

September 18, 2018.

Appendix: For Online Publication

Contents

A	Some More Context On Danish Municipalities	2
B	Overview of Policies Included in Our Measure	3
C	Details about Estimation of Municipal Fiscal Policy	4
D	Some Descriptive Features of Municipal Fiscal Policy	6
E	Validating Our Measure Of Citizens' Policy Preferences	9
F	Regression Table for Main Results	10
G	Does It Simply Reflect Fiscal Stress?	11
H	Does Fiscal Policy Affect Voter Preferences?	12
I	Is it Just The Mayoralty?	13
J	Effects on Individual Policy Indicators	14

A Some More Context On Danish Municipalities

There have been two large reforms of local politics in the last 50 years. The first was conducted in 1970 as the Danish welfare state started to expand. Here the number of municipalities were reduced from more than 1000 to 275 (Ingvartsen, 1991). (Although it was 277 the first two years.) The second reform was conducted in 2007 and further reduced the number of municipalities from 275 to 98. Once again, the increasing complexity of public service provision was a key argument for the reform (Christiansen and Klitgaard, 2008). Since both of these reforms were comprehensive in terms of amalgamations and changes to the relative power of national ctr. local government, we let them be the bookends of our analysis, examining the relationship between citizens policy views and the ideological flavor of municipal policy between the two reforms.* Because of data availability we further limit our study period, so that it goes from 1978 and 2008.

In the period we study, Danish municipalities are governed by small city councils (between 9 and 29 members) which are elected at proportional elections and with a multi-party system which, to a large extent, mirrors the party system at the national level (Blom-Hansen et al., 2009). Elections are fixed to take place every four years and do not usually coincide with elections at the national or EU level.[†] Turnout is high with an average of around 70 percent since 1970.

Following each municipal election, a majority in the city council elects a mayor, and the chairmen of the various committees (Serritzlew et al., 2008). Mayors are the only full time professional politicians in the city councils and have a number of formal obligations (Kjaer, 2015). Mayors are also responsible for the day-to-day business of the administration and chairs the important economic committee which sets taxes and the budget. The work in the city council is structured by a a number of committees. The number and size of the committees is determined by the council. Committee membership is allocated proportionality between the political parties which means that there is broad political representation in all committees. The committees can decide on matters in their area and the administrative responsibility across areas is therefore essentially divided.

*In this study, we exclude the municipality of Copenhagen and Frederiksberg, as these were governed in a different way.

[†]There was only three years between the elections of 1981 and 1978

B Overview of Policies Included in Our Measure

C Details about Estimation of Municipal Fiscal Policy

We parameterize fiscal conservatism using the following measurement model, which allows us to estimate it across time and space:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{itk} &\sim N(F_{itk}^*, \phi) \\ F_{itk}^* &= \beta_k C_{it} - \alpha_k \end{aligned}$$

Where F is the level of the observed fiscal policy variable k in municipality i at time t . the distribution of each of these observed variables is drawn from a normally distributed latent variable F^* , which has variance ϕ . C is the quantity of most interest – the latent fiscal conservatism in that municipality. β is the discrimination parameter, which captures how strongly each observed policy variable loads onto the latent dimension. Finally, α represents each item's difficulty parameter, which measures how fiscally conservative a municipality is, if it were to score 0 on the policy variable k .

This parameterization is in many ways similar to frequentist factor analysis. However, a major advantage to using Bayesian techniques when making inferences about the latent trait is that the simulations will impute missing data during the estimation, which allows us to include items with different numbers of observations in the model – the variables with missing observations will simply supply less information to the estimation. Furthermore, we can use the Bayesian priors to introduce dynamics into the model, thus allowing quantities to not only vary across time, but also directly model temporal autocorrelation. Additionally, the estimation is simulation based, which allows us to directly estimate uncertainty around all model parameters. Finally, constraining prior distributions offers a flexible way of identifying the policy space. More on this final point later.

We include the 14 policy variables listed in table ?? in the model. Before we do so, all variables are rescaled to have mean zero and variance one. Furthermore, all variables where higher values imply a more left-wing fiscal policy are reversed. This implies that when estimating policy conservatism, higher values on all variables indicate a more conservative policy. This is strictly speaking not necessary, but it makes interpretation of the model parameters simpler.

