

IEB Working Paper 2018/04

POPULARITY SHOCKS AND POLITICAL SELECTION

Francisco Cavalcanti, Gianmarco Daniele, Sergio Galletta

Fiscal Federalism

IEB Working Paper

POPULARITY SHOCKS AND POLITICAL SELECTION

Francisco Cavalcanti, Gianmarco Daniele, Sergio Galletta

The **Barcelona Institute of Economics (IEB)** is a research centre at the University of Barcelona (UB) which specializes in the field of applied economics. The **IEB** is a foundation funded by the following institutions: Applus, Abertis, Ajuntament de Barcelona, Diputació de Barcelona, Gas Natural, La Caixa and Universitat de Barcelona.

The **IEB** research program in **Fiscal Federalism** aims at promoting research in the public finance issues that arise in decentralized countries. Special emphasis is put on applied research and on work that tries to shed light on policy-design issues. Research that is particularly policy-relevant from a Spanish perspective is given special consideration. Disseminating research findings to a broader audience is also an aim of the program. The program enjoys the support from the **IEB-Foundation** and the **IEB-UB** Chair in Fiscal Federalism funded by Fundación ICO, Instituto de Estudios Fiscales and Institut d'Estudis Autònoms.

Postal Address:
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona
Facultat d'Economia i Empresa
Universitat de Barcelona
C/ John M. Keynes, 1-11
(08034) Barcelona, Spain
Tel.: + 34 93 403 46 46
ieb@ub.edu
<http://www.ieb.ub.edu>

The IEB working papers represent ongoing research that is circulated to encourage discussion and has not undergone a peer review process. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IEB.

POPULARITY SHOCKS AND POLITICAL SELECTION *

Francisco Cavalcanti, Gianmarco Daniele, Sergio Galletta

ABSTRACT: We observe that popularity shocks are crucial for electoral accountability beyond their effects on voters' behaviors. By focusing on Brazilian politics, we show that the disclosure of audit reports on the (mis)use of federal funds by local administrators affects the type of candidates who stand for election. When the audit finds low levels of corruption, the parties supporting the incumbent select less-educated candidates. On the contrary, parties pick more-educated candidates when the audit reveals a high level of corruption. These effects are stronger in municipalities that have easier access to local media.

JEL Codes: D70, D72, D73

Keywords: Political selection, corruption, competence, local election, political parties

Francisco Cavalcanti
Universitat de Barcelona &
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona (IEB)
E-mail: f.cavalcanti@ub.edu

Gianmarco Daniele
Bocconi University (Baffi Carefin) &
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona (IEB)
E-mail: gianmarco.daniele@unibocconi.it

Sergio Galletta
Universitat de Barcelona,
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona (IEB),
Institute of Economics (IdEP) &
University of Lugano (USI)
E-mail: sergio.galletta@usi.ch

* We are grateful to Toke Aidt, Massimo Bordignon, Fernanda Brollo, Pamela Campa, Claudio Ferraz, Diogo Gerhard, Benny Geys, Miriam Golden, Roland Hodler, Mario Jametti, Stephan Litschig, Eva Mörk, Hannes Mueller, Torsten Persson, Dina Pomeranz, Didac Queralt, Albert Solé-Ollé and Ragnar Torvik for valuable comments and suggestions. We have also benefited from comments by participants at the Sinergia Workshop (Basel), SIEP (Lecce), SSES (Lausanne) and seminars at the Universities of Barcelona, Warwick, Lugano and ETHZ - KOF in Zürich. Sergio Galletta gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Swiss National Science Foundation (grants Early Postdoc.Mobility – 15860 and Advanced Postdoc.Mobility – 167635). Gianmarco Daniele gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Recercaixa project: “Limits to political corruption: Media, party systems, civil society and citizens” (2016ACUP 00177).

1. Introduction

Electoral accountability is a crucial mechanism that helps guarantee the sustainability of modern democracies. It allows sufficiently informed voters to assess the government's performance and hold politicians accountable for their actions (Barro, 1973; Mayhew, 1974). An extensive empirical literature shows that voters reduce their support of parties and officials involved in political scandals and reward politicians who are perceived to perform better (Ashworth, 2012; Ferraz and Finan, 2008; Snyder and Hirano, 2012; Chong et al., 2015; Costas-Pérez et al., 2012; Bagues and Esteve-Volart, 2016).¹

In this paper, we follow up on these findings and account for the possibility that political parties might anticipate voters' punishment, or reward, and change the composition of the pool of candidates selected to run for office accordingly. Specifically, we show that the release of information about government corruption affects the quality of candidates of the incumbent coalition. Intuitively, one might expect that if a political party (or coalition of parties) supports a government that faces a negative popularity shock, it might react by selecting more appealing and competent candidates to compensate for the expected poor results in the following election. Symmetrical intuitions could hold if there is a positive popularity shock: one might expect the party to behave strategically by reducing the share of costly, high-ability candidates given that the election will be less competitive.² These ideas are closely related to a recent strand of literature showing that political parties are strategic players that take into account specific features of the electoral competition when making decisions (Galasso and Nannicini, 2011; Mattozzi and Merlo, 2015).

We address this issue in the Brazilian context by looking at the effect of popularity shocks resulting from the disclosure of reports about potential misconduct in local governments on the ability of candidates for city councilor in the 2004 and 2008 local elections. Hence, we relate the education level of candidates from the coalition support-

¹Interestingly, this effect might not arise when voters already believe politicians to be malfeasant Arias et al. (2017) or when the media market structure does not provide incentives to supply politically-relevant information to their audiences Larreguy et al. (2017).

²We follow recent studies by considering education level as a proxy for politicians' ability. See, for example, Ferraz and Finan (2009), Galasso and Nannicini (2011), Gagliarducci and Nannicini (2013), Besley et al. (2011) or Daniele and Geys (2015). In the next section, we discuss the reasons and the implications of the fact that high ability candidates are costly for political parties.

ing (or opposing) the incumbent government with the release of information about its (dis)honesty. This information was made available to voters through an anti-corruption program introduced in 2003 by the Brazilian central government that monitors how municipalities spend federal funds. The primary task is performed by auditors who examine municipalities' accounts to verify the correct use of federal transfers.

Municipalities are randomly selected into the anti-corruption program, and the timing of the release of the report is also random. These characteristics are crucial for our identification strategy, as they help to assess the multi-faceted endogeneity issue of linking government conduct and the general quality of local politicians. Another important aspect for our purposes is that the process of selecting candidates for the city council has a similar schedule in all Brazilian municipalities. This makes it possible to define when, during the term, the selection process is taking place. Further, although city councilors are elected using an open-list proportional system, parties play a central role in selecting candidates. In practice, a citizen is eligible to stand for election if he has been affiliated with the supporting party for at least 12 months before election day. Formally, the candidate list is decided during party conventions that, by law, are held in June of each election year. This list must be submitted at least 3 months before election day.

We exploit the randomness of the timing of corruption disclosures and, conditioning on the level of corruption, compare the ability of the pool of candidates in municipalities where the audits were released during the candidate selection period (i.e., from 12 to 3 months before the election) with that of municipalities in which the audits were released either before or after the selection period. While our identification strategy closely follows the one used in Ferraz and Finan (2008), we define treatment slightly differently to suit our distinct research question.

Our findings, which are based on 1,321 municipalities that were audited in the period 2003–2010, show that when reports are disclosed during the political selection period, they lead to a significant change in the average ability of the candidates running for the city council who belong to the party (or coalition) of the incumbent mayor.³ This effect crucially depends on the level of corruption reported. Indeed, the spread of information about government conduct can provide either a positive or negative shock to the expected electoral results, depending on citizens' prior beliefs about the quality of the government (Besley, 2007). On the one hand, we find that there is a decrease in

³We reach a similar conclusion when studying mayoral candidates, though with less statistical power.

the candidates' average education of nearly 4.5 months of schooling when low levels of corruption are reported (i.e., lower than the median). On the other hand, we find an increase of nearly 4 months of schooling when substantial corruption is reported (i.e., higher than the median). In other words, there is a difference of 8.5 months of schooling depending on the results of the audit, which corresponds to about 30–35% of one standard deviation. These symmetric results are not surprising in a context where trust in politics is very low, and releasing information about the absence of corruption could be more unexpected than the opposite.⁴ The effect is of a similar magnitude when considering the sample of freshmen candidates or when we look at the median level of education. Interestingly, the effect is larger when we constrain our analysis to municipalities that have easier access to information due to the existence of local radio stations. Indeed, our findings are confirmed when using a different proxy for candidates' ability, i.e. individuals' main occupation. However, we do not find any change in other observable characteristics such as age and gender. Moreover, the undesirable selection of low ability candidates in municipalities that experience a positive popularity shock fades away the closer the release of the audit report is to the election. Finally, we find that changing the composition of the candidate pool does not have a significant effect on electoral outcomes. In fact, voters still punish corrupt parties, in particular where local radio stations are available, and the elected candidates do not appear to have different characteristics compared to those elected in municipalities where the report was released outside the selection period.

To our knowledge, we are the first to estimate the effect of popularity shocks about the incumbent government on the quality of political candidates. Our findings are closely related to the recent literature that emphasizes that the characteristics of the electoral race affect candidate selection. This could be caused by a change in either individuals' incentives to enter politics or parties' incentives to select particular types of candidates (Caselli and Morelli, 2004; Galasso and Nannicini, 2011). Our interpretation of the results is more in line with studies that emphasize the role of the demand for politicians (i.e., party selection) than those that focus on the supply of politicians (i.e., self-selection of individuals). For instance, Galasso and Nannicini (2011) focus on parties' role in

⁴Brazilians have very low confidence in political parties. More than 85% of the individuals interviewed in the 6th wave of the World Values Survey (2010–2014) responded that they have little or no confidence at all in political parties.

selecting candidates. Studying the Italian parliamentary elections, they show that better candidates (i.e., those with more years of schooling) are selected in districts where the electoral race is expected to be more competitive. Mattozzi and Merlo (2015) further show that the incentives to select high-ability candidates crucially depend on the electoral system. Specifically, high-ability candidates are less likely to be chosen in proportional than in majoritarian systems, as the latter are characterized by a higher level of electoral competitiveness. Likewise, Esteve-Volart and Bagues (2012), studying Senate and House elections in Spain, find that parties tend to select female candidates where they are less likely to be elected.

A second group of studies instead focuses on the supply side, showing that both monetary and non-monetary incentives might affect individuals' decision to enter politics. Kotakorpi and Poutvaara (2011), Ferraz and Finan (2009) and Gagliarducci and Nannicini (2013) show that higher salaries attract more educated individuals to politics in Finland, Brazil and Italy, respectively. Daniele and Geys (2015) and Daniele (2017) exploit shocks in the presence of criminal organizations in Italian municipalities to show that educated individuals drop out of politics when criminal groups are stronger, as they decrease the expected payoffs from politics (Dal Bó et al., 2006).⁵

Further, we complement the literature on political scandals. For instance, Ferraz and Finan (2008) focus on random audits in Brazilian municipalities to show that publicly exposed corrupt incumbents are less likely to be re-elected in the next election. In addition, Snyder and Hirano (2012) show that in US House elections, incumbents involved in scandals have a higher probability of losing their primary elections, and receive less votes in general elections compared to non-scandal incumbents. Chong et al. (2015) show that voters punish both incumbents and challengers after receiving information about the inefficient use of public funds in Mexico. Finally, Bobonis et al. (2016) find that foreseeable anti-corruption audits reduce corruption in the short-term, as they have a disciplining effect on the incumbent. In a similar vein, we find that the incumbent strategically reacts to the release of corruption news selecting different candidates.

Our results also contribute to the recent literature on the consequences of Brazil's randomized auditing policy. While Litschig and Zamboni (2013) and Avis et al. (2017)

⁵Finally, Baltrunaite et al. (2014) show that gender quotas increase the presence of (female) educated politicians. However, they do not discuss whether this is mostly driven by a change in the supply of or demand for educated politicians.

show that increasing the audit risk reduces rent extraction, Ferraz and Finan (2008), Brollo et al. (2013) and Muço (2016) confirm that releasing the audit reports indeed has an effect on electoral outcomes.⁶ Politicians seem to anticipate this potential electoral punishment by reducing malfeasance when they are eligible for re-election (Ferraz and Finan, 2011). Interestingly, Brollo et al. (2013) hint that auditing policy has an impact on political selection: they show that the disclosure of the audit reports affects not only the mayor’s likelihood of re-election but also the probability that he or she will run for re-election. Muço (2016) finds that municipal audits influence federal elections. Voters also reduce their support for the party of the incumbent mayor when voting in presidential elections. This result emphasizes that party labels matter in Brazil.⁷

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe our main hypothesis. Section 3 describes the institutional setting. In Sections 4 and 5, we present the data and estimation strategy, respectively. The main results and additional tests are reported in Sections 6 and 7. We conclude in Section 8.

2. Hypothesis

In this section, we provide a brief explanation of our main hypothesis and clarify its underlying assumptions.

As explained above, we depart from the literature on the voting effects of popularity shocks, which concentrates on whether voters hold politicians accountable. We instead focus on the idea that parties select candidates they expect to be popular with voters. Our main hypothesis is that, as selecting high-ability candidates is costly, political parties will strategically pick them depending on their expected likelihood of winning the election. Specifically, a positive popularity shock that increases the chances of winning an election will reduce the propensity to select appealing, high-ability candidates. A negative popularity shock will have the opposite effect, which increases parties’ motivation to select high-ability and competent candidates. This reasoning is based on the validity of three main assumptions.

