

Bureaucratic Quality and Electoral Accountability

Tara Slough—NYU

25th June, 2022

In search of accountability...

- Pervasive “bad” governance in developing countries.
 - Corruption, lack of public goods and services.
 - Cited as evidence of limited accountability.
 - Recent work on information as an antidote to these problems (e.g., Dunning et al. 2019)
- Challenges:
 1. Conflicting findings in studies of information and accountability.
 2. Asymmetric treatment of outcomes of limited accountability in developed vs. developing democracies.

Co-production of public goods

- **Politicians** and **bureaucrats** co-produce public goods:
 - Politicians allocate funding.
 - Bureaucrats produce/implement public goods.
- Globally, **bureaucratic quality** varies substantially.
- Bureaucratic quality drives the efficiency of public goods investments, which influences:
 - Politician incentives to allocate budget to public goods vs. rents.
 - Voters' ability to update on politician type, select "competent" types.

Overview

Theory: Simple model of electoral accountability with a voter, a politician, and a bureaucrat.

- Characterize equilibria at different levels of bureaucratic quality.
- Equilibria imply distinct **empirical implications** of electoral accountability.

Overview

Theory: Simple model of electoral accountability with a voter, a politician, and a bureaucrat.

Design: Two theoretically-structured **meta-studies** to test empirical implications against two special cases capturing existing arguments.

- Today: Extend three studies of accountability of Brazilian mayors.
 - 3 studies on corruption and accountability.

Overview

Theory: Simple model of electoral accountability with a voter, a politician, and a bureaucrat.

Design: Two theoretically-structured **meta-studies** to test empirical implications against two “nested” corner cases.

Findings: Data is consistent with the (full) model, not the alternatives.

○ In Brazil...

- Politicians allocate funds to rents (instead of public goods) as a function of bureaucratic quality.
- Voters update on politicians differently at different levels of bureaucratic quality.

Theory



Model overview

- Simple 2-period accountability model.
- Players: Politician, Bureaucrat, Voter.
- P of type $\theta \in \{\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}\}$ – Incompetent or competent.
 - Ability to “get things done”
 - Monitor at rate $\bar{\theta}$ or $\underline{\theta}$, where $0 < \underline{\theta} < \bar{\theta} < 1$
 - Private information to P and B
 - Citizen’s prior: $\Pr(\theta = \bar{\theta}) = \pi \in (0, 1)$

Public goods production

- In each period, public goods co-produced by P and B.
- With budget normalized to 1, P allocates:
 - a_t to public goods.
 - $1 - a_t$ to private rents.
- Bureaucrat, of quality $q > 1$, exerts effort $e_t \in (0, 1)$ to produce the public good
 - q is exogenous, common knowledge.
- Public goods g_t produced according to:

$$g_t = \begin{cases} qa_t & \text{with probability } e_t \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - e_t \end{cases}$$

Election, voter's utility

- Voter observes a signal, z , of:

$$z = \begin{cases} g_1 & \text{with probability } p \\ \emptyset & \text{with probability } 1 - p \end{cases}$$

- $p = 0$: no voter information \Rightarrow “no accountability”
- Used to derive predictions “with” and “without” voter information

- Voter's utility:

$$E[u_v(i)] = E[g_2^i | z] + \phi$$

$$E[u_v(c)] = E[g_2^c]$$

- where $\phi \sim U[-b, b]$, for $b > q$, is a valence shock
- Challenger assumed to act as a first-period incumbent.

Utilities

○ Politician:

- If in office:

$$U_t^P = \underbrace{1 - a_t}_{\text{Rents}} + \underbrace{g_t}_{\text{PG}}$$

- If not in office, U_t^P normalized to 0
- No discounting.

○ Bureaucrat:

- Recall that monitoring rate is $\theta \in (0, 1)$:

$$U_t^B = -\theta(1 - e_t) - \frac{e_t^2}{2}$$

- Bureaucrat is not forward-looking.

Sequence, equilibrium concept

○ Sequence:

1. Nature determines θ_1 .
2. The incumbent allocates a_1 to the public good.
3. The bureaucrat exerts effort e_1 to produce g_1 .
4. With probability p , the voter observes $z = g_1$ and forms posterior $\mu(z)$. ϕ is realized and the voter chooses incumbent or challenger.
5. The incumbent allocates a_2^i (if re-elected), challenger allocates a_2^c (if not re-elected) to the public good.
6. Bureaucrat exerts effort e_2^i or e_2^c to produce g_2^i or g_2^c , respectively.

