



UPPSALA  
UNIVERSITET

## Punished for austerity

---

Pär Nyman

[par.nyman@statsvet.uu.se](mailto:par.nyman@statsvet.uu.se)

NOPSA, August 14, 2014



# Introduction

---

## About me

### Previous research

### Main results

### Heterogenous effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

## About me

- PhD Candidate at Uppsala University.
- Background as an economist and feel at home within the political economy discourse.
- Election year = new influences and opportunities.
- NOPSA has been a crash course in elections and voter behaviour.



# Introduction

---

## About me

### Previous research

### Main results

### Heterogenous effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

## About me

- Previously written papers on public finance and economic policymaking.
- Right now working on two field experiments to study the effects of door canvassing.
- This paper is an attempt to 'touch upon' both electoral studies and the public finance literature.



# Introduction

---

## About me

## Previous research

## Main results

## Heterogenous effects

Transparency  
Accountability  
Partisan effects  
All parties

## The paper

- In the paper I analyse the electoral consequences of fiscal adjustments.
- That is: Do government parties lose votes, on average, after implementing tax hikes or cuts in public spending?
- It is the very first draft. Don't be fooled by the looks!



## Previous research

---

- Seven previous studies that deal with this question.
- There are three cross-country (“The political economy of fiscal adjustments”; “The Electoral Consequences of Large Fiscal Adjustments”; “How do budget deficits and economic growth affect reelection prospects? Evidence from a large panel of countries”) analyses and four studies using the within-country variation (“Voters as fiscal conservatives”; “Fiscal Policy Outcomes and Electoral Accountability in American States”; “The effect of fiscal performance on local government election results in Israel: 1989–1998”; “Electoral manipulation via voter-friendly spending: Theory and evidence”).
- None of them finds that voters punish governments for fiscal adjustments.
- In addition, there is the retrenchment literature.



# Previous research

---

## Why make another study?

- Results did not match my world view!
- Neither did they match the assumptions of *new politics*, *political business cycles* or the *public finance* literature.
- I found two reasons for why previous research could have underestimated the true effects.



# Previous research

---

## 1 Cabinet changes instead of vote shares

- Several studies use the probability of re-election as dependent variable.
- Obvious risk of reverse causation: If parties know that they have a high probability of re-election, they might be more willing to implement fiscal adjustments.
- The problem remains – but is smaller – with changes in vote shares.
- Anyhow, the problem creates a bias towards fiscal conservatism.
- Using a dichotomous outcome also means throwing away scarce and valuable information.



# Previous research

---

## 2 No cyclical adjustment of the budget balance

- All these studies measure fiscal adjustments as the accumulated change in the budget balance.
- Four of them do not adjust the budget balance for the state of the economy.
- Obvious risk of spurious relationship in the opposite direction: a decrease in unemployment improves the budget balance and increases support for the government.





# My model

---

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

$$v_{p,e} = a + sbb_{p,e} + \phi_{p,e} + \chi_e + \psi_p + e_{p,e} \quad (1)$$

$$sbb_{p,e} = \sum_{c=1}^n (sbb_{last,c} - sbb_{first,c}) \times cab_c \quad (2)$$



# Main results

[About me](#)[Previous research](#)[Main results](#)[Heterogenous effects](#)[Transparency](#)[Accountability](#)[Partisan effects](#)[All parties](#)

	(1) Re-election	(2) Vote change	(3) Vote change	(4) Vote change
<i>Change while in government</i>				
Structural budget balance	0.06 (0.06)			-1.02*** (0.25)
Non-adjusted budget balance		-0.21 (0.20)	-0.69*** (0.22)	
Unemployment rate	-0.06 (0.07)		-0.94** (0.40)	-0.73* (0.38)
GDP growth	0.02 (0.04)		0.07 (0.19)	0.02 (0.17)
Average GDP growth	-0.20** (0.08)		0.18 (0.51)	-0.29 (0.49)
Right-wing party	0.34 (0.22)	1.16 (0.85)	1.06 (0.79)	1.01 (0.75)
Constant	0.64** (0.28)	-2.96*** (0.66)	-2.51* (1.31)	-0.79 (1.31)
Observations	182	182	182	182
Adjusted $R^2$		0.006	0.143	0.182



# Heterogeneous effects

---

- It is a common assumption that voter reactions are stronger when policy changes are transparent and it is clear which party that is accountable.
- I include a wide range of indicators for both transparency and accountability.
- Admittedly, some of them are questionable and the interpretations are not always obvious.
- This part of the paper is more exploratory. I plan to narrow it, but I am not sure how.



# Transparency

---

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

- Transparency is lower during episodes of fast economic growth.
- Transparency increases with the size of adjustments.
- A transparent budget process increases transparency of fiscal adjustments.
- Parties can announce their fiscal policy before being elected (a different kind of transparency[?]).



