'Does Transparency Improve Legislator Performance?'

Philipp Denter, Luis Martínez, Nicolas Motz & Carlos Sanz

Discussant comments

Guillermo Toral (IE University)

Contributions

- Leverages a nation-wide scandal with differential "dosing" across legislators to examine **the effects of corruption revelations on a chain of legislator survival and performance**

Contributions

- Leverages a nation-wide scandal with differential "dosing" across legislators to examine **the effects of corruption revelations on a chain of legislator survival and performance**

- **Great data on the characteristics, behavior, and performance of legislators** before and after 1) the scandal, and 2) an election

Contributions

- Leverages a nation-wide scandal with differential "dosing" across legislators to examine **the effects of corruption revelations on a chain of legislator survival and performance**

- **Great data on the characteristics, behavior, and performance of legislators** before and after 1) the scandal, and 2) an election

- **Potential for theoretical innovation** here, since this seems a case of non-electoral accountability (although probably mediated elites' expectation of electoral accountability in an upcoming legislative election)

Points for discussion

- Strengthening the theory

Points for discussion

- Strengthening the theory

- Clarifying the design

Points for discussion

- Strengthening the theory

- Clarifying the design

- Making sense of results

Points for discussion

- Strengthening the theory

- Clarifying the design

- Making sense of results

- Smaller suggestions

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**

  - Incumbent behavior

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**
  - Before the May 2010 elections
  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**
  - Incumbent behavior
  - Legislator turnover

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**

  - Incumbent behavior

  - Legislator turnover

  - Replacement behavior

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**

  - Incumbent behavior

  - Legislator turnover

  - Replacement behavior

- **How do effects kick in?**

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**

  - Incumbent behavior

  - Legislator turnover

  - Replacement behavior

- **How do effects kick in?**

  - Within-party accountability

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**

  - Before the May 2010 elections

  - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**

  - Incumbent behavior

  - Legislator turnover

  - Replacement behavior

- **How do effects kick in?**

  - Within-party accountability

  - Judicial (and prosecutorial) accountability

Thickening the theory

- **When do effects kick in?**
    - Before the May 2010 elections
    - After the 2010 elections

- **Where do effects kick in?**
    - Incumbent behavior
    - Legislator turnover
    - Replacement behavior

- **How do effects kick in?**
    - Within-party accountability
    - Judicial (and prosecutorial) accountability
    - Electoral accountability

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

- Counter to their study, **this one seems to be a story of within-party accountability**:

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

- Counter to their study, **this one seems to be a story of within-party accountability**:

  - Meaningful especially given the UK's electoral system

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

- Counter to their study, **this one seems to be a story of within-party accountability**:

  - Meaningful especially given the UK's electoral system

- But then **new questions** arise that it would be great if you could address theoretically and empirically:

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

- Counter to their study, **this one seems to be a story of within-party accountability**:

  - Meaningful especially given the UK's electoral system

- But then **new questions** arise that it would be great if you could address theoretically and empirically:

  - Why more punishment among Conservatives than Labour?

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

- Counter to their study, **this one seems to be a story of within-party accountability**:
  - Meaningful especially given the UK's electoral system

- But then **new questions** arise that it would be great if you could address theoretically and empirically:
  - Why more punishment among Conservatives than Labour?
  - Who within each party was more likely to be "purged"?

Situating this study in the literature

- **Wood and Groose's 2022 AJPS**: randomized audits of US Representatives in the 70s had impacts on incumbents' retirement, approval, challengers, and electoral performance.

- Counter to their study, **this one seems to be a story of within-party accountability**:

  - Meaningful especially given the UK's electoral system

- But then **new questions** arise that it would be great if you could address theoretically and empirically:

  - Why more punishment among Conservatives than Labour?

  - Who within each party was more likely to be "purged"?

  - What happened in the smaller parties? (Lib-Dems particularly relevant given their push for reform at the time)

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**
  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**
  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID
  - What pre-treatment covariates are you using for matching?

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**

  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**

  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID

  - What pre-treatment covariates are you using for matching?

