This research is funded by the National Science Centre of Poland (project 2014/13/B/HS4/03204).

Can (limited) fiscal autonomy curb government deficits at the local level?

Joanna Siwińska-Gorzelak & Grażyna Bukowska





London, 14-16 September 2017

Motivation

The paper aims to answer:

- ➤ What is the impact of "potential" or "de jure" fiscal autonomy (decentralisation) on fiscal discipline at the local level?
 - Fiscal autonomy = "potential" own revenues / total revenues
- ➤ What is the impact of tax exemptions (i.e. what happens when local authorities "use" their autonomy)
- > Does political competition change the picture?

Sample

- ➤ Whole sample of over 2400 Polish municipalities in years 2002-2014
- > Detailed data on the revenue structure & political variables

The share of different revenue sources in total revenues of Polish municipalities, in years 2003-2015 (in %)

	2012	2013	2014	2015
Own revenues	30,2	31,2	32	31,4
Shared taxes (PIT&CIT)	16,4	16,9	17,4	18,3
Conditional grants	22	20,9	21,6	21,3
Unconditional grants	31,4	31	29,1	29

Contribution of the paper

- Single country uniform institutions, culture, etc.
- Detailed data, allowing to precisely measure the fiscal (revenue) autonomy
- We utilise a measure of
 - > "potential" (de jure) own revenues and tax exemptions that to some extend alleviates the problem of endogenity
 - > Tax exemptions
- > Inclusion of the variables related to the political environment

Relation to the literature

- ➤ The effects of decentralisation depend on the revenue structure of the local governments (Eyraud and Lusinyan, 2013)
- ➤ Higher reliance on fiscal transfers from the central government matters for fiscal imbalances. Higher share of transfers (i.e. lower fiscal autonomy) may lead to higher fiscal deficits due to:
 - fiscal illusion (Wibbels, 2000)
 - common pool problem (Plekhanov and Singh, 2006)
 - Lower accountability (Baskaran, 2012)
 - lower fiscal flexibility in face of unexpected fiscal shocks (Asatryan et al., 2015)
 - soft budget constraints (Baskaran, 2012; Foremny, 2014; Goodspeed, 2002; Neyapti, 2013; Rodden, 2002)
 - Leviathan Hypothesis (Besley and Case, 1995)

Relation to the literature

- ➤ On the other hand, higher fiscal autonomy might lead to higher fiscal imbalances, due to:
 - ➤ competition between local units for the mobile capital and a "race to the bottom" in taxation (Edwards and Keen, 1996; Wilson and Wildasin, 2004)
 - ➤ diseconomies of scale and coordination problems may increase the costs of supplying public goods (Neyapti, 2010)
 - ➤ higher corruption (Neyapti, 2010)

Empirical Strategy

$$fb_{i,t}$$

$$= \alpha + \beta * fb_{i,t-1} + \gamma RD_{i,t} * + \gamma TE_{i,t} + \vartheta * Z_{i,t} + \mu * Pol_{i,t} + \omega * time_i + e_{i,t}$$

- fb stands for current fiscal balance (current revenues current spending/ current revenues) and total fiscal balance (total revenues - total spending/ total revenues)
- > RD is the share of "de jure" own revenues (measure of fiscal autonomy);
- ➤ TE_1 is the share of tax exemptions granted by each municipality of total revenues of the municipality
- > TE_2 is the share of tax exemptions granted by each municipality of own revenues of the municipality
- > Z is a set of control variables

Empirical Strategy

- ➤ Yearly data: FE, the GMM dynamic panel data estimation (Arellano & Bond, 1991; Arellano & Bover, 1995).
- ➤ Four-year averages: fixed effects estimation (FE with Driscoll-Kraay standard errors)
- Estimation for the whole sample of all municipalities, as well as the subsamples of only urban and only rural municipalities

Data

- ➤ We use annual data, for years 2002-2014; collected for all municipalities in Poland.
- > Local revenues and expenditures: Polish Ministry of Finance;
- Demographic & other structural characteristics: the Local Database of Central Statistical Office
- > Political variables: National Electoral Commission

Results

	(total fb)	(total fb)	(5)	(6)
	Whole	Whole	Urban	Rural
	sample	sample		
Potential RD	0.221***	0.221***	0.0787**	0.192***
	(0.0117)	(0.0297)	(0.0265)	(0.0187)
Tax exemptions	-0.203***	-0.203**	-0.161*	-0.361***
	(0.0317)	(0.0865)	(0.0879)	(0.0517)
Driscoll_Kray	no	yes	yes	yes
Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes

Empirical strategy – the political scene

- ➤ To measure political competition (fragmentation) at the elections we calculate a Herfindahl index (from 0 to 1)
 - ➤ Higher values corresponding to higher level of political competition, i.e. many political candidates & almost equal share of votes; no candidate strictly dominates over the others.
- > We also control for:
 - > party fragmentation of the municipal or town council
 - > educational attainment of the mayor, mayor party

Variables	current fb	currrent fb
potential RD	0.190***	0.222***
	(0.0199)	(0.0231)
tax_exemptions	-0.502***	-0.525***
	(0.0509)	(0.0690)
mayor_fragm	-0.00879***	-0.0105***
	(0.00291)	(0.00173)
council_fragm	0.00154	-0.000813
	(0.00386)	(0.00305)
mayor_edu	0.000755	0.00266**
	(0.00194)	(0.000633)
mayor_party	-0.000703*	-0.000419
	(0.000413)	(0.000221)
Controls	yes	yes
Driscoll-Kray	no	yes

Conclusions

- Higher "potential" level of fiscal autonomy is associated with more fiscal prudence
- ➤ When the local governments choose to actively shape their tax policy and decrease the local tax burden, this is associated with lower fiscal balances.
- > The need to join fiscal autonomy with fiscal rules?
- The results remain robust also when we limit the sample to just rural or just urban municipalities.

Conclusions – the impact of the political scene

- ➤ Political competition index has a significant and negative impact, indicating that tighter elections lead to deterioration of fiscal balances.
- ➤ The findings are consistent with the hypothesis that a fragmented political arena has an negative effect on local fiscal balance.