First, it assumes that voters value candidates’ ability when casting their vote. Indeed,

⁶These results are relevant to our study, as they provide additional support to the critical assumption that auditing disclosure affects voters’ decisions.

⁷Samuels and Zucco (2014) reach a similar conclusion, as they find that Brazilians conform their opinions on public policy to those of the parties they support.

there is a large literature showing that voters primarily care about competence when picking an elected officer (Kinder et al., 1980; Todorov et al., 2005). Importantly, there is also empirical evidence that education – which we use as a proxy for competence – is a valid predictor of electoral success (Dal Bó et al., 2017). Our findings confirm this evidence. Appendix Table A.1 shows that, after controlling for city fixed effects and other individual characteristics, educated candidates are much more likely to be elected.

Second, this hypothesis assumes that selecting high-ability candidates is costly for a political party. Several papers corroborate the idea that a lack of incentives might limit the number of good citizens who choose to enter politics (Caselli and Morelli, 2004; Messner and Polborn, 2004). In fact, parties might benefit from selecting low-ability politicians, for example if they provide higher rents for the party or/and have a lower reservation wage (Besley, 2005; Dal Bó et al., 2006). Conversely, parties might select better candidates when an election is more competitive in order to maximize their chances of winning (Galasso and Nannicini, 2011; Mattozzi and Merlo, 2015). In line with these findings, in a recent working paper on Brazilian local politics, Colonnelli et al. (2017) show that there is a trade-off between education and party loyalty in the probability that party supporters will have a public-sector job. Finally, we find that educated candidates receive more party funds with which to finance their electoral campaigns, which suggests that selecting high-ability candidates is costlier for political parties (Appendix Table A.1).

Third, our hypothesis is valid in a political system in which political parties play a relevant role in selecting candidates, which depends on the country’s institutional framework. In the next section, we provide evidence of the crucial role that Brazilian political parties play in local elections.

Our reasoning thus far has focused on an incumbent coalition that is directly hit by a shock. Yet if the effects of a shock spill over to affect the challenger’s decision making, it is less clear what we should expect. First, the challenging party might expect the incumbent to react to the shock, and therefore has no incentive to change its own pool of candidates. Second, and perhaps more importantly, the type of spillover effect for the challenger is unclear. Assuming that voters have perfect information, if the incumbent is hit by a negative (positive) shock, the challenger should experience an electoral advantage (disadvantage). However, Chong et al. (2015) and Daniele et al. (2017) show that voters may blame the entire political class for a negative popularity shock, and thus punish both the incumbent and the challenger. In this case, the negative (positive) effects of a

shock would spread to the challenger as well.

3. Institutional setting

3.1. Local institutions and electoral rules

Brazil is a federation with three levels of government. In addition to the federal government, there are 26 states and 5,565 municipalities. Citizens choose the executive and the legislative branches of each jurisdiction through direct elections. Local governments have a central role in the provision of a variety of public goods (e.g., primary education, culture, health care, housing, transportation and municipal infrastructure). Transfers from upper levels of government cover a significant proportion of these expenditures.

At the municipal level, the mayor (*Prefeito*) has executive power while the city council (*Câmara de Vereadores*) exercises legislative power. The number of seats for councilors in each city council is based on population size.⁸ Mayors and city councilors are both elected for a term of 4 years, but while mayors are limited to two terms, city councilors have no term limits. The mayor plays a central role in defining the expenditure programs, and the city council is responsible for enacting municipality laws and overseeing the mayor's usage of public resources. Indeed, councilors have influence over the allocation of funds, for instance by proposing petitions, amendments and voting on the municipal budget proposal.

In municipal elections, voters are provided with a list of candidates running for mayor, at most one for each party (or coalition of parties), and a list of candidates for city councilor indicating which party they support.⁹ Voters can cast one vote for mayor and one vote for councilor. Alternatively, voters can select a party in the city council election without specifying a candidate. While mayors are elected with a majority of votes, councilor elections use an open-list proportional system, and the distribution of seats follows the d'Hondt method. This means that the number of seats assigned to a party in the city council depends on how many votes all candidates from that party

⁸Local laws define the exact number of seats, but they have to follow federal laws that set the limit of seats according to the population in the municipality (Art. 29 of 1988 Brazilian Federal Constitution.). The number of seats ranges from a minimum of 9 in municipalities with less than fifteen thousand inhabitants, and a maximum of 55 in those with more than eight million people.

⁹Municipal elections are held in different years than federal and state elections.

received. However, for each party, only the candidates with the most votes will become city councilors.

3.2. Party organization and the candidate selection process

Importantly for our study, political parties play a significant role in selecting candidates to run in local elections (Mainwaring, 1999; Guarnieri, 2011; Avelino et al., 2012). Only parties registered with the Tribunal Superior Eleitoral (TSE) within one year before the elections can present candidates. Almost 30 different parties presented candidates in the 2004 and 2008 elections. However, the five biggest parties accounted for more than 65% of all mayors elected in the 2004 and 2008 elections. A similar time constraint applies to citizens who want to register to run in the mayoral or city councilor elections. They need to have their voting residency in the district they would like to represent and to be affiliated with their supporting political party for at least one year before the election. The electoral law requires parties to nominate candidates during local conventions, but it does not define how these conventions need to be organized or how candidates should be selected, delegating complete autonomy to the executive committee of each party. In the 2004 and 2008 municipal elections, parties had to choose their candidates and coalitions in a party caucus from June 10–30 of the election year.¹⁰ Final candidate lists had to be registered with the TSE before July 5.¹¹ The maximum number of candidates a coalition can put forward is twice the total number of seats it holds in the city council.¹² The parties must put forward a minimum of 30% female candidates.

Although local conventions formally control the candidate selection process, national and regional party bodies can influence it, depending on the party statute (Avelino et al., 2012; Ribeiro, 2013a,b; Guarnieri, 2011). These differ across parties depending on the number of eligible voters and on whether the system is based on elections or direct appointment. Some parties select candidates in regional or national committees, so lo-

¹⁰These elections were held on October 3, 2004 and October 5, 2008

¹¹Changes to the electoral law (Law No. 9504, of 30 September 1997) in 2015 affected some of the elements we exploit in our analysis. Beginning with the 2016 municipal elections: (1) party conventions are required to take place from July 20 to August 5 in election years; (2) candidate lists must be submitted by August 14 and (3) candidates must be affiliated with a political party for at least 6 months before election day.

¹²If a party is not in a coalition, the number of candidates cannot be more than 150% of the total number of seats it holds in the city council. Further, if not all candidates are selected during the party convention, party leaders may fill the remaining vacancies within 60 days of the election.

cal candidates do not have to go through an approval process. In other parties every candidate is elected by vote, and thus presumably no higher party body can modify the candidate list. Following this classification, Guarnieri (2011) labels three types of parties:¹³ monocratic, oligarchic and polyarchic. In monocratic parties, the decision-making process is in the hands of a single group that has an absolute majority of votes and absolute control over party decisions. This group includes the Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro (PTB) and the Partido Progressista (PP). In oligarchic parties, a small number of groups control a considerable proportion of votes. While no single group can control the party on its own, the small number of groups facilitates coordination, increasing the cohesion and stability of the coalition. This group includes the Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira (PSDB), the Partido Democrático Trabalhista (PDT) and the Democratas (DEM). In polyarchic parties, the organization is more decentralized. The decision making depends on constant negotiations and discussions across and within different party layers and bodies. Both the cohesion and the stability of coalitions comprised of such groups are likely to be more precarious. This last group includes the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT) and the Partido do Movimento Democrático Brasileiro (PMDB).¹⁴

To conclude, the Brazilian (local) candidates selection process appears a multifaceted one, where both local and high level party branches play a role. Importantly for our hypothesis, we face a selection process characterized by a central role of political parties.

3.3. The Brazilian anti-corruption program

In 2003, the Brazilian national government, led by Luís Inácio Lula da Silva, established an innovative anti-corruption program to improve the transparency of public spending and to tackle corruption in local governments. The Controladoria Geral da União (CGU), a federal agency, was made responsible for auditing local spending that has been funded with federal transfers.¹⁵ Importantly for our analysis, municipalities are

¹³Other scholars reach similar conclusions on classifying Brazilian parties (Ribeiro, 2013a,b).

¹⁴Other mechanisms, such as party affiliations, also influence the candidate selection process. Party leaders can deliberately withdraw existing affiliations or deny new ones (Guarnieri, 2011). Another mechanism is to replace, due to irregularities, a local committee with a provisional one directly under the control of a national/regional party committee. Indeed, there are many cases of replacements for reasons that are not clearly stated in the statute (Guarnieri, 2011).

¹⁵CGU Decree No. 247, June 20, 2003.

randomly selected to the auditing process. Lotteries are held every two or three months in the Caixa Econômica Federal, in Brasília, in the presence of the media and members of civil society. Only municipalities with more than 500,000 inhabitants are exempt from the lottery. Further, since lotteries are run independently for each state, the probability of being selected for an audit in a given year varies by state. The first lottery selected 26 municipalities. From the second lottery to the eighth, 50 municipalities were selected each time; 60 municipalities have been chosen since the ninth lottery.

For each selected municipality the CGU compiles a list of all federal transfers received since 2001. Typically, 10 to 15 auditors spend around two weeks in the municipal offices searching for potential anomalies. Once the auditors have completed the inspections, they prepare a report listing any irregularities and malpractices. The report is then sent to competent authorities for prosecution and made publicly available on the CGU website about 3 months later. As shown by Ferraz and Finan (2008), the results of the audits generally receive media attention, especially at the local level.

4. Data

To estimate the effect of corruption disclosure on the quality of the pool of candidates, we collect information about Brazilian municipalities from a variety of sources for the period 2001–2010, which covers two full municipal terms (i.e., 2001–2004 and 2005–2008).¹⁶

Information about municipal-level corruption is taken from Brollo et al. (2013). Their data contain different measures of corruption for all 1,481 municipalities selected in the first 29 lotteries of the anti-corruption program (i.e., audits disclosed from July 2003 to March 2010). We use a broad definition of corruption that includes also irregularities that could be interpreted as government mismanagement rather than true corruption events.¹⁷ This definition includes illegal procurement practices and the diversion of funds – not justifiable payments.¹⁸ To account for the different levels of corruption across municipalities, our analysis uses the variable *Corruption*, which represents the

¹⁶Table A.2 reports summary statistics of the variables described below.

¹⁷Therefore, in our analysis we do not distinguish between active and passive waste (Bandiera et al., 2009), as we rely on the fact that both types of misbehaviours might be salient for electoral accountability.

¹⁸The dataset and full details on how the measure is constructed are available at <https://sites.google.com/site/fernandabrollo/home/data>.

amount of misappropriated funds as a proportion of the total amount audited.¹⁹ This information is available for only 1,422 municipalities, as it was not possible to compute the amount of resources involved in some irregularities. The level of observation is the municipality-term, meaning that we can clearly identify the term during which electoral irregularities took place. In other words, if a municipality was selected in a lottery in 2007, it will likely appear in the sample twice, as the auditors checked spending that occurred in both the 2001–2004 term and the first part of the 2005–2008 term. We present in Table 1 the summary statistics of *Corruption* divide by electoral term.

We use candidates’ level of education as a proxy for quality. Specifically, we consider the minimum number of years necessary to attain a certain degree.²⁰ Alternatively, we use the share of candidates that completed *Mandatory School*. The TSE provides data on the level of education of candidates for the city council. For each municipality, we distinguish between the *Average Education* level of candidates in the incumbent’s and the challengers’ coalitions. The incumbent’s coalition includes candidates from all the parties that run in the same coalition as the incumbent mayor’s party and who belonged to the winning coalition in the previous municipal election.²¹ The challengers’ coalition includes candidates running for all other parties. As an additional measure of quality we consider candidates’ job. That is, we associate to each candidate the average national salary correspondent to her profession and we compute coalitions’ *Average Income*.

Further, we compute the same variable considering *new* candidates (i.e., those who were not city councilors in the previous term) and *re-running* candidates. We also take into account the *Median Education* level of candidates and two other characteristics relevant for political selection – the *Share of Female* candidates and *Average Age*.²²

We compute similar measures for mayoral candidates, but focus only on candidates belonging to the same party as the incumbent. Finally, we consider the *Share of Seats*

¹⁹In the original dataset this variable is called *Broad Fraction of the Amount*. Note that we do not consider a binary measure of corruption as in the Brazilian context, the presence of corruption might not be informative per se, conversely we exploit the severity of the phenomenon. See Section 1 and the footnote 5.

²⁰For candidates who started a degree but eventually dropped out, we assign half the number of years that would be needed to complete it.

²¹We also show in Appendix Table A.4 our main results by defining the incumbent coalition as composed of all parties that belonged to the winning coalition in the previous municipal election.

²²We also construct the two latter variables and the *Average Education* level for the sample of elected candidates.

Won by candidates elected from the incumbent’s coalition.