○ Solution concept: Perfect Bayesian Equilibria (PBE) with intuitive criterion refinement.

Analysis

- Bureaucrat's optimal effort (in both periods):

$$e_t^* = \theta_t$$

- In a second term, a politician allocates:

$$a_2^{i*} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } q \geq \frac{1}{\theta_2} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

- Given production function, $E[g_2^i] = qa_2^i\theta_2 \rightarrow$ Politician type (θ) and bureaucratic quality (q) are **complements**.

Voter's re-election decision

- Voters re-elect if $E[u_v(i)] > E[u_v(c)]$ implying:


$$\Pr(\text{re-election}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{E[g_2^j|z] - E[g_2^c]}{2b}$$

- Recall that voter may or may not observe $z \in \{0, qa_t\}$:
 - With probability $1 - p$ voter does not observe z and so $\mu = \pi$
 - With probability p voter observes z , but informativeness of public goods signal depends on politician allocation behavior!

Equilibria

- Consider three thresholds of bureaucratic quality: $q_L \leq q_M \leq q_H$:

$$q_L = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \quad q_M = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \frac{2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta})}{\underline{\theta}(2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta}) + p\bar{\theta}(1 - \pi))} \right\}, \quad q_H = \frac{1}{\underline{\theta}}$$




Pooling

Equilibria

- Consider three thresholds of bureaucratic quality: $q_L \leq q_M \leq q_H$:

$$q_L = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \quad q_M = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \frac{2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta})}{\underline{\theta}(2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta}) + p\bar{\theta}(1 - \pi))} \right\}, \quad q_H = \frac{1}{\underline{\theta}}$$




Pooling

Separating

Equilibria

- Consider three thresholds of bureaucratic quality: $q_L \leq q_M \leq q_H$:


$$q_L = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \quad q_M = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \frac{2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta})}{\underline{\theta}(2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta}) + p\bar{\theta}(1 - \pi))} \right\}, \quad q_H = \frac{1}{\underline{\theta}}$$



Equilibria

- Consider three thresholds of bureaucratic quality: $q_L \leq q_M \leq q_H$:

$$q_L = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \quad q_M = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}}, \frac{2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta})}{\underline{\theta}(2b(1 - \pi\bar{\theta}) + p\bar{\theta}(1 - \pi))} \right\}, \quad q_H = \frac{1}{\underline{\theta}}$$



Reassessing the Accountability of Brazilian Mayors



Measuring bureaucratic quality, q

- Measure: **education level** of the average municipal bureaucrat
 - From IBGE's Municipal Information Survey (MUNIC), 2005-2014
 - From counts bureaucrats by education level, measured \approx triennially
- What drives variation in bureaucratic quality?
 - Variation in public sector hiring, contracting processes (Torralba 2019)
 - Local labor market conditions
 - Include: State FE; decile bins: % formal, avg. ed., GDP, population
 - Collectively these account for only **20% of variation in BQ**
 - Conditional on these covariates, independent of **community radio**
- Assumption: Bureaucratic quality is **sticky**, at least in the short-run.
 - Annualized textbfautocorelation in BQ measure: 0.83.
 - First-difference models reveal no evidence that changes in mayor or mayor's party yield differential changes in BQ.

Audits: Measuring Politicians' Behavior

- Model emphasizes tradeoff between **allocation** and **rents**:
 - Public goods are co-produced.
 - Rents measure actions of the politician.
- **Audit outcomes** serve as the measure of politician allocation.
 - **Mayors** responsible for proposing budget, monitoring execution. Gonçalves (2013)
 - Lawsuits against audits from politicians, not bureaucrats. Seabra (2016)
- Scope: First 11 rounds of randomized CGU audits, 2003-2004:
 - DV is % of audited funds misused Avis et al. (2018)
 - Here randomization is serving as **random sampling**, since I am only looking at audited municipalities.
 - Abstracts from politician learning from audits Lichand et al. (2016); Avis et al. (2018)

Measuring Citizen Updating

- Survey experimental evidence to measure **updating**
 - Lots of recent consternation about non-alignment between survey, field experiments on **corruption**. Boas et al. (2019) and Incerti (2019)
 - But they measure changes in beliefs and actions, respectively.
 - Focus for talk: updating.
- Nationally representative **survey experiment** fielded in Brazil Weitz-Shapiro and Winters (2016); Winters and Weitz-Shapiro (2016)
 - Conducted in 2013 in 142 municipalities.
 - Manipulation is information about audit outcome of hypothetical “Mayor Carlos” in “municipality like yours”
 - Treatment conditions: (1) no information, (2) **clean**, or (3) corrupt
 - Testing a new prediction for updating on a clean signal.