To identify the direction of the policy space, we constrain the β 's to be positive, so that municipalities scoring higher on our observed policy variables will be estimated to be more conservative. Location and scale is identified by placing standard normal priors on the distributions of all model parameters. All precision parameters are estimated using uninformative gamma priors.

Estimation is done by initiating a random walk over the parameter space defined by the model using the Gibbs sampler. We run 25,000 iterations of the model, where the first 2,500 are burn in. We run three parallel chains. To reduce autocorrelation within the chains of sampled values and improve convergence, we set a thinning interval of five, meaning that we

only retained every fifth sampled value. Together, this specification ensured convergence of the model and provided well-behaved, normal posterior distributions.


D Some Descriptive Features of Municipal Fiscal Policy

Figure D1 presents some descriptive features of the annual measure of fiscal policy conservatism. In particular, it looks at how the measure is distributed across time and space, revealing some interesting patterns in municipal fiscal policy.

Fiscal policy conservatism dropped slightly in the period. The drops are located in '78 to 81 and from 93 to 2000: periods where the Social Democratic Party was in power nationally. This makes sense as liberal national fiscal policies are likely to spill over into local politics through intergovernmental grants etc.


Aside from the national trends, however, the most notable feature of the time series seems to be the large variation we identify in fiscal policy. Some municipalities are, apparently, very fiscally conservative while others are very liberal. Although the within-differences are less dramatic, we also see some municipalities start out more conservative and then become more liberal and vice versa.

Further, the geographic spread of fiscal conservatism matches what most observers of Danish politics would expect. The most conservative municipalities are in Western Jutland and North of Copenhagen whereas the most Liberal (or Socialist) municipalities are west of Copenhagen and in and around the other large cities (Aalborg, Aarhus, Odense). Figure D2 presents an overview of the most and the least conservative municipalities across the entire period.



(a) Average Municipal Fiscal Policy Conservatism (dark line) and Municipal Fiscal Policy Conservatism for Individual Municipalities (grey lines) from 1978 to 2006.

(b) Distribution of Municipal Fiscal Policy Conservatism from 1978 to 2006 (densities).



(c) The Geographic Distribution of Municipal Fiscal Policy Conservatism at Three Points in Time.

Figure D1: How has Municipal Fiscal Policy Conservatism Developed from 1978 to 2006?





Figure D2: The Most and Least Conservative Municipalities

E Validating Our Measure Of Citizens' Policy Preferences

In figure E3a, we try to gauge the extent to which it matters that our measure relies on data from municipal rather than national elections. To do this, we correlate municipal-level net support for conservative parties at the 2005 municipal election with municipal-level net support for the same conservative parties at a national election held six months earlier. This analysis reveals a strong, but in no way deterministic, correlation of 0.56. Accordingly, we might miss meaningful variation, if we used election returns from national, rather than local, elections to estimate local policy preferences.



(a) How strongly correlated are the electorate's preferences at municipal and national elections? Data from the 2005 municipal and national elections.

(b) Does the electorates preference over parties reflect preferences over policy? Data from the 2013 municipal election.

Figure E3: How does our measure of local policy preferences perform?

How well does this electoral measure capture voters underlying preferences? To get an indication of this, we look at the 2013 Danish Municipal Election Survey Elklit et al. (2017). In this survey, more than 30 respondents (avg. 46) from each municipality were asked to place themselves on an eleven point ideology scale going from left to right. We calculate the municipality-specific mean of these responses and correlate these with the municipality-specific net support for conservative parties in the 2013 municipal election. As can be seen from figure E3b, the two are strongly correlated, which suggests that we are in fact tapping into relevant variation in policy views, when we measure citizens preferences over parties. Further, its important to note that the correlation is biased downwards, because we have random measurement error in our sample based measure of policy views.[‡]

[‡]The reader should also note that due to the municipal reform of 2006 (cf. the section on empirical context) we can only have 98 observations corresponding to the 98 (amalgamated) municipalities.