We control for local political preferences by creating a dummy variable that equals 1 if the incumbent government was led by a mayor from Partido dos Trabalhadores, and 0 otherwise. This variable also controls for whether the municipalities is ruled by the same party in power at the federal government. The 2000 Brazilian Census provides data about the *Population* of the municipality, monthly per capita *Income*, *Share of Population Employed*, the *Gini Coefficient* of income, the *Share of population with a Secondary Degree*, the *Share of Population in Urban* areas, the share of population working in different job sectors (*Services, Transport, Public and Commerce*). We also construct a dummy variable *Media*, which accounts for the presence of local radio stations in the municipal area. This information is taken from the 2006 municipality survey *Perfil dos Municípios Brasileiros: Cultura*.

To provide homogeneous results in all our estimates, we apply a sequence of restrictions to the original dataset on corruption provided by Brollo et al. (2013). First, we remove eight municipalities, as they did not yet exist in 2000 when the population census was conducted. Second, we consider only municipalities in which at least some parties support the incumbent’s coalition. Therefore, we remove 88 more municipalities. Finally, we exclude five municipalities in which there were no new candidates for city councilor (i.e., they were all incumbents). Clearly, by applying these restrictions the sample of municipalities we use in our analysis is no longer random. We address this issue in Section 7.

5. Estimation strategy

The main objective of this study is to test whether information shocks that change citizens’ voting behavior affect the quality of electoral candidates selected by parties. Specifically, we want to compare (1) the ability of candidates running for city council when the local government experiences an informative shock during the party selection period to (2) the ability of candidates running for city council in local governments that experience a similar informative shock at other points in time. In order to provide a reliable counterfactual analysis, we exploit the randomness of the timing of the disclosure of the audit reports to determine the group of *Treated* vs. *Control* municipalities.

To precisely determine the *selection period* (and hence the composition) of the two different groups, we identify two important dates in the electoral process. First, we

account for the deadline for parties to provide their candidate lists (i.e., July 5, 2004 for the elections held in October 2004 and July 5, 2008 for the October 2008 elections). Second, we consider the cutoff date for citizens to be affiliated with a party in order to run as a candidate for that party (i.e., October 3, 2003 for the October 2004 elections and October 5, 2007 for the elections held in October 2008). Thus, a municipality is considered to be *treated* if the disclosure of the report occurred between 12 to 3 months before election day. Indeed, depending on the lottery results, the communication of the audit reports might occur during, before or after what we identify as the treatment period. We think our definition makes clear that the focus on parties' role in the selection process as the group of citizens willing to run for public office is mostly predetermined by the time the reports are disclosed.

It is worth noting that our strategy closely follows the one used in Ferraz and Finan (2008). However, as we are exploring a distinct research question, our definition of *treatment* and the way we split the sample between treated and control municipalities are rather different. Indeed, Ferraz and Finan (2008) define *treated* municipalities as those that received an auditing disclosure anytime before the election. Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, we provide results where we use this latter definition of the treatment group. By doing so, on the one hand, we loosen the focus on parties' role in the selection process as now the group of citizens that can become eligible to run for election is not predetermined. For example, citizens can decide to enroll in a political party as a response to an audit report published more than 12 months before the election, while this would not be taken into account with our primary definition of treatment. On the other hand, we control for the possibility that receiving a popularity shock in the three months before the election causes the withdraw from the electoral competition of previously selected candidates. For instance, political candidates from the incumbent political party that experience a very negative popularity shock might withdraw from the electoral competition so that the incumbent party may replace these candidates. Related to this point, we also report results where we exclude from the analysis municipalities that had the auditing disclosed more than 12 months before elections. We do so given that it is not straightforward to think of them as part of the control group as the informational

shocks occurred before the end of the selection period.²³

Another aspect to take into account is that auditing reports reveal a misuse of public funds that could cover both terms we include in our analysis. This could be a problem if it were not possible to determine the exact timing of the misbehavior. In this case, citizens would be limited in their judgment as it would be less clear who was accountable for the discoveries made during the audit. Luckily, the corruption data we use categorize the misuse of public funds by term and municipality, which allows us to identify the treated and control groups for each term as reported in Figure 1.

Table 2 summarizes the sample composition, differentiating accordingly to the time of the disclosure of the auditing report. Over the two terms, we have 1,695 observations. Following our main definition of treatment: 327 are treated (19.3% of the sample) and 1,368 are controls (80.7% of the sample).²⁴ We have 182 treated and 960 control municipalities for the 2001–2004 term. Here, the treated municipalities are the ones drawn from the four lotteries disclosed between October 2003 and April 2004, while the control group includes all municipalities selected in the other 25 lotteries that had audit reports released in the 2001–2004 term. For the 2005–2008 term we have 145 treated and 408 control municipalities. The treated municipalities were drawn from the three lotteries disclosed between January 2008 and June 2008, while the control group comprises all municipalities selected from the six lotteries disclosed between February 2006 and July 2007 plus the four lotteries disclosed between December 2008 and March 2010 that were audited for federal funds released in the 2005–2008 term.²⁵

Table 3 reports the summary statistics for the two groups of municipalities. Indeed, although our sample is a sub-sample of those selected within the randomized lotteries, it seems well balanced. Only the share of the population working in the industrial sector

²³In summary, the auditing disclosed more than 12 months before elections are used as part of the control group in Table 4, as part of the treated group in Table 6 and excluded from the sample in Appendix Table A.3.

²⁴Instead, if we consider the Ferraz and Finan’s (2008) definition we would have 905 treated observations (43.4% of the sample) and 790 as controls (46.6% of the sample).

²⁵The reports disclosed before February 2006 did not account for funds released in the 2005–2008 term. 374 municipalities appear in the sample twice, as they are part of the control group for the first term and part of either the control or treated group in the second term. Municipalities that were audited more than once appear in our sample only with reference to the first draw. In this way, we avoid the possibility that the potential long-term effects of the audit would bias our estimates (Avis et al., 2017).

is different between the two groups at the 5% significance level. Note that including this variable in our specifications does not affect our findings.

Formally, we start the analysis by estimating the following ordinary least squares (OLS) model:

$$Y_{ist} = \beta T_{ist} + \delta \mathbf{X}_i + \gamma_s + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{ist}, \quad (1)$$

where i denotes the municipality, s the state and t the term. Y_{ist} can be the *Average Year of Schooling* of either all or freshmen candidates for city councilor, from either the incumbent or the challenger coalition. T_{ist} is a dummy taking a value of 1 for municipalities with audit reports released during the selection period (i.e., from 12 to 3 months before the election), while \mathbf{X}_i is a set of time-invariant municipal controls. Finally, γ_s are state-fixed effects, λ_t are term-fixed effects and ϵ_{is} is the error term. We use an OLS model with standard errors clustered at the municipality level.

Thanks to the random assignment of the auditing among municipalities, the coefficient β is the causal parameter of interest. In other words, it represents the average effect of the release of the auditing reports on candidates' education levels. State-fixed effects are included in all specifications, since the random assignment was stratified at the state level. Therefore, we ensure that our identification accounts for the heterogeneous probability of selection on the treatment faced by municipalities from different states. In addition, term-fixed effects account for other unobservable characteristics that might have changed from one term to the next. We include municipal controls in order to provide more precise estimates in case the randomization still produces a selection of treated and controlled municipalities with unbalanced characteristics.

We expect the estimates from Equation (1) to produce significant results if the auditing disclosure *per se* matters in the candidate selection process, regardless of the actual information provided. However, this would only be the case if the information disclosed differs from what the voters or parties expect (Ferraz and Finan, 2008) – i.e., if there is a systematic under- or over-estimation of a municipality's level of corruption.

Therefore, we refine our baseline analysis by taking into account the results of the auditing process. We produce different estimations to test whether the effect of the disclosure on the selection of candidates depends on the kind of information reported. Specifically, we estimate the following equation:

$$Y_{ist} = \beta_1 T_{ist} \times Corruption_{ist} + \beta_2 T_{ist} + \beta_3 Corruption_{ist} + \delta \mathbf{X}_i + \gamma_s + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{ist}, \quad (2)$$

where $Corruption_{ist}$ is the share of corrupted resources. Moreover, to provide more flexible estimations and to account for potential non-linearity of the effects, we interact T with a variable identifying municipalities that belong to different quartiles of the distribution of corruption. In other words, we compare the effect of the disclosure of different levels of corruption on the level of education of the pool of candidates. This is a crucial point because, depending on the level of corruption revealed, the information shock could send either a positive or negative message to citizens. However, using this approach could raise important issues if our measure of corruption simply serves as a proxy for other municipal conditions. We check for this possibility in Section 7.

6. Results

6.1. Baseline analysis

In this section, we report our central results. Specifically, Columns (1) and (2) of Table 4 show the results from the estimates of Equation (1), in which the dependent variable measures the level of education of all candidates in the incumbent’s coalition. As expected, the disclosure of reports *per se* has no direct effect on candidates’ quality. Moreover, the inclusion of municipal covariates does not seem to have a sizable impact on the main coefficient, which is in line with a balanced sample thanks to the randomization of the treatment. The remaining columns of Table 4 report estimates of Equation (2). Columns (3) to (5) report the effect of the auditing, interacted with the level of corruption, on the education of all candidates selected by the incumbent coalition’s parties. Column (3) provides the first indication that reporting high corruption boosts the quality of candidates put forward by the incumbent’s party. The interaction term has a positive sign, but it is not statistically significantly different from 0. Column (4) reports the estimate where the treatment status variable interacts with a dummy that identifies whether a municipality is in the top 50th percentile of the distribution of our measure of corruption.²⁶ This result, coherently with Column (3), suggests that

²⁶The level of corruption in the median municipality was 0.5%. Note that our results are confirmed when considering as low level of corruption only cities without any corruption event.

when the audit report is disclosed during the selection period, in municipalities with low levels of corruption candidates from the incumbent’s coalition have around 4.5 months less of schooling (coeff. -0.378). However, if high levels of corruption are exposed, we observe an increase in the average education of slightly more than 4 months of schooling (coeff. $0.724 - 0.378 = 0.346$). Both coefficients are statistically significant. Therefore, there are more than 8.5 months of education difference depending on the signal provided by the audit. This difference corresponds to about 30–35% of one standard deviation.²⁷ The coefficients in Column (5) indicate the quartile of corruption and emphasize that the effect is stronger with higher levels of reported corruption.²⁸ The last three columns suggest similar results once the focus is only on new candidates (i.e., those who were not previously on the city council). This is a crucial finding, as using new candidates rules out the possibility that the estimates rely on a mechanical effect coming from the direct consequences of the audit (e.g., if the audit led to the incarceration of involved

²⁷Note that the magnitude of our findings is comparable with previous papers on political selection. For instance, Daniele and Geys (2015) and Daniele (2017) estimate a change in politicians’ education due to mafia presence of about 35% of a standard deviation. Kotakorpi and Poutvaara (2011) find that a 35% increase in salary leads to a 5-percentage-point increase in candidates with high education. Baltrunaite et al. (2014) report a modest increase of 2-3 months in politicians’ education after the introduction of gender quotas.

²⁸Appendix Table A.3 show that the results are similar if we only use as control those municipalities that have the auditing disclosure after the selection period. Appendix Table A.4 provides the results of changing the definition of the incumbent’s coalition to include all parties that supported the mayor in the previous election, regardless of whether they do so in the following election. The results are similar, though the positive effect on the education of candidates running for office in highly corrupt municipalities is smaller than the one found with our standard definition of incumbent’s coalition. This does not change if we consider the extended sample which includes all the 1396 municipalities where there is at least one candidate representing the old incumbent’s coalition. Additionally, Appendix Table A.5 includes an alternative measure of schooling as a dependent variable – the share of candidates that completed *Mandatory School*. Our findings are confirmed. Specifically, the share of candidates that completed mandatory school decreases by 4.3 percentage points where low levels of corruption are found, and increases by about 3.5 percentage points with levels of corruption above the median. Further, in Appendix Table A.6, we show that our results are mainly driven by the candidates’ selection for the 2004 elections. Finally, note that our main findings do not vary depending on the level of electoral competitiveness. Specifically, the change in candidates’ ability is not significantly higher in close elections and neither in case the mayor is re-running for office or is facing term limits (results available upon request).

councilors who were mostly low-ability individuals).²⁹ Table 5 shows that the challenging coalition, which is not directly accountable for the outcome of the audit, does not change the education levels of its pool of candidates: the coefficients of interest are not statistically significant in any of the regressions.³⁰ As suggested in Section 2, the effects of a popularity shock hitting the incumbent might spill to or have the opposite effect on the challenger. Therefore, these (lack of) results can be read in the light of the unclear nature of the shock received by the challenger.

So far we considered a municipality to be treated if the disclosure of the report occurred during the selection period that we define taking places between 12 to 3 months before election day. However, one can still think of a more general definition of treatment period by considering as treated all municipalities that experience the disclosure of the report before the election. Therefore, following Ferraz and Finan (2008), we report in Table 6 the results from regressions where now the treatment includes the entire pre-electoral period.³¹ From Column 1 (all candidates) and Column 3 (freshmen), we still observe that audits reporting a low level of corruption lead to a worse political selection, while candidates' ability increases in cities reporting above median levels of corruption. However, in the latter case, the magnitude of the estimated effect is lower than the one in Table 4. In Columns 2 and 4, instead, we separate the pre-electoral period in three parts: i) at least 12 months before the elections; ii) between 3 and 12 months before the elections; iii) between 0 and 3 months before the elections. It seems our results are driven uniquely by the period in between 3 and 12 months. Conversely, it appears that political selection does not change when the audit is released far from the elections (more than 12 months). Also, audits released just before the elections (less than 3 months) do not affect candidates' selection. These results add credibility to our main definition of treatment.

