

TABLES

I.1	Two-person game (Player A with three and Player B with two strategies)	4
I.2	Three levels of rulemaking	9
3.1	Difference between actual and formal rigidity: As n increases, the error term (difference) approaches zero	80
3.2	Effect of formal rigidity on another variable (constitutional amendments): As n increases, the coefficient approximates the true value	81
3.3	Estimation of coefficient of “culture” as a lagged dependent variable: When institutional data are serially correlated, including a lagged dependent variable will inflate its estimated effect and lead to misestimation of other variables including the wrong sign	88
3.4	Association of indicators of culture from Tarabar and Young (2021) with economic outcomes (based on IMF data) are not as expected	91
4.1	Reasons for “NO” vote of Chilean referendum in September 2022	119
4.2	Reasons for “NO” vote of Chilean referendum in December 2023	120
4.3	What are all the reasons why you voted “NO” at the referendum on the European Constitution?	122
5.1	Congressional seats of main parties in Mexico (1997–2015)	136
6.1	Correlation of veto player constitutional rigidity index with other indexes	154
6.2	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (null, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on amendment rate for $\text{POLITY2} \geq 5$ threshold 103 countries; likelihood ratio tests	159
6.A.1.1	Results of the heteroskedastic regression for fundamental amendments ($\text{POLITY2} \geq 5$)	161
6.A.1.2	Results of the heteroskedastic regression for the combination of fundamental and major amendments ($\text{POLITY2} \geq 5$)	162
6.A.1.3	Results of the heteroskedastic regression on all amendments ($\text{POLITY2} \geq 5$)	162
6.A.2.1	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (null, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on amendment rate for $\text{POLITY2} \geq 6$ threshold (ninety-five countries; likelihood ratio tests)	164

6.A.2.2	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (null, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on amendment rate for POLITY2 ≥ 7 threshold (eighty-three countries; likelihood ratio tests)	165
6.A.2.3	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (null, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on amendment rate for POLITY2 ≥ 8 threshold (seventy-two countries; likelihood ratio tests)	165
6.A.2.4	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (null, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on amendment rate for POLITY2 ≥ 9 threshold (fifty-four countries; likelihood ratio tests)	166
6.A.2.5	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (null, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on amendment rate for POLITY2 ≥ 10 threshold (thirty-five countries; likelihood ratio tests)	166
6.A.3.1	OLS regressions of different amendment rates (POLITY2 ≥ 5 cutoff) on constitutional rigidity and social capital (n = 57)	167
6.A.3.2	OLS regressions of different amendment rates (POLITY2 ≥ 5 cutoff) on constitutional rigidity and each indicator of social capital separately (n = 57)	168
7.1	Time inconsistency as a function of constitution length	179
7.2	Constitutional length as a function of country characteristics	182
7.3	GDP per capita as a function of constitutional length and economic variables	182
7.4	GDP per capita as a function of length, economic variables, education, and corruption	183
8.1	Measures of de facto judicial independence	196
8.2	Measures of de jure judicial independence	197
8.3	Components of de jure judicial independence	198
8.4	Countries with constitutional courts	205
8.5	Effect of constitutional rigidity on percentage of strikes (sample: POLITY2 ≥ 5)	216
8.6	Comparison of three models of effects of constitutional rigidity (base, mean only, and heteroskedastic) on judicial strikes for POLITY2 ≥ 5 threshold (likelihood ratio tests, n = 30)	216
8.A.1	Data used in the analysis (constitutional and unconstitutional judgments) from the Comparative Law Database	219