  - Why not use one of the imputation-based DiD methods (e.g. Liu et al.)? Pros: more efficient, diagnostic tools

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**
  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID
  - What pre-treatment covariates are you using for matching?
  - Why not use one of the imputation-based DiD methods (e.g. Liu et al.)? Pros: more efficient, diagnostic tools

- **Tease out unconditional effects vs effects conditional on turnover**

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**
  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID
  - What pre-treatment covariates are you using for matching?
  - Why not use one of the imputation-based DiD methods (e.g. Liu et al.)? Pros: more efficient, diagnostic tools

- **Tease out unconditional effects vs effects conditional on turnover**

- **Heterogeneous treatment effects?**

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**
  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID
  - What pre-treatment covariates are you using for matching?
  - Why not use one of the imputation-based DiD methods (e.g. Liu et al.)? Pros: more efficient, diagnostic tools

- **Tease out unconditional effects vs effects conditional on turnover**

- **Heterogeneous treatment effects?**
  - Use interactions rather than subsets

Clarifying the design

- **What's the treatment?**
  - A revelation of higher levels of malfeasance, in the context of a system-wide scandal

- **Why the synthetic did?**
  - Clarify for readers why you need the SDID
  - What pre-treatment covariates are you using for matching?
  - Why not use one of the imputation-based DiD methods (e.g. Liu et al.)? Pros: more efficient, diagnostic tools

- **Tease out unconditional effects vs effects conditional on turnover**

- **Heterogeneous treatment effects?**
  - Use interactions rather than subsets
  - Let theory drive those tests

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?

  - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?

  - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?
    - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**
    - Put them in context

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?
    - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**
    - Put them in context

- **Are the effects merely driven by the replacement of incumbents by more junior legislators?**

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?

  - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**

  - Put them in context

- **Are the effects merely driven by the replacement of incumbents by more junior legislators?**

  - For baseline, you could estimate through a close-races RDD the effects of getting a new legislator.

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?

    - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**

    - Put them in context

- **Are the effects merely driven by the replacement of incumbents by more junior legislators?**

    - For baseline, you could estimate through a close-races RDD the effects of getting a new legislator.

- **Use variation within 2009 to examine effects on legislative behavior**

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?
    - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**
    - Put them in context

- **Are the effects merely driven by the replacement of incumbents by more junior legislators?**
    - For baseline, you could estimate through a close-races RDD the effects of getting a new legislator.

- **Use variation within 2009 to examine effects on legislative behavior**
    - Before and after scandal broke out in *The Daily Telegraph*

Making sense of results

- Can you use survey, Google search, or local media data to **test whether more affected districts had more citizen attention and/or outrage at the scandal**?
  - Use baseline measures of exposure to *The Daily Telegraph*?

- **How big are these effects?**
  - Put them in context

- **Are the effects merely driven by the replacement of incumbents by more junior legislators?**
  - For baseline, you could estimate through a close-races RDD the effects of getting a new legislator.

- **Use variation within 2009 to examine effects on legislative behavior**
  - Before and after scandal broke out in *The Daily Telegraph*
  - Before and after the Legg report

Smaller suggestions to consider

- Add robustness checks to appease concerns about boundary changes (maybe subset to non-changing districts, or other ways to define matches)

Smaller suggestions to consider

- Add robustness checks to appease concerns about boundary changes (maybe subset to non-changing districts, or other ways to define matches)

- Do you find larger effects when defining the treatment at a higher level of repayments?

Smaller suggestions to consider

- Add robustness checks to appease concerns about boundary changes (maybe subset to non-changing districts, or other ways to define matches)

- Do you find larger effects when defining the treatment at a higher level of repayments?

- Why do you need the party x year fixed effects?

Smaller suggestions to consider

- Add robustness checks to appease concerns about boundary changes (maybe subset to non-changing districts, or other ways to define matches)

- Do you find larger effects when defining the treatment at a higher level of repayments?

- Why do you need the party x year fixed effects?

- Are your standard errors clustered at the district level, where treatment is determined?

Smaller suggestions to consider

- Add robustness checks to appease concerns about boundary changes (maybe subset to non-changing districts, or other ways to define matches)

- Do you find larger effects when defining the treatment at a higher level of repayments?

- Why do you need the party x year fixed effects?

- Are your standard errors clustered at the district level, where treatment is determined?

- Include placebo tests (different periods, different treatments)