Overall, our main result points to the effect of information on shaping the selection of political candidates. Given the institutional background of the case at study, our preferred interpretation of the empirical evidence is that political parties, rather than politicians, do react to the expected electoral shocks. On the one hand, they increase the

²⁹Appendix Table A.7 provides results on re-running candidates. While the magnitude of the effect is similar to the one estimated so far, this is barely significant.

³⁰Our results are unchanged when considering the reaction of the most voted challenging coalition, either in the previous or in the present elections.

³¹Brollo et al. (2013) apply also a very similar identification strategy.

quality of candidates in municipalities where elections become more difficult (i.e., where a severe report has been released) and they need to increase their popularity. This is in line with previous research showing that parties select better candidates when they need them, namely during more competitive elections (Galasso and Nannicini, 2011; Mattozzi and Merlo, 2015). Importantly, this intuition is supported by the suggestive results of Table A.1 and other more accurate studies showing that educated individuals are more likely to be elected (Dal Bó et al., 2017). On the other hand, elections become less risky when the local government experiences a positive shock, such as reporting no or little corruption. In this case, parties might decide to reduce the number of high-ability individuals if they are *costly*. For example, this is possible if the party shares rents with selected candidates, and this rent is higher the lower the public motivation (Besley, 2007), or if the party has to supplement candidates' salaries, as high-ability individuals have a higher reservation wage (Mattozzi and Merlo, 2008). In our context, as highlighted in Table A.1, more educated candidates tend to receive a higher direct economical support from political parties.

Below, we propose additional analyses that complement the previous findings. We only report results that focus on parties that support the incumbent, as we have already shown the absence of effects for the challengers.

6.2. *Additional analysis*

6.2.1. *A test on the role of political parties*

Although we believe our results can likely be explained by parties' strategic behaviors, we cannot rule out the possibility that they are also influenced by changes in the supply of politicians (i.e., the pool of individuals willing to run for office). This potential effect is already partially reduced because our treated municipalities cannot select individuals who are external to the party. In other words, the pool of potential candidates is pre-determined with respect to the treatment. Still, even within this sample of individuals, an effect could be expected. However, in principle, citizen-candidate models would predict results that are opposite to our findings (Caselli and Morelli, 2004; Osborne and Slivinski, 1996). For instance, one might expect high-ability individuals to have even lower incentives to enter politics after a political scandal. Similarly, it is hard to explain why high-ability candidates would refuse to stand for election in a municipality that appears to have a functioning administration, where it would be easier to be elected. Therefore, the effect of the disclosure of the audit report on individuals' willingness to

enter politics will, if anything, adjust the size of our coefficients downward.

To provide additional support to our interpretation, we test the heterogeneity of the estimated effect with respect to the power structure of the mayor's party. As explained in Section 3.2, in centralized parties top and mid-level party leaders are the decision-makers, while ordinary members have a greater voice in decentralized parties. Therefore, we expect that changes in the supply side of politicians would affect our results mostly when the popularity shock hits a decentralized party. In other words, it is easier for individuals who are willing to run for office to enter the pool of candidates of a decentralized rather than a centralized party.

We operationalize such a measure of party organization by following Guarnieri's (2011) definition and consider parties to be decentralized if they are defined as pol-yarchic, and centralized if they are classified as either oligarchic or monocratic. We investigate the potential presence of a heterogeneous effect by splitting the sample into two groups depending on the incumbent mayor's party of affiliation and running separate regressions.³² Table 7 presents the results from these regressions. In Columns (1) and (3) we consider municipalities governed by centralized parties (i.e., PSDB, PDT, DEM, PTB and PP), while in Columns (2) and (4) we use the sample of municipalities ruled by decentralized parties (i.e., PT and PMDB). The results tend to confirm our intuition. Indeed, we find a significant change in the education of the selected candidates only when the incumbent hit by the popularity shock was affiliated with a centralized party. Column (1) suggests that the presence of a positive shock decreases the quality of the pool of candidates by nearly 4 months of education (coeff. -0.374), though the coefficient is not significant. A negative shock significantly increases the level of education by about 6 months of schooling (coeff. $0.858 - 0.374 = 0.484$). Column (3) reports similar results for freshman candidates. In this case, a significant, though negative, effect on candidate quality is also observed for positive popularity shocks. In Columns (2) and (4), in which we limit the analysis to decentralized parties, none of the coefficient estimates is significantly different from 0. The signs are coherent with previous findings, but the coefficients are smaller in size.

³²It is worth highlighting that the mayor's party of affiliation in a given municipality is not randomly assigned, thus the following results are not intended to establish causal relationships.

6.2.2. *Alternative dependent variables*

We first repeat our main analysis on a different measure of candidates quality. That is, instead of using candidates' level of education we focus on candidates' job (Besley et al., 2017). We estimated each candidate's salary based on the average national salary of her profession, which we used to compute coalitions' *average salary*. We used the logarithm of the average income of the incumbent coalition as the dependent variable. We report these new results in Columns (1) and (6) of Table 8. Both columns report very similar results: a negative popularity shock significantly increases the average income of the pool of candidates. The average income increase by 7.6% (coeff. $0.117-0.041=0.076$) among all candidates and 9.6% (coeff. $0.157-0.061=0.096$) in the sample of freshman. Hence our results are confirmed by this alternative measure of ability for the case of a negative shock. However, using this measure, we cannot confirm that a positive popularity shock affects candidates' selection.

Second, we check whether the effect of the disclosure on candidates' average level of education was driven by a general increase (or decrease) in the quality of the pool of candidates or whether it came from the selection of a few very good (or bad) candidates. Therefore, in Columns (2) and (7) of Table 8 we estimate Equation (2) by using the median level of education of candidates for city councilor as a dependent variable. The estimates reveal that the median level of education is also significantly affected, in the same direction as in the main analysis. In particular, the disclosure of a positive report decreases the level of median education by 5 months (coeff -0.431), while it increases by 3 months (coeff. $0.690-0.431=0.259$) when the report is negative. The point estimates are similar when looking at freshmen candidates. This is consistent with a general change in the composition of the pool of candidates.

Third, we replicate the principal analysis looking at the education of mayoral candidates. Therefore, the regression reported in Column (3) of Table 8 considers only municipalities in which the party of the incumbent mayor decided to present a candidate (either the incumbent mayor or a new candidate) in the next election. In Column (8) we focus on the sub-sample of new candidates. The main coefficients are not statistically significantly different from 0, but their direction is consistent with the results for candidates for city councilors.³³ The insignificant effect could be driven by two characteristics of the mayoral race that make the statistical test weaker. First, there is low

³³Recall that for mayor, instead of looking at the coalition, we focus on party affiliation.

variability in the pool of candidates from one term to the next, as many mayors can run for re-election. This is not an issue if we look at the results in Column (8), which pertain to new candidates. Indeed, the effects are larger than those reported in Column (3) for incumbent mayors. The second characteristic that could be driving the insignificant effect is the limited variability in the level of education of mayoral candidates: they are usually highly educated, particularly compared to the general population and city councilors (see Table A.2).

Finally, we explore the possibility that the disclosure might also affect other candidate characteristics – namely age and gender, which have been analyzed in previous studies on political selection (Esteve-Volart and Bagues, 2012; Daniele and Geys, 2015; Paola et al., 2010). We consider the average age of candidates and the share of female candidates as dependent variables. Our findings, reported in Columns (4 and 9) and (5 and 10) of Table 8, do not highlight any substantial change concerning these characteristics.³⁴

6.2.3. *Timing of the disclosure*

In this section, we test the heterogeneity of the effect of the disclosure depending on when it occurred to determine whether the effect was mainly due to municipalities in which the audit report was released close to the end of the selection process. However, it could also be that audits released earlier have the strongest effect because the incumbent would have longer to change the selection of candidates.

For this analysis we estimate the following regression separately for the sub-samples of municipalities with high and low corruption:

$$Y_{ist} = \sum_{\tau=1}^{\tau=3} \beta_{\tau} T_{ist} \times 1(t = \tau) + \delta \mathbf{X}_i + \gamma_s + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{ist}, \quad (3)$$

where T_{ist} interacts with a set of dummies for each trimester of the treatment period. We report the results of these estimates in Figure 2. In the top panel we display point estimates and (95%) confidence intervals from a regression limited to the sample of municipalities in which audit reports revealed high levels of corruption, while in the bottom panel the analysis is constrained to municipalities with low levels of corruption reported in their audit.

³⁴We also tested whether the disclosure affects the share of freshmen elected candidates. Also in this case, we did not find any significant effect (results available upon request).

While all coefficients are borderline insignificant, we can draw two interesting implications. First, the difference between the point estimates from the two groups of municipalities remains relatively stable over time.

Second, the level of education of the selected candidates is higher the closer to the election the report is disclosed. This is true regardless of the report's severity. Thus, for instance, auditing disclosures that took place from 3 months to 1 month before the candidate list deadline had no effect on education when they revealed low levels of corruption, but had a large positive effect in municipalities with high levels of corruption. Hence, for a policy maker that aims at improving the overall candidates' quality would be optimal to concentrate the auditing disclosure closer to the election. By doing so, it should avoid the unintended negative effect on candidates' quality coming from the disclosure of positive reports occurred far from the election day.

6.2.4. Electoral results and local media

The mass media are the main channel through which citizens are informed about politicians' behavior (Enikolopov et al., 2011). Indeed, the effect of a popularity shock on the electoral results varies depending on the availability and accessibility of sources of information (Ferraz and Finan, 2008; Costas-Pérez et al., 2012). If the results shown so far come from parties that act in anticipation of the potential impact of the audit report on the electoral results, we should also find that parties' reactions depend on the presence of local media. Therefore, we expect audit reports to have a greater effect on the quality of candidates where citizens have easier access to information. To test this hypothesis, we follow Ferraz and Finan (2008) and account for the presence of local radio stations to characterize the different degrees of media penetration across municipalities. Therefore, we provide estimates by separately considering (1) municipalities that have at least one local AM/FM radio station and (2) municipalities with no local radio stations.³⁵

Initially, we look at the impact of the audit reports on electoral outcomes. It is important to emphasize that this analysis adds to previous findings about the effect of the Brazilian auditing policy on electoral results since, to our knowledge, we are the first

³⁵Similarly to what already discuss in section 6.2.1, media presence in a given municipality is not randomly assigned, which implies the following results are not intended to establish causal links.

to examine how the disclosure of corruption might also effect city council elections.³⁶ Hence, we replicate the baseline model using the *Share of Seats* won by the incumbent’s coalition as a dependent variable. We first study the whole sample and then split it depending on whether municipalities have local radio stations. The results are reported in Columns (1), (2) and (3) of Table 9. The coefficients of interest are only significant when looking at municipalities where citizens have greater access to information. On the one hand, Column (2) shows that in municipalities where the disclosure of a positive report occurs during the selection period, the parties supporting the incumbent mayor win 5% more seats, while if the report is negative they win 5% fewer seats.³⁷ On the other hand, Columns (1) and (3) suggest that, on average (and in the absence of a media presence) audits have very little effect on the electoral results. We can draw three important implications from these results. First, we can confirm that local media play an essential role in the accountability process. Second, the publication of the audit reports has a real effect on the election. This is a crucial element as in order for parties to react to the results of the audit report, they have to expect that voters care enough about the contents of the report to change how they vote. Third, voters still punish corrupt parties in elections even if they could select better candidates. Indeed, the electoral reward of a positive report is not affected by a potential decrease in the quality of candidates.

We then apply the same procedure to our baseline estimation. In Column (4) we report the same results as Column (4) from Table 4, while Columns (5) and (6) report the results for the samples of municipalities with and without local radio, respectively. In municipalities with radio stations, when the disclosure of the report provides a positive signal (i.e., low corruption) there is a decrease in the average years of schooling of all candidates of a bit less than 7 months (coeff. -0.582), while there is an increase in education of 3 months when the report provides a negative signal (coeff. $0.845 - 0.582 = 0.263$). The coefficients are of a similar size when we consider either all candidates or only new candidates (Column 2). When we focus on municipalities with no local radio

³⁶Ferraz and Finan (2008) show that corrupt mayors have a lower probability of being re-elected, while Muço (2016) finds that voters also reduce their support of a corrupt incumbent mayor’s party in presidential elections.

³⁷If we replicate this analysis and add to our treated municipalities those in which the report is disclosed between the end of the selection period and election day, we have slightly different results. While the punishment for having a negative report is significant and of a similar magnitude, there is no electoral reward associated with receiving a positive report.

stations, Columns (3) and (4), the effect is either not significant or borderline significant and the reported coefficients are also smaller.

Overall, the results seem to be coherent with our intuition, as the effect of the audit report appears to be larger, and statistically significantly different from 0 at the 1% level, only in municipalities where citizens are likely to be more exposed to the media (i.e., those with local radio stations).³⁸ Interestingly, the substantial change in the quality of the pool of candidates does not seem to be enough to significantly change the electoral results.³⁹ These results are consistent with recent studies providing evidence that voters do not seem to be affected by ex-ante justifiable parties' reactions to popularity shocks (Adam, 2012).

7. Identification checks

7.1. Sample selection

In our analysis we always constrain the sample to municipalities in which the incumbent's coalition decides to run for election. In other words, our sample is not random. This might produce a self-selection bias if the disclosure of the audit report affects the stability of the coalition and hence the decision to run for office. To account for this potential issue, we test whether there is any difference in the probability of being part of our sample between municipalities in which the auditing report was disclosed during the selection period (i.e., the treated group) or at other times (i.e., the control group). Therefore, we take the sample provided by Broglio et al. (2013), which includes all municipalities selected in the first 29 lotteries. From this larger sample we keep the municipalities used so far in the paper as well as those that were only excluded from the analysis because the incumbent party did not present any candidates. We then create a dummy variable equal to 1 if the municipality was part of our sample, and 0 otherwise. We replicate the same procedure for the sample used in the mayoral election analysis. The whole sample would be composed of 1,858 municipality-term observations, which

³⁸We apply the same strategy by replicating the estimates in Table 8. The main findings do not seem to be dependent on the presence of the media, except if the dependent variable is the median level of education; in that case, similarly to the results of this section, the effect appears to be more pronounced where local radio stations are available.

³⁹In Appendix B we also provide results indicating the absence of an effect on the average quality of the elected candidates.

excludes only 163 observations from the analysis. We report in Table 10 the formal test of the potential presence of self-selection bias, including a number of t-tests showing that being treated does not affect the average probability of being part of our sample. This is also true when we look separately at the samples with high and low levels corruption. In conclusion, this analysis suggests that a coalition's decision to run for re-election is uncorrelated with the treatment, and that this is true for different levels of corruption.

7.2. Robustness of the corruption measure

Another potential concern about our identification is that our corruption measure may be serving as a proxy for other municipal features. In fact, while municipalities are randomly assigned to either a treated or control group, the level of corruption is not random and might depend on specific municipal conditions. For instance, corruption is potentially higher where there is extensive use of public investments, which usually occurs in bigger and richer cities. If this is true, we may be estimating how the release of an audit (regardless of its severity) has a differential effect on candidates' education, for example in small vs. big or poor vs. rich cities. To help assess this potential issue, we replicate our baseline estimations and include additional interaction terms, where we multiply the treatment status dummy by a set of covariates that could be expected to be correlated with the level of corruption: *Population*, *Income*, *Education* and *Share of Pop. in Public Administration*. The results, presented in Table 11, reduce our concerns: in all the estimates, the interaction between the treatment status variable and the level of corruption is always significantly different from 0 and the coefficient is relatively stable across the different specifications. Moreover, the interaction terms that include the covariates never reach the conventional level of significance, whether analyzed in separate estimations (Columns 1 to 4) or jointly (Column 5).⁴⁰ Overall, this suggests that our measure of corruption is unlikely to be proxying for other municipal characteristics.⁴¹

⁴⁰We find similar results when the interaction term instead uses a dummy for the top 50% percentile or dummies for the different quartiles.

⁴¹Note that in this table, while the interpretation of the interaction term "Pre-selection auditing X above median corruption" does not change, the uninteracted coefficient "Pre-selection auditing" cannot be interpreted as in the previous tables, as in this case, we interact it with more than one variable in the same regression.

8. Conclusion

This paper provides some of the first evidence on the effect of information about government behavior on the selection of political candidates. Using city council election data from Brazil, we find that an unexpected positive shock regarding the government's honesty has a detrimental effect on the quality of candidates put forward by its coalition in the next election. By contrast, it selects better candidates when there is a negative shock. Indeed, we show that these effects are present whether we use the average or median years of candidates' schooling. Importantly, the results of our analysis are of similar size when focusing only on freshmen candidates. Our findings also show that the accessibility of information plays a role, as our results are clearer in municipalities that have radio stations. However, other candidate characteristics, such as the share of female candidates and the average age of the pool of candidates, are not affected. We also find that, despite the changes in the quality of candidates, neither the electoral results nor the types of elected representatives seem to be significantly affected.

Overall, our analysis first provides one of the few causal estimates supporting the predictions of recent studies showing that political parties react to specific characteristics of electoral competition (Galasso and Nannicini, 2011; Mattozzi and Merlo, 2015). Second, we show that information releases might have indirect effects on electoral outcomes. In light of our results, it could be plausible that studies showing a change in support for the incumbent after a popularity shock might underestimate the shock's *pure* effect on voters' preferences, as their voting decisions might also have been affected by changes to the quality of the pool of candidates. Finally, we find that the Brazilian policy analyzed in this study does not help improve the quality of elected politicians. On the contrary, in the absence of corruption we observe that the incumbent party selects lower-ability candidates. In other words, parties select lower-ability candidates when it is easier to win the election. However, our results also suggest that a way to account for this unintended effect of the anti-corruption measures on the dynamics of political accountability would be to disseminate all reports closer to end of the selection period. Indeed, only in this case the disclosure of positive audit reports has no consequences on candidates' quality.




Figure 1: Treated and control definition





Figure 2: Timing of the release - High and low corruption sub samples

Table 1: Corruption by electoral term

	N	Mean	Percentile			
			25%	50%	75%	99%
Term 2001-2004	1299	0.0462	0	0.001	0.049	0.532
Term 2005-2008	709	0.0561	0	0.017	0.068	0.465

Notes: This table reports information about the revealed corruption over the term 2001-2004 and 2005-2008.

Table 2: Sample details

		Term 2001	Term 2005	Total
Before elections	More than 12 months before election	243	242	485
	Between 12 months and 3 months to election	182	145	327
	From 3 months before election	93	0	93
After elections		624	166	790
Total		1142	553	1695

Notes: The table reports details on the sample of 1321 municipalities considered in our analysis. The level of observation is municipality-term.

Table 3: Differences in observable characteristics

	Control group	Treated group	Difference
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Average education in $t - 1$ (incumbent)	9.324	9.348	-0.024
Average education in $t - 1$ (challenger)	9.262	9.165	0.097
Dummy party incumbent PT	0.215	0.202	0.013
Population	26516	23511	3004
Income	581.668	573.920	7.749
Share of pop. employed	37.720	37.313	0.408
Gini coefficient	0.560	0.558	0.002
Avg. municipal number of years of education	3.568	3.483	0.085
Share of pop. in public administration	2.088	2.196	-0.108
Share of pop. in agriculture	16.390	16.792	-0.403
Share of pop. in industry	4.038	3.592	0.446**
Share of pop. in service	6.705	6.551	0.154
Share of pop. in commerce	7.584	7.327	0.257
Share of pop. in transport	1.175	1.137	0.038
Share of pop. in service	6.705	6.551	0.154

Notes: This table displays the mean characteristics of 1321 municipalities (1695 municipality-term observations) that were audited by the *Controladoria Geral da União* (CGU) in the period 2003-2009 (i.e., from the 2nd to the 29th lottery). The control group (column 1) is composed by 994 municipalities which had disclosed the results of the auditing concerning the term 2001-2004 either before the 5th of Oct 2003 or after the 5th of Jul 2004, or had disclosed the results of the auditing concerning the term 2005-2008 after the 5th of Jul 2008 or before the 3rd of Oct 2007. Instead, the treated group (column 2) is composed by 327 municipalities which had disclosed the results of the auditing from 12 to 3 months before the elections (i.e., from one year before elections to the 5th of July 2004 or 2008). Column (3) shows the difference of the means and the level of significance. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 4: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - incumbent coalition

	All candidates					New candidates		
	(1)	(2)	Linear (3)	Median (4)	Quartile (5)	Linear (6)	Median (7)	Quartile (8)
Pre-selection auditing	0.016 (0.134)	0.041 (0.115)	-0.073 (0.131)	-0.378** (0.172)	-0.429** (0.194)	-0.160 (0.141)	-0.448** (0.191)	-0.531** (0.212)
Pre-selection auditing × corruption			1.567 (0.993)			1.796* (1.080)		
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption				0.724*** (0.235)			0.723*** (0.258)	
Pre-selection auditing × second quartile of corruption					0.281 (0.393)			0.448 (0.459)
Pre-selection auditing × third quartile of corruption					0.629** (0.315)			0.691** (0.333)
Pre-selection auditing × fourth quartile of corruption					0.899*** (0.280)			0.906*** (0.314)
Corruption			0.297 (0.452)			0.377 (0.496)		
Above median corruption				-0.017 (0.097)			-0.004 (0.109)	
Second quartile					-0.005 (0.202)			0.139 (0.207)
Third quartile					0.002 (0.115)			0.040 (0.132)
Fourth quartile					-0.036 (0.126)			0.005 (0.143)
F-test inter			0.181	0.012	0.078	0.142	0.025	0.107
R ²	0.117	0.374	0.376	0.379	0.379	0.319	0.320	0.322
N observations	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry* *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table 5: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - challenger coalitions

	All candidates					New candidates		
	(1)	(2)	Linear (3)	Median (4)	Quartile (5)	Linear (6)	Median (7)	Quartile (8)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.043 (0.095)	-0.012 (0.075)	0.014 (0.088)	-0.034 (0.112)	-0.048 (0.125)	-0.026 (0.090)	-0.091 (0.118)	-0.114 (0.133)
Pre-selection auditing × corruption			-0.452 (0.886)			-0.602 (0.845)		
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption				0.038 (0.150)			0.052 (0.156)	
Pre-selection auditing × second quartile of corruption					0.075 (0.266)			0.138 (0.277)
Pre-selection auditing × third quartile of corruption					0.174 (0.191)			0.220 (0.200)
Pre-selection auditing × fourth quartile of corruption					-0.058 (0.185)			-0.054 (0.193)
Corruption			0.246 (0.283)			0.309 (0.297)		
Above median corruption				0.010 (0.068)			0.013 (0.069)	
Second quartile					0.077 (0.127)			0.005 (0.125)
Third quartile					-0.017 (0.084)			-0.036 (0.086)
Fourth quartile					0.067 (0.086)			0.069 (0.088)
F-test inter			0.839	0.983	0.932	0.618	0.846	0.857
R ²	0.172	0.515	0.515	0.515	0.515	0.499	0.499	0.500
N observations	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the challenger coalitions*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *Gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry*, *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 6: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - before election

	All candidates		New candidates	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Pre-election auditing	-0.311**		-0.446***	
	(0.144)		(0.157)	
Pre-election auditing × above median corruption	0.432**		0.540***	
	(0.184)		(0.201)	
Pre-election auditing (at least 12 months before)		-0.039		-0.206
		(0.145)		(0.160)
Pre-election auditing (between 3 and 12 months before)		-0.393**		-0.531***
		(0.184)		(0.205)
Pre-election auditing (between 0 and 3 months before)		0.104		0.028
		(0.318)		(0.332)
Pre-election auditing (at least 12 months before) × above median corruption		-0.248		0.025
		(0.199)		(0.223)
Pre-election auditing (between 3 and 12 months before) × above median corruption		0.632**		0.739***
		(0.252)		(0.280)
Pre-election auditing (between 0 and 3 months before) × above median corruption		-0.150		0.006
		(0.420)		(0.438)
Above median corruption	-0.044	0.072	-0.076	-0.026
	(0.112)	(0.130)	(0.126)	(0.152)
F-test inter	0.052	0.041	0.014	0.105
R ²	0.377	0.380	0.321	0.322
N observations	1695	1695	1695	1695
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry*, *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table 7: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - Party organization

	All candidates		New candidates	
	Centralized (1)	Decentralized (2)	Centralized (3)	Decentralized (4)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.374 (0.246)	-0.260 (0.273)	-0.574** (0.275)	-0.063 (0.323)
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption	0.858** (0.373)	0.633 (0.430)	0.962** (0.401)	0.240 (0.505)
Above median corruption	-0.123 (0.147)	-0.169 (0.190)	-0.110 (0.170)	-0.151 (0.200)
F-test inter	0.151	0.513	0.102	0.887
R ²	0.344	0.529	0.292	0.489
N observations	758	437	758	437
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *ln(population), income, gini coefficient, share of population with a secondary degree, share of population employed, share of population working in agriculture, share of population working in industry share of population working in commerce, share of population working in transport, share of population working in service and share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table 8: Audit releases and candidates' characteristics

	All candidates					New candidates				
	Income (1)	Median edu. (2)	Mayor edu. (3)	Female (4)	Age (5)	Income (6)	Median edu. (7)	Mayor edu. (8)	Female (9)	Age (10)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.041 (0.049)	-0.431* (0.225)	-0.415 (0.687)	-0.012 (0.013)	-0.239 (0.377)	-0.061 (0.057)	-0.474* (0.253)	-0.615 (0.687)	-0.021 (0.015)	-0.250 (0.426)
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption	0.117* (0.060)	0.690** (0.316)	0.309 (0.594)	0.010 (0.017)	0.449 (0.508)	0.157** (0.069)	0.600* (0.346)	0.434 (0.852)	0.010 (0.020)	0.558 (0.566)
Above median corruption	0.004 (0.026)	-0.018 (0.137)	0.177 (0.256)	-0.008 (0.007)	0.035 (0.218)	0.019 (0.031)	0.058 (0.151)	-0.023 (0.339)	-0.009 (0.009)	0.117 (0.252)
F-test inter	0.077	0.125	0.646	0.578	0.765	0.012	0.173	0.821	0.309	0.563
R ²	0.223	0.301	0.138	0.065	0.143	0.202	0.267	0.151	0.053	0.139
N observations	1665	1695	1195	1695	1694	1657	1695	663	1695	1694
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is $\ln(\text{average candidates income})$ in Columns (1) and (6), $\text{median years of education}$ in Columns (2) and (7), $\text{mayor cand. avg. number of years of education}$ in Columns (3) and (8), Share of female in columns (4) and (9) and average age in columns (5) and (10). *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT, population, income, Gini coefficient, share of population with a secondary degree, share of population employed, share of population working in agriculture, share of population working in industry, share of population working in commerce, share of population working in transport, share of population working in service and share of population working in the public administration.* Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 9: Audit releases, electoral results and the quality of candidates by media presence

