] withr_3.0.2       magrittr_2.0.3      digest_0.6.37      grid_4.5.2
[25] rstudioapi_0.17.1 hms_1.1.3        lifecycle_1.0.4      vctrs_0.6.5
[29] evaluate_1.0.3     glue_1.8.0        farver_2.1.2       rmarkdown_2.29
[33] tools_4.5.2        pkgconfig_2.0.3     htmltools_0.5.8.1
```