Test #1: Politician allocation behavior

- Sign of association between bureaucratic quality and rents extracted.


- Estimator:

$$Y_{msl} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Q_m + \gamma_s + \lambda_l + \delta X_m + \epsilon_{msl}$$

- Prediction is that $\beta_1 < 0$.
- Note: Theory suggests non-linearities in Q_m . I use linear as well as tercile, quartile specifications of Q_m .

Result #1


- Negative association between bureaucratic quality and rents.



Association between q and % of audited funds misused. $N = 448$.

Aside: What is the range of bureaucratic quality in Brazil?

	q : Bureaucratic quality			
	q_L	q_M	q_H	
Allocation by type $\bar{\theta}$	$a_1 = a_2 = 0$	$a_1 = a_2 = 1$	$a_1 = a_2 = 1$	$a_1 = a_2 = 1$
Allocation by type $\underline{\theta}$	$a_1 = a_2 = 0$	$a_1 = a_2 = 0$	$a_1 = 1, a_2 = 0$	$a_1 = a_2 = 1$




Rents are relatively circumscribed.

Test #2: Term effects on allocation

- Marginal effect of second term on rents is only positive at low levels of BQ (within sample).
 - Estimator:


$$Y_{msl} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Q_m + \beta_2 \text{Second term}_m + \beta_3 Q_m \text{Second term}_m + \gamma_s + \lambda_l + \delta X_m + \epsilon_{msl}$$

- Prediction: $\beta_2 + \beta_3 > 0$ for low levels of Q_m and $\beta_3 < 0$.
- Brazilian mayors are term-limited to two (consecutive) terms.
- Second term_m is an indicator for a mayor's final term in office.



Result #2:

- Second term shirking is only detected at low levels of BQ.



Marginal effect of second term on politician's allocation to rents at different levels of BQ.

Implications of Result #2:

- First-term incompetent politicians reduce allocation to rents to win re-election → voters are watching
 - ...but only at low levels of BQ → evidence of pooling equilibrium at high BQ
- Inconsistent with a “bureaucrats in charge” alternative explanation for previous association between BQ and rents (at least in isolation).

Test #3:


- **Prediction:** At high levels of q , V 's posterior (μ) is equal to her prior (π) upon receiving a signal that P allocated no funds to rents.
 - Here, the signal is **politician allocation behavior**, not public goods provision.
- CATEs of the **clean audit** treatment at different levels of bureaucratic quality.
 - Estimator:

$$Y_{ims} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{Clean signal}_i + \beta_3 \text{Clean signal}_i Q_m + \\ \beta_4 \text{Corrupt signal}_i + \beta_5 \text{Corrupt signal}_i Q_m + \gamma_s + \theta X_m + \epsilon_{ims}$$

- Outcome is 7-point feeling thermometer towards mayor.
- Predictions: $\beta_3 < 0$ and $\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ at high levels of BQ.
- Use of corrupt signal allows for "testing" off-path assumptions.

Result #3:

- Updating on clean signal attenuated to 0 as BQ increases → evidence that voters **update** consistently with general model predictions.



Voters do not update on a clean signal at high levels of BQ.

Discussion



Implications

1. Observable implications of functioning accountability relations **look different in different places**.
 - Critical observation: stems from **co-production** of public goods by politicians and bureaucrats.
2. Bad outcomes need not be generated by **"bad politics"**.
3. Over-emphasis on **similarities** rather than **differences** in the (current) study of comparative politics

Thank you!


www.taraslough.com




Appendix



Signal content: public goods vs. politician action



Public goods signal



Politician action signal. Note that $\tilde{q}_M \leq q_M$.

Vignettes

Arm	Vignette Text
Control	"Imagine that you live in a neighborhood similar to your own but in a different city in Brazil. Let's call the mayor of that hypothetical city in which you live Carlos. Imagine that Mayor Carlos is running for reelection. During the four years that he has been mayor, the municipality has experienced a number of improvements, including good economic growth and better health services and transportation." (Weitz-Shapiro and Winters, 2016, p. 266).
Clean	Control text + "Also, it is well known in the city that Mayor Carlos has not accepted any bribes when awarding city contracts."
Corrupt	Control text + "Also, it is well known in the city that Mayor Carlos has accepted bribes when awarding city contracts."

Tabelle: Vignette text for each treatment condition.