	Share of seats won			Education of candidates		
	All (1)	Local Radio (2)	No Local Radio (3)	All (4)	Local Radio (5)	No Local Radio (6)
Pre-selection auditing	0.011 (0.018)	0.053** (0.026)	-0.019 (0.025)	-0.378** (0.172)	-0.582*** (0.182)	-0.275 (0.266)
Pre-selection auditing \times above median corruption	-0.031 (0.024)	-0.110*** (0.034)	0.024 (0.033)	0.724*** (0.235)	0.845*** (0.304)	0.578* (0.340)
Above median corruption	0.008 (0.010)	0.013 (0.016)	0.008 (0.014)	-0.017 (0.097)	-0.055 (0.134)	0.029 (0.141)
F-test inter	0.520	0.006	0.707	0.012	0.006	0.240
R ²	0.146	0.188	0.134	0.379	0.427	0.289
N observations	1695	730	965	1695	730	965
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Share of seats won by the incumbent coalition* in columns (1-3) and *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition* in columns (4-6). *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT, population, income, Gini coefficient, share of population with a secondary degree, share of population employed, share of population working in agriculture, share of population working in industry, share of population working in commerce, share of population working in transport, share of population working in service and share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 10: Sample selection

	Control group (1)	Treated group (2)	Difference (3)
<i>All</i>			
Re-run city council (inc)	0.911	0.919	-0.008
Re-run mayor all (inc)	0.648	0.621	0.028
Re-run mayor new (inc)	0.362	0.334	0.028
<i>High corruption</i>			
Re-run city council (inc)	0.890	0.913	-0.023
Re-run mayor all (inc)	0.670	0.649	0.021
Re-run mayor new (inc)	0.367	0.351	0.016
<i>Low corruption</i>			
Re-run city council (inc)	0.930	0.919	0.004
Re-run mayor all (inc)	0.626	0.601	0.025
Re-run mayor new (inc)	0.356	0.322	0.034

Notes: This table reports differences between the control (1502 observations) and the treated (356 observations) group about the mean probability of being part of the sample of municipalities we use in the different sections of the paper. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 11: Robustness of the corruption measure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.227 (0.870)	-0.686** (0.291)	-0.969* (0.499)	-0.318 (0.265)	0.128 (1.014)
Pre-selection auditing \times above median corruption	0.725*** (0.234)	0.781*** (0.239)	0.798*** (0.248)	0.716*** (0.236)	0.806*** (0.246)
Pre-selection auditing \times ln(population)	-0.016 (0.087)				-0.108 (0.100)
Pre-selection auditing \times income		0.000 (0.000)			0.000 (0.000)
Pre-selection auditing \times education			0.157 (0.110)		0.130 (0.161)
Pre-selection auditing \times pop. in pub. administration				-0.025 (0.077)	-0.081 (0.083)
Above median corruption	-0.017 (0.097)	-0.025 (0.097)	-0.026 (0.097)	-0.016 (0.097)	-0.029 (0.097)
F-test inter	0.008	0.007	0.008	0.012	0.002
R ²	0.379	0.379	0.379	0.379	0.380
N observations	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is the *average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalitions*. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT, ln(population), income, Gini coefficient, share of population with a secondary degree, share of population employed, share of population working in agriculture, share of population working in industry share of population working in commerce, share of population working in transport, share of population working in service and share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

A. Appendix - Additional tables

Table A.1: Education, voting and party contribution

	Electoral success	Party contributions
	(1)	(2)
Low level of education	0.027 (0.020)	0.226* (0.023)
Medium level of education	0.070*** (0.020)	0.423** (0.019)
High level of education	0.147*** (0.021)	0.761*** (0.008)
Age	0.001*** (0.000)	0.002 (0.001)
Female	-0.049*** (0.004)	-0.669** (0.014)
R ²	0.578	0.395
N observations	243,058	243,058
Municipality FE	Yes	Yes
Term FE	Yes	Yes

Notes: These results come from a sample of all candidates as city councilor for which we have information on the level of education and that received party's contributions. The dependent variable is, in column (1), $\ln(\text{number of votes})$ received by a candidate running for a seat in the city council, while in column (2) is $\ln(\text{amount of party's contribution})$ to a candidate campaign. The coefficients on education have as a reference group the candidates with *no education*. *Low level of education* is a dummy indicating whether a candidate maximum achievement in school was to start or complete the "ensino fundamental" (i.e., from 1 to 9 years of schooling). *Median level of education* indicates whether a candidate maximum achievement in school was to start or complete the "ensino médio" (i.e., from 10 to 12 years of schooling), while *high level of education* indicates whether a candidate maximum achievement in school was to start or complete the "ensino superior" (i.e., from 13 to 17 years of schooling). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Table A.2: Summary statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	N
<i>Municipalities sample</i>					
Average education - n. of years (incumbent)	9.938	2.186	1	17	1,695
Average education - n. of years (challenger)	9.805	1.675	3.571	14.258	1,695
Average education of freshmen - n. of years (incumbent)	9.919	2.331	1	17	1,695
Average education of freshmen - n. of years (challenger)	9.734	1.687	3	14.3	1,695
Average education of re-running - n. of years (incumbent)	10.137	3.298	1	17	1,466
Average income (incumbent)	1,155.935	455.112	88.745	4,207.949	1,665
Average income of freshmen (incumbent)	1,132.868	499.168	88.745	4,207.949	1,657
Mandatory school (incumbent)	0.678	0.231	0	1	1,695
Mandatory school of freshmen (incumbent)	0.679	0.247	0	1	1,695
Median education - n. of years (incumbent)	9.882	2.891	1	17	1,695
Average age (incumbent)	43.542	4.092	23.5	59	1,694
Share of female (incumbent)	0.211	0.133	0	1	1,695
Median education of freshmen - n. of years (incumbent)	9.822	3.058	1	17	1,695
Average age of freshmen (incumbent)	42.871	4.662	22	67	1,694
Share of female of freshmen (incumbent)	0.237	0.166	0	1	1,695
Average education elected - n. of years (incumbent)	10.472	3.007	1	17	1,540
Average age elected (incumbent)	42.964	6.348	22	69	1,540
Share of female elected (incumbent)	0.132	0.212	0	1	1,540
Mayor average education - n. of years (incumbent)	13.257	4.013	1	17	1,195
Mayor average education freshmen - n. of years (incumbent)	13.206	4.015	1	17	663
Decentralized party	0.366	0.482	0	1	1195
Share of seats won (incumbent)	0.330	0.196	0	1	1,695
Corruption	0.048	0.1	0	0.905	1,695
Media	0.431	0.495	0	1	1,695
Dummy party incumbent PT	0.212	0.409	0	1	1,695
Population	25,936.923	48,667.258	795	461,534	1,695
Income	580.174	317.944	80.967	3,062.481	1,695
Share of pop. employed	37.641	8.202	11.499	75.59	1,695
Gini coefficient	0.560	0.068	0.344	0.796	1,695
Municipality average education	3.552	1.088	0.746	7.711	1,695
Share of pop. in public administration	2.126	1.202	0.122	9.147	1,695
Share of pop. in agriculture	16.467	9.856	0.041	64.043	1,695
Share of pop. in industry	3.952	3.69	0	34.637	1,695
Share of pop. in service	6.675	2.763	0.257	18.756	1,695
Share of pop. in commerce	7.535	3.848	0.26	27.764	1,695
Share of pop. in transport	1.167	0.695	0	5.593	1,695
Share of pop. in service	6.675	2.763	0.257	18.756	1,695
<i>Individuals sample</i>					
No education	0.025	0.157	0	1	243,058
Low level education	0.375	0.484	0	1	243,058
Medium level education	0.364	0.481	0	1	243,058
High level education	0.235	0.424	0	1	243,058
Party's contributions	989.35	6,444.851	0.01	1,081,211.875	243,058
Number of votes	305.994	1,110.917	1	165,880	243,058

Table A.3: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - restricted sample

	All candidates					New candidates		
	(1)	(2)	Linear (3)	Median (4)	Quartile (5)	Linear (6)	Median (7)	Quartile (8)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.092 (0.140)	-0.026 (0.120)	-0.143 (0.136)	-0.445** (0.181)	-0.497** (0.202)	-0.260* (0.149)	-0.558*** (0.201)	-0.636*** (0.223)
Pre-selection auditing × corruption			1.546 (1.025)			2.121* (1.115)		
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption				0.734*** (0.242)			0.790*** (0.267)	
Pre-selection auditing × second quartile of corruption					0.271 (0.397)			0.443 (0.467)
Pre-selection auditing × third quartile of corruption					0.705** (0.322)			0.800** (0.342)
Pre-selection auditing × fourth quartile of corruption					0.839*** (0.289)			0.921*** (0.326)
Corruption			0.354 (0.516)			0.128 (0.555)		
Above median corruption				-0.044 (0.113)			-0.078 (0.127)	
Second quartile					-0.023 (0.224)			0.080 (0.231)
Third quartile					-0.110 (0.135)			-0.103 (0.157)
Fourth quartile					0.015 (0.146)			-0.014 (0.167)
F-test inter			0.178	0.014	0.074	0.113	0.018	0.100
R ²	0.123	0.374	0.377	0.379	0.380	0.315	0.317	0.318
N observations	1385	1385	1385	1385	1385	1385	1385	1385
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: These results come from a sample where we exclude municipalities for which the audit report was published more than 12 months before the election. The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry*, *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table A.4: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - old incumbent coalition

	All candidates					New candidates		
	(1)	(2)	Linear (3)	Median (4)	Quartile (5)	Linear (6)	Median (7)	Quartile (8)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.102 (0.112)	-0.083 (0.093)	-0.169 (0.105)	-0.323** (0.137)	-0.358** (0.154)	-0.182* (0.106)	-0.370*** (0.139)	-0.402*** (0.155)
Pre-selection auditing × corruption			1.224 (0.878)			1.311 (0.905)		
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption				0.414** (0.187)			0.482** (0.189)	
Pre-selection auditing × second quartile of corruption					0.179 (0.320)			0.164 (0.334)
Pre-selection auditing × third quartile of corruption					0.253 (0.245)			0.319 (0.247)
Pre-selection auditing × fourth quartile of corruption					0.622*** (0.229)			0.686*** (0.231)
Corruption			0.097 (0.409)			0.009 (0.416)		
Above median corruption				-0.006 (0.086)			-0.028 (0.086)	
Second quartile					0.092 (0.171)			0.080 (0.172)
Third quartile					0.058 (0.104)			0.038 (0.103)
Fourth quartile					-0.040 (0.110)			-0.066 (0.111)
F-test inter			0.279	0.073	0.190	0.278	0.037	0.124
R ²	0.126	0.419	0.420	0.421	0.422	0.417	0.418	0.419
N observations	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the old incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry*, *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table A.5: Audit releases and the quality of candidates (mandatory school)

	All candidates					New candidates		
	(1)	(2)	Linear (3)	Median (4)	Quartile (5)	Linear (6)	Median (7)	Quartile (8)
Pre-selection auditing	0.000 (0.014)	0.002 (0.013)	-0.007 (0.015)	-0.043** (0.021)	-0.053** (0.024)	-0.018 (0.016)	-0.054** (0.023)	-0.060** (0.026)
Pre-selection auditing × corruption			0.124 (0.107)			0.189 (0.119)		
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption				0.078*** (0.027)			0.086*** (0.029)	
Pre-selection auditing × second quartile of corruption					0.056 (0.045)			0.035 (0.053)
Pre-selection auditing × third quartile of corruption					0.071** (0.034)			0.080** (0.035)
Pre-selection auditing × fourth quartile of corruption					0.102*** (0.034)			0.102*** (0.037)
Corruption			0.036 (0.052)			0.048 (0.057)		
Above median corruption				-0.003 (0.011)			0.000 (0.012)	
Second quartile					-0.015 (0.021)			0.005 (0.022)
Third quartile					-0.001 (0.013)			0.003 (0.015)
Fourth quartile					-0.010 (0.015)			-0.000 (0.016)
F-test inter			0.320	0.023	0.146	0.123	0.016	0.155
R ²	0.111	0.286	0.288	0.291	0.292	0.251	0.253	0.254
N observations	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695	1695
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Share of candidates which finished mandatory school - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry*, *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table A.6: Audit releases and the quality of candidates by electoral term

	Term 2001-2004				Term 2005-2008			
	Incumbent		Challenger		Incumbent		Challenger	
	All (1)	New (2)	All (3)	New (4)	All (5)	New (6)	All (7)	New (8)
Pre-selection auditing	-0.612*** (0.227)	-0.711*** (0.256)	-0.088 (0.152)	-0.148 (0.162)	0.157 (0.254)	0.112 (0.275)	0.052 (0.148)	-0.007 (0.153)
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption	0.783** (0.304)	0.819** (0.339)	0.153 (0.204)	0.175 (0.212)	0.331 (0.368)	0.280 (0.405)	-0.197 (0.213)	-0.202 (0.219)
Above median corruption	0.007 (0.115)	0.030 (0.127)	-0.040 (0.081)	-0.074 (0.083)	-0.213 (0.182)	-0.164 (0.209)	0.111 (0.119)	0.183 (0.120)
F-test inter	0.032	0.028	0.891	0.721	0.237	0.546	0.718	0.337
R ²	0.389	0.332	0.518	0.496	0.375	0.321	0.515	0.508
N observations	1142	1142	1142	1142	553	553	553	553
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates as a city councilor*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT, population, income, Gini coefficient, share of population with a secondary degree, share of population employed, share of population working in agriculture, share of population working in industry, share of population working in commerce, share of population working in transport, share of population working in service and share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

Table A.7: Audit releases and the quality of candidates - re-running candidates

	Re-running candidates		
	Linear (1)	Median (2)	Quartile (3)
Pre-selection auditing	0.189 (0.227)	-0.168 (0.290)	-0.008 (0.316)
Pre-selection auditing × corruption	0.641 (1.336)		
Pre-selection auditing × above median corruption		0.696* (0.401)	
Pre-selection auditing × second quartile of corruption			-0.747 (0.772)
Pre-selection auditing × third quartile of corruption			0.160 (0.550)
Pre-selection auditing × fourth quartile of corruption			0.829* (0.471)
Corruption	-0.461 (0.829)		
Above median corruption		-0.143 (0.182)	
Second quartile			-0.328 (0.334)
Third quartile			-0.120 (0.226)
Fourth quartile			-0.299 (0.234)
F-test inter	0.646	0.265	0.245
R ²	0.229	0.231	0.234
N observations	1466	1466	1466
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *Average years of education of candidates - as a city councilor - from the incumbent coalition*. *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT*, $\ln(\text{population})$, *income*, *gini coefficient*, *share of population with a secondary degree*, *share of population employed*, *share of population working in agriculture*, *share of population working in industry*, *share of population working in commerce*, *share of population working in transport*, *share of population working in service* and *share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05 and *** p < 0.01.