F Regression Table for Main Results

Table F1

<i>Dependent variable:</i>								
	Full Measure t_{+4}				Spending Only t_{+4}			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Right Vote	0.416*** (0.059)	0.129*** (0.037)	0.145*** (0.048)		1.110*** (0.122)	0.317*** (0.081)	0.335*** (0.099)	
FD Right Vote					0.065* (0.038)			0.143* (0.085)
Municipality FE?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Municipality FD?	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Time FE?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time X covariates?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
Observations	1,908	1,908	1,908	1,363	1,908	1,908	1,908	1,363
R ²	0.057	0.874	0.924	0.672	0.071	0.843	0.914	0.869
Adjusted R ²	0.056	0.853	0.906	0.670	0.070	0.816	0.893	0.869

Note: Robust standard errors with clustering at the municipality level are in parentheses. First-difference models uses Beck-Katz panel corrected standard errors. Population size (logged) included in all models.

G Does It Simply Reflect Fiscal Stress?

an increase of one percentage point in education is related to a decrease in support for right-wing parties of approximately 1/20 of a standard deviation.

Table G2: Support for Right-Wing Parties and Socio Demographics.

<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
Electoral Support for Right-Wing Parties	
Education	-0.007 (0.005)
Immigrants	-0.0001 (0.0001)
Unemployed	-0.003 (0.002)
Wald Stat	2.22
Municipality?	Yes
Year FE?	Yes
Observations	818
Adjusted R ²	-0.500

Note: Robust standard errors clustered on municipality are in parentheses. P value for the wald statistic is 0.53.

H Does Fiscal Policy Affect Voter Preferences?





Figure H4: Reverse Causality? Fiscal Conservatism does not predict future support for Right-Wing parties. Confidence intervals are 95 percent, computed using robust standard errors clustered at the municipality level.

I Is it Just The Mayoralty?

There are two important reasons why we would expect municipal policy to be responsive to voter preferences. First, when the electorate chooses to elect more right-wing candidates, we would expect them to enact more fiscally conservative policies. Second, we might observe that parties are differentially responsive to voter preferences. We investigate these mechanisms in Figure I5.

In panel A, we include a categorical control for whether the mayoral party is the Liberal Party, the Social Democrats, or some third party. In doing so, we condition the effect of electoral support for right-wing parties on, whether those parties control the most important municipal policy-making position. This gives us the effect of support for right-wing parties among the voters after taking into account, which politicians they elect. Identifying the direct effect of electoral support net of selection by including a post-treatment control in this way requires very strong assumptions that are unlikely to be met **REFERENCE**. Still, it is striking how little the coefficient on the policy preferences of the electorate changes, when controlling for the mayoral party. Additionally, it is interesting that policy does not seem to be different when the mayoralty changes from one party to another.



(a) Are Results Driven by Selection? The figure shows results after including control for the mayoral party. Baseline estimates are included for comparison.

(b) Are All Parties Equally Responsive? The figure shows the marginal effects from a model including an interaction between mayoral party and electoral support for right-wing parties.

Figure I5: Responsiveness or Selection? Two-way fixed effects and population size (logged) included in both models. Confidence intervals are 95 pct., computed from robust standard errors with clustering at the municipal level.

In panel B, we allow the effect to vary across our three different categories of mayoral party. The differences in the estimates are very small, and we cannot reject that policy under all three mayoralties respond equally to voter preferences.

J Effects on Individual Policy Indicators




Figure J6: Effect of Right-Wing Electoral Support Across Components of our Measure. Note that all measures of taxes and spending are reversed to capture more conservative fiscal policies. Confidence intervals are 95 percent, computed using robust standard errors clustered at the municipality level.

References

- Blom-Hansen, J., Elklist, J., and Kjær, U. (2009). Ét eller 98 kommunale valg i 2009? In Kjær, U., Elklist, J., and Elmelund-Præstekær, C., editors, *KV09. Analyser Af Kommunalvalget 2009*. Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Christiansen, P. M. and Klitgaard, M. B. (2008). *Den utænkelige reform. Strukturreformens tilblivelse 2002-2005*. Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Elklist, J., Elmelund-Præstekær, C., and Kjær, U. (2017). Kv13-analyser af kommunalvalget 2013.
- Ingvartsen, O. (1991). *Kommunalreformen i Danmark: Nye kommunale opgaver, planlægning og styring efter 1970*. Forl. Kommuneinformation.
- Kjaer, U. (2015). Urban political leadership and political representation: the multifaceted representational role of danish mayors. *Urban Affairs Review*, 51(4):563–577.
- Serritzlew, S., Skjæveland, A., and Blom-Hansen, J. (2008). Explaining oversized coalitions: empirical evidence from local governments. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 14(4):421–450.