# Transparency

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Change while in government</i>				
Structural budget balance	-1.11*** (0.22)	-0.19 (0.48)	-0.42* (0.22)	-0.92*** (0.32)
Unemployment rate	-0.51 (0.42)	-0.61 (0.41)	0.23 (0.30)	-0.76* (0.44)
GDP growth	0.06 (0.16)	0.03 (0.16)	-0.29* (0.15)	0.08 (0.17)
<i>Interaction with SBB</i>				
SBB × Average growth	0.16*** (0.05)			
SBB × SBB		-0.10** (0.04)		
SBB × Fiscal transparency			-0.38* (0.22)	
SBB × Austerity manifesto				0.40** (0.19)
Fiscal transparency			0.01 (0.42)	
Austerity manifesto				-0.78* (0.40)
Average GDP growth	-0.52 (0.47)	-0.29 (0.49)	0.74** (0.33)	-0.54 (0.53)
Right-wing party	0.73 (0.71)	0.76 (0.72)	0.49 (0.57)	0.72 (0.69)
Constant	-0.45 (1.28)	-1.43 (1.41)	-2.91*** (0.97)	-0.05 (1.45)
Observations	182	182	147	162
Adjusted $R^2$	0.210	0.200	0.106	0.127



# Accountability

---

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

- The PM's party is held accountable to a larger degree.
- Accountability is higher for majority governments.
- Accountability decreases with the number of government parties.
- Accountability is higher when a party has been in cabinet for a long time.



# Accountability

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Change while in government</i>				
Structural budget balance	-0.44 (0.32)	-0.70 (0.45)	-1.38** (0.53)	-0.95*** (0.27)
Unemployment rate	-0.66* (0.39)	-0.72* (0.38)	-0.60 (0.40)	-0.42 (0.27)
GDP growth	0.02 (0.17)	0.02 (0.17)	0.08 (0.17)	-0.06 (0.13)
<i>Interaction with SBB</i>				
SBB × PM's party	-0.87** (0.41)			
SBB × Majority government		-0.41 (0.51)		
SBB × Government parties			0.20 (0.19)	
SBB × Incumbent last period				-0.05 (0.55)
Prime minister's party	0.00 (1.32)			
Majority government		0.16 (1.55)		
Government parties			0.59 (0.37)	
Incumbent last period				1.93 (1.43)
Average GDP growth	-0.24 (0.51)	-0.28 (0.49)	-0.18 (0.48)	0.27 (0.34)
Right-wing party	1.06 (0.76)	1.08 (0.76)	1.26* (0.73)	1.34* (0.77)
Constant	-1.15 (1.38)	-0.91 (1.84)	-3.18* (1.73)	-3.40** (1.50)
Observations	182	179	182	171
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.203	0.179	0.219	0.218



# Accountability

---

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

- Voters should punish leftish governments for fiscal adjustments when there is a high risk of default.
- That risk is operationalized as the interest rate on government bonds (compared to Germany).





# Partisan effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Change while in government</i>			
Structural budget balance	-1.25*** (0.25)	-1.76** (0.74)	-0.42 (0.36)
SBB × Right-wing	0.72* (0.42)	1.56 (1.97)	-0.23 (0.41)
Unemployment rate	-0.70* (0.37)	-0.94 (0.79)	-0.37 (0.36)
GDP growth	0.03 (0.17)	0.54 (0.63)	-0.06 (0.17)
Average GDP growth	-0.32 (0.48)	-0.90 (1.30)	0.19 (0.43)
Right-wing party	-0.29 (1.01)	-2.28 (3.37)	1.43 (1.07)
Constant	-0.26 (1.33)	0.22 (3.64)	-2.61* (1.35)
Observations	182	24	136
Adjusted $R^2$	0.189	0.525	0.017
Risk for default	–	Large	Small



# All parties

About me

Previous  
research

Main results

Heterogenous  
effects

Transparency

Accountability

Partisan effects

All parties

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Change while in government</i>			
Structural budget balance	-1.53*** (0.28)	-1.69*** (0.39)	-1.53*** (0.32)
Unemployment rate	-0.55 (0.36)	-0.55 (0.37)	-0.57 (0.38)
GDP growth	-0.18 (0.17)	-0.19 (0.17)	-0.18 (0.18)
<i>Change during period</i>			
Structural budget balance	0.31** (0.15)	1.02*** (0.24)	0.24 (0.26)
Unemployment rate	0.00 (0.10)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.12)
GDP growth	0.03 (0.08)	0.03 (0.08)	0.03 (0.08)
<i>Interaction with SBB</i>			
SBB × Parliament experience		-0.82*** (0.26)	
SBB × Government experience		0.24 (0.39)	
SBB × Right-wing scale			0.03 (0.05)
SBB × Distance from centre			-0.04 (0.11)
Parliament experience		-5.96*** (0.84)	
Government experience		0.29 (0.68)	
Right-wing scale			-0.07 (0.17)
Distance from centre			0.05 (0.19)
Average GDP growth	-0.07 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.13)	-0.07 (0.12)
Right-wing party	0.90** (0.44)	0.70 (0.47)	0.92 (0.78)
Constant	-0.35 (0.45)	5.49*** (0.90)	-0.13 (0.81)
Observations	561	561	561
Adjusted $R^2$	0.159	0.169	0.154