B. Appendix - Elected candidates

As outlined above, city councilors are elected using an open-list proportional system, and citizens still have a say over who will eventually be chosen. Here we analyze whether the disclosure of the report, affecting candidates' selection, has also an effect on the elected candidates. This may happen because selecting more- (or less-) educated candidates could lead to more- (or less-) educated elected politicians. To do so, we use the usual specification and consider the average years of schooling of candidates who were elected from the incumbent coalition as a dependent variable. We also provide alternative results that examine the share of females and the average age of the elected candidates. We report the estimated coefficients in Table B.1. The main coefficients in all three columns are not significantly different from 0, though the signs of the first column are in line with the once from the main analysis.

However, it is difficult to assess whether voters are responding to the strategic change in the composition of candidates a party chooses for its ticket/party list, as it is not possible to have a proper counter-factual. This would require comparing municipalities that experienced a shock in which (by accident) the composition of candidates did not change with municipalities hit by a shock where the composition did change. Without such a comparison, it is difficult to draw conclusions about whether voters are affected by parties' reactions to popularity shocks.

Table B.1: Audit releases and elected candidates

	Education (1)	Age (2)	Female
Pre-selection auditing	-0.102 (0.263)	-1.031* (0.609)	0.018 (0.020)
Pre-selection auditing \times above median corruption	0.064 (0.351)	0.866 (0.818)	-0.030 (0.028)
Above median corruption	0.033 (0.160)	0.082 (0.367)	0.010 (0.013)
F-test inter	0.965	0.342	0.696
R ²	0.256	0.086	0.047
N observations	1540	1540	1540
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Municipality control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The dependent variable is *average years of education of elected candidates* in column (1), *average age of elected candidates* in column (2) and *share of female of the elected candidates* in column (3). *Corruption* is the share of the amount of the audited budget involved in general violations. Municipality controls include: *dummy party incumbent PT, population, income, Gini coefficient, share of population with a secondary degree, share of population employed, share of population working in agriculture, share of population working in industry share of population working in commerce, share of population working in transport, share of population working in service and share of population working in the public administration*. Standard errors clustered at the municipality level in parenthesis * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$.

Bibliography

- Adam, J., 2012. Causes and electoral consequences of party policy shifts in multiparty elections: Theoretical results and empirical evidence. *Annual Review of Political Science* 15, 401–419.
- Arias, E., Larreguy, H. A., Marshall, J., Querubin, P., 2017. Priors rule: When do malfeasance revelations help and hurt incumbent parties? Cambridge, Harvard University, manuscript.
- Ashworth, S., 2012. Electoral accountability: Recent theoretical and empirical work. *Annual Review of Political Science* 15, 183–201.
- Avelino, G., Biderman, C., Barone, L. S., 2012. Articulações intrapartidárias e desempenho eleitoral no Brasil. *Dados-Revista de Ciências Sociais* 55 (4).
- Avis, E., Ferraz, C., Finan, F., 2017. Do government audits reduce corruption? Estimating the impacts of exposing corrupt politicians. *Journal of Political Economy* , forthcoming.
- Bagues, M., Esteve-Volart, B., 2016. Politicians' luck of the draw: Evidence from the Spanish christmas lottery. *Journal of Political Economy* 124 (5), 1269–1294.
- Baltrunaite, A., Bello, P., Casarico, A., Profeta, P., 2014. Gender quotas and the quality of politicians. *Journal of Public Economics* 118, 62–74.
- Bandiera, O., Prat, A., Valletti, T., 2009. Active and passive waste in government spending: Evidence from a policy experiment. *American Economic Review* 99 (4), 1278–1308.
- Barro, R., 1973. The control of politicians: An economic model. *Public Choice* 14 (1), 19–4.
- Besley, T., 2005. Political selection. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19 (3), 43–60.
- Besley, T., March 2007. *Principled agents?: The political economy of good government*. OUP Catalogue. Oxford University Press.

- Besley, T., Folke, O., Persson, T., Rickne, J., 2017. Gender quotas and the crisis of the mediocre man: Theory and evidence from Sweden. *American Economic Review* 107 (8), 2204–42.
- Besley, T., Montalvo, J. G., Reynal-Querol, M., 2011. Do educated leaders matter? *The Economic Journal* 121 (554), F205–227.
- Bobonis, G. J., Cámara Fuertes, L. R., Schwabe, R., 2016. Monitoring corruptible politicians. *American Economic Review* 106 (8), 2371–2405.
- Brollo, F., Nannicini, T., Perotti, R., Tabellini, G., 2013. The political resource curse. *American Economic Review* 103 (5), 1759–96.
- Caselli, F., Morelli, M., 2004. Bad politicians. *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (3-4), 759–782.
- Chong, A., Ana, L., Karlan, D., Wantchekon, L., 2015. Does corruption information inspire the fight or quash the hope? A field experiment in Mexico on voter turnout, choice, and party identification. *The Journal of Politics* 77 (1), 55–71.
- Colonnelli, E., Prem, M., Teso, E., 2017. Patronage in the allocation of public sector jobs, Mimeo.
- Costas-Pérez, E., Solé-Ollé, A., Sorribas-Navarro, P., 2012. Corruption scandals, voter information, and accountability. *European Journal of Political Economy* 28 (4), 469 – 484.
- Dal Bó, E., Dal Bó, P., Di Tella, R., 2006. “Plata o Plomo?”: Bribe and punishment in a theory of political influence. *American Political Science Review* 100 (01), 41–53.
- Dal Bó, E., Finan, F., Folke, O., Persson, T., Rickne, J., 2017. Who becomes a politician? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 132 (4), 1877–1914.
- Daniele, G., 2017. Strike one to educate one hundred: Organized crime, political selection and politicians’ ability. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organizations* , forthcoming.
- Daniele, G., Galletta, S., Geys, B., Jul. 2017. Abandon ship? Party brands and politicians’ responses to a political scandal. *IdEP Economic Papers* 1703, USI Università della Svizzera italiana.

- Daniele, G., Geys, B., 2015. Organised crime, institutions and political quality: Empirical evidence from Italian municipalities. *The Economic Journal* 125 (586), F233–F255.
- Enikolopov, R., Petrova, M., Zhuravskaya, E., 2011. Media and political persuasion: Evidence from Russia. *American Economic Review* 101 (7), 3253–3285.
- Esteve-Volart, B., Bagues, M., 2012. Are women pawns in the political game? Evidence from elections to the Spanish Senate. *Journal of Public Economics* 96 (3), 387–399.
- Ferraz, C., Finan, F., 2008. Exposing corrupt politicians: The effects of Brazil's publicly released audits on electoral outcomes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123 (2), 703–745.
- Ferraz, C., Finan, F., Apr. 2009. Motivating politicians: The impacts of monetary incentives on quality and performance. NBER Working Papers, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Ferraz, C., Finan, F., 2011. Electoral accountability and corruption: Evidence from the audits of local governments. *The American Economic Review* 101 (4), 1274–1311.
- Gagliarducci, S., Nannicini, T., 2013. Do better paid politicians perform better? Disentangling incentives from selection. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 11 (2), 369–398.
- Galasso, V., Nannicini, T., 2011. Competing on good politicians. *American Political Science Review* 105, 79–99.
- Guarnieri, F., 2011. A força dos partidos "fracos". *Dados-Revista de Ciências Sociais* 54 (1).
- Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., Abelson, R. P., Fiske, S. T., 1980. Presidential prototypes. *Political behavior* 2 (4), 315–337.
- Kotakorpi, K., Poutvaara, P., 2011. Pay for politicians and candidate selection: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Public Economics* 95 (7), 877–885.
- Larreguy, H. A., Marshall, J., Snyder Jr, J. M., 2017. Publicizing malfeasance: When media facilitates electoral accountability in Mexico. Cambridge, Harvard University, manuscript.

- Litschig, S., Zamboni, Y., 2013. Audit risk and rent extraction: Evidence from a randomized evaluation in Brazil. *Economics working papers*, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Mainwaring, S., 1999. Rethinking party systems in the third wave of democratization: The case of Brazil. Stanford University Press.
- Mattozzi, A., Merlo, A., 2008. Political careers or career politicians? *Journal of Public Economics* 92 (3-4), 597–608.
- Mattozzi, A., Merlo, A., 2015. Mediocracy. *Journal of Public Economics* 130, 32–44.
- Mayhew, D., 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. Yale University Press.
- Messner, M., Polborn, M. K., 2004. Paying politicians. *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (12), 2423–2445.
- Muço, A., 2016. Learn from thy neighbour: Do voters associate corruption with political parties?, Mimeo.
- Osborne, M. J., Slivinski, A., 1996. A model of political competition with citizen-candidates. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 111 (1), 65–96.
- Paola, M. D., Scoppa, V., Lombardo, R., 2010. Can gender quotas break down negative stereotypes? Evidence from changes in electoral rules. *Journal of Public Economics* 94 (5–6), 344 – 353.
- Ribeiro, P. F., 2013a. El modelo de partido cartel y el sistema de partidos de Brasil. *Revista de Ciencia política (Santiago)* 33 (3), 607–629.
- Ribeiro, P. F., 2013b. Organização e poder nos partidos brasileiros: Uma análise dos estatutos. *Revista Brasileira de Ciencia Política* 10, 225–265.
- Samuels, D., Zucco, C., 2014. The power of partisanship in Brazil: Evidence from survey experiments. *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (1), 212–225.
- Snyder, J. M., Hirano, S., 2012. What happens to incumbents in scandals? *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 7 (4), 447–456.
- Todorov, A., Mandisodza, A. N., Goren, A., Hall, C. C., 2005. Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes. *Science* 308 (5728), 1623–1626.

2013

- 2013/1, **Sánchez-Vidal, M.; González-Val, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Sequential city growth in the US: does age matter?"
- 2013/2, **Hortas Rico, M.:** "Sprawl, blight and the role of urban containment policies. Evidence from US cities"
- 2013/3, **Lampón, J.F.; Cabanelas-Lorenzo, P.; Lago-Peñas, S.:** "Why firms relocate their production overseas? The answer lies inside: corporate, logistic and technological determinants"
- 2013/4, **Montolio, D.; Planells, S.:** "Does tourism boost criminal activity? Evidence from a top touristic country"
- 2013/5, **García-López, M.A.; Holl, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Suburbanization and highways: when the Romans, the Bourbons and the first cars still shape Spanish cities"
- 2013/6, **Bosch, N.; Espasa, M.; Montolio, D.:** "Should large Spanish municipalities be financially compensated? Costs and benefits of being a capital/central municipality"
- 2013/7, **Escardíbul, J.O.; Mora, T.:** "Teacher gender and student performance in mathematics. Evidence from Catalonia"
- 2013/8, **Arqué-Castells, P.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Banking towards development: evidence from the Spanish banking expansion plan"
- 2013/9, **Asensio, J.; Gómez-Lobo, A.; Matas, A.:** "How effective are policies to reduce gasoline consumption? Evaluating a quasi-natural experiment in Spain"
- 2013/10, **Jofre-Monseny, J.:** "The effects of unemployment benefits on migration in lagging regions"
- 2013/11, **Segarra, A.; García-Quevedo, J.; Teruel, M.:** "Financial constraints and the failure of innovation projects"
- 2013/12, **Jerrim, J.; Choi, A.:** "The mathematics skills of school children: How does England compare to the high performing East Asian jurisdictions?"
- 2013/13, **González-Val, R.; Tirado-Fabregat, D.A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Market potential and city growth: Spain 1860-1960"
- 2013/14, **Lundqvist, H.:** "Is it worth it? On the returns to holding political office"
- 2013/15, **Ahlfeldt, G.M.; Maennig, W.:** "Homevoters vs. leasevoters: a spatial analysis of airport effects"
- 2013/16, **Lampón, J.F.; Lago-Peñas, S.:** "Factors behind international relocation and changes in production geography in the European automobile components industry"
- 2013/17, **Guío, J.M.; Choi, A.:** "Evolution of the school failure risk during the 2000 decade in Spain: analysis of Pisa results with a two-level logistic mode"
- 2013/18, **Dahlby, B.; Rodden, J.:** "A political economy model of the vertical fiscal gap and vertical fiscal imbalances in a federation"
- 2013/19, **Acacia, F.; Cubel, M.:** "Strategic voting and happiness"
- 2013/20, **Hellerstein, J.K.; Kutzbach, M.J.; Neumark, D.:** "Do labor market networks have an important spatial dimension?"
- 2013/21, **Pellegrino, G.; Savona, M.:** "Is money all? Financing versus knowledge and demand constraints to innovation"
- 2013/22, **Lin, J.:** "Regional resilience"
- 2013/23, **Costa-Campi, M.T.; Duch-Brown, N.; García-Quevedo, J.:** "R&D drivers and obstacles to innovation in the energy industry"
- 2013/24, **Huisman, R.; Stradnic, V.; Westgaard, S.:** "Renewable energy and electricity prices: indirect empirical evidence from hydro power"
- 2013/25, **Dargaud, E.; Mantovani, A.; Reggiani, C.:** "The fight against cartels: a transatlantic perspective"
- 2013/26, **Lambertini, L.; Mantovani, A.:** "Feedback equilibria in a dynamic renewable resource oligopoly: pre-emption, voracity and exhaustion"
- 2013/27, **Feld, L.P.; Kalb, A.; Moessinger, M.D.; Osterloh, S.:** "Sovereign bond market reactions to fiscal rules and no-bailout clauses – the Swiss experience"
- 2013/28, **Hilber, C.A.L.; Vermeulen, W.:** "The impact of supply constraints on house prices in England"
- 2013/29, **Revelli, F.:** "Tax limits and local democracy"
- 2013/30, **Wang, R.; Wang, W.:** "Dress-up contest: a dark side of fiscal decentralization"
- 2013/31, **Dargaud, E.; Mantovani, A.; Reggiani, C.:** "The fight against cartels: a transatlantic perspective"
- 2013/32, **Saarimaa, T.; Tukiainen, J.:** "Local representation and strategic voting: evidence from electoral boundary reforms"
- 2013/33, **Agasisti, T.; Murtinu, S.:** "Are we wasting public money? No! The effects of grants on Italian university students' performances"
- 2013/34, **Flacher, D.; Harari-Kermadec, H.; Moulin, L.:** "Financing higher education: a contributory scheme"
- 2013/35, **Carozzi, F.; Repetto, L.:** "Sending the pork home: birth town bias in transfers to Italian municipalities"
- 2013/36, **Coad, A.; Frankish, J.S.; Roberts, R.G.; Storey, D.J.:** "New venture survival and growth: Does the fog lift?"

2013/37, **Giulietti, M.; Grossi, L.; Waterson, M.**: "Revenues from storage in a competitive electricity market: Empirical evidence from Great Britain"

2014

2014/1, **Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.**: "When police patrols matter. The effect of police proximity on citizens' crime risk perception"

2014/2, **García-López, M.A.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.**: "Do land use policies follow road construction?"

2014/3, **Piolatto, A.; Rablen, M.D.**: "Prospect theory and tax evasion: a reconsideration of the Yitzhaki puzzle"

2014/4, **Cuberes, D.; González-Val, R.**: "The effect of the Spanish Reconquest on Iberian Cities"

2014/5, **Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, E.**: "Tax professionals' view of the Spanish tax system: efficiency, equity and tax planning"

2014/6, **Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.**: "Difference-form group contests"

2014/7, **Del Rey, E.; Racionero, M.**: "Choosing the type of income-contingent loan: risk-sharing versus risk-pooling"

2014/8, **Torregrosa Hetland, S.**: "A fiscal revolution? Progressivity in the Spanish tax system, 1960-1990"

2014/9, **Piolatto, A.**: "Itemised deductions: a device to reduce tax evasion"

2014/10, **Costa, M.T.; García-Quevedo, J.; Segarra, A.**: "Energy efficiency determinants: an empirical analysis of Spanish innovative firms"

2014/11, **García-Quevedo, J.; Pellegrino, G.; Savona, M.**: "Reviving demand-pull perspectives: the effect of demand uncertainty and stagnancy on R&D strategy"

2014/12, **Calero, J.; Escardíbul, J.O.**: "Barriers to non-formal professional training in Spain in periods of economic growth and crisis. An analysis with special attention to the effect of the previous human capital of workers"

2014/13, **Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.**: "Gender differences and stereotypes in the beauty"

2014/14, **Piolatto, A.; Schuett, F.**: "Media competition and electoral politics"

2014/15, **Montolio, D.; Trillas, F.; Trujillo-Baute, E.**: "Regulatory environment and firm performance in EU telecommunications services"

2014/16, **Lopez-Rodriguez, J.; Martinez, D.**: "Beyond the R&D effects on innovation: the contribution of non-R&D activities to TFP growth in the EU"

2014/17, **González-Val, R.**: "Cross-sectional growth in US cities from 1990 to 2000"

2014/18, **Vona, F.; Nicolli, F.**: "Energy market liberalization and renewable energy policies in OECD countries"

2014/19, **Duro, J.A.; Grau, M.**: "Voters' responsiveness to public employment policies"

2014/20, **Curto, J.A.; Teixidó-Figueras, J.; Padilla, E.**: "The causal factors of international inequality in co2 emissions per capita: a regression-based inequality decomposition analysis"

2014/21, **Fleten, S.E.; Huisman, R.; Kilic, M.; Pennings, E.; Westgaard, S.**: "Electricity futures prices: time varying sensitivity to fundamentals"

2014/22, **Afcha, S.; García-Quevedo, J.**: "The impact of R&D subsidies on R&D employment composition"

2014/23, **Mir-Artigues, P.; del Río, P.**: "Combining tariffs, investment subsidies and soft loans in a renewable electricity deployment policy"

2014/24, **Romero-Jordán, D.; del Río, P.; Peñasco, C.**: "Household electricity demand in Spanish regions. Public policy implications"

2014/25, **Salinas, P.**: "The effect of decentralization on educational outcomes: real autonomy matters!"

2014/26, **Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.**: "Does corruption erode trust in government? Evidence from a recent surge of local scandals in Spain"

2014/27, **Costas-Pérez, E.**: "Political corruption and voter turnout: mobilization or disaffection?"

2014/28, **Cubel, M.; Nuevo-Chiquero, A.; Sanchez-Pages, S.; Vidal-Fernandez, M.**: "Do personality traits affect productivity? Evidence from the LAB"

2014/29, **Teresa Costa, M.T.; Trujillo-Baute, E.**: "Retail price effects of feed-in tariff regulation"

2014/30, **Kilic, M.; Trujillo-Baute, E.**: "The stabilizing effect of hydro reservoir levels on intraday power prices under wind forecast errors"

2014/31, **Costa-Campi, M.T.; Duch-Brown, N.**: "The diffusion of patented oil and gas technology with environmental uses: a forward patent citation analysis"

2014/32, **Ramos, R.; Sanromá, E.; Simón, H.**: "Public-private sector wage differentials by type of contract: evidence from Spain"

2014/33, **Backus, P.; Esteller-Moré, A.**: "Is income redistribution a form of insurance, a public good or both?"

2014/34, **Huisman, R.; Trujillo-Baute, E.**: "Costs of power supply flexibility: the indirect impact of a Spanish policy change"

- 2014/35, Jerrim, J.; Choi, A.; Simancas Rodríguez, R.: "Two-sample two-stage least squares (TSTLS) estimates of earnings mobility: how consistent are they?"
- 2014/36, Mantovani, A.; Tarola, O.; Vergari, C.: "Hedonic quality, social norms, and environmental campaigns"
- 2014/37, Ferraresi, M.; Galmarini, U.; Rizzo, L.: "Local infrastructures and externalities: Does the size matter?"
- 2014/38, Ferraresi, M.; Rizzo, L.; Zanardi, A.: "Policy outcomes of single and double-ballot elections"

2015

- 2015/1, Foremny, D.; Freier, R.; Moessinger, M-D.; Yeter, M.: "Overlapping political budget cycles in the legislative and the executive"
- 2015/2, Colombo, L.; Galmarini, U.: "Optimality and distortionary lobbying: regulating tobacco consumption"
- 2015/3, Pellegrino, G.: "Barriers to innovation: Can firm age help lower them?"
- 2015/4, Hémet, C.: "Diversity and employment prospects: neighbors matter!"
- 2015/5, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "An axiomatization of difference-form contest success functions"
- 2015/6, Choi, A.; Jerrim, J.: "The use (and misuse) of Pisa in guiding policy reform: the case of Spain"
- 2015/7, Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, A.; Salvadori, L.: "Empirical evidence on tax cooperation between sub-central administrations"
- 2015/8, Batalla-Bejerano, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Analysing the sensitivity of electricity system operational costs to deviations in supply and demand"
- 2015/9, Salvadori, L.: "Does tax enforcement counteract the negative effects of terrorism? A case study of the Basque Country"
- 2015/10, Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.: "How time shapes crime: the temporal impacts of football matches on crime"
- 2015/11, Piolatto, A.: "Online booking and information: competition and welfare consequences of review aggregators"
- 2015/12, Boffa, F.; Pingali, V.; Sala, F.: "Strategic investment in merchant transmission: the impact of capacity utilization rules"
- 2015/13, Slemrod, J.: "Tax administration and tax systems"
- 2015/14, Arqué-Castells, P.; Cartaxo, R.M.; García-Quevedo, J.; Mira Godinho, M.: "How inventor royalty shares affect patenting and income in Portugal and Spain"
- 2015/15, Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.: "Measuring the negative externalities of a private leisure activity: hooligans and pickpockets around the stadium"
- 2015/16, Batalla-Bejerano, J.; Costa-Campi, M.T.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Unexpected consequences of liberalisation: metering, losses, load profiles and cost settlement in Spain's electricity system"
- 2015/17, Batalla-Bejerano, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Impacts of intermittent renewable generation on electricity system costs"
- 2015/18, Costa-Campi, M.T.; Paniagua, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Are energy market integrations a green light for FDI?"
- 2015/19, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Sánchez-Vidal, M.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Big plant closures and agglomeration economies"
- 2015/20, Garcia-López, M.A.; Hémet, C.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "How does transportation shape intrametropolitan growth? An answer from the regional express rail"
- 2015/21, Esteller-Moré, A.; Galmarini, U.; Rizzo, L.: "Fiscal equalization under political pressures"
- 2015/22, Escardíbul, J.O.; Afcha, S.: "Determinants of doctorate holders' job satisfaction. An analysis by employment sector and type of satisfaction in Spain"
- 2015/23, Aidt, T.; Asatryan, Z.; Badalyan, L.; Heinemann, F.: "Vote buying or (political) business (cycles) as usual?"
- 2015/24, Albæk, K.: "A test of the 'lose it or use it' hypothesis in labour markets around the world"
- 2015/25, Angelucci, C.; Russo, A.: "Petty corruption and citizen feedback"
- 2015/26, Moriconi, S.; Picard, P.M.; Zanaj, S.: "Commodity taxation and regulatory competition"
- 2015/27, Brekke, K.R.; Garcia Pires, A.J.; Schindler, D.; Schjelderup, G.: "Capital taxation and imperfect competition: ACE vs. CBIT"
- 2015/28, Redonda, A.: "Market structure, the functional form of demand and the sensitivity of the vertical reaction function"
- 2015/29, Ramos, R.; Sanromá, E.; Simón, H.: "An analysis of wage differentials between full-and part-time workers in Spain"
- 2015/30, Garcia-López, M.A.; Pasidis, I.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Express delivery to the suburbs the effects of transportation in Europe's heterogeneous cities"
- 2015/31, Torregrosa, S.: "Bypassing progressive taxation: fraud and base erosion in the Spanish income tax (1970-2001)"

- 2015/32, **Choi, H.; Choi, A.:** "When one door closes: the impact of the hagwon curfew on the consumption of private tutoring in the republic of Korea"
- 2015/33, **Escardíbul, J.O.; Helmy, N.:** "Decentralisation and school autonomy impact on the quality of education: the case of two MENA countries"
- 2015/34, **González-Val, R.; Marcén, M.:** "Divorce and the business cycle: a cross-country analysis"
- 2015/35, **Calero, J.; Choi, A.:** "The distribution of skills among the European adult population and unemployment: a comparative approach"
- 2015/36, **Mediavilla, M.; Zancajo, A.:** "Is there real freedom of school choice? An analysis from Chile"
- 2015/37, **Daniele, G.:** "Strike one to educate one hundred: organized crime, political selection and politicians' ability"
- 2015/38, **González-Val, R.; Marcén, M.:** "Regional unemployment, marriage, and divorce"
- 2015/39, **Foremny, D.; Jofre-Monseny, J.; Solé-Ollé, A.:** "'Hold that ghost': using notches to identify manipulation of population-based grants"
- 2015/40, **Mancebón, M.J.; Ximénez-de-Embún, D.P.; Mediavilla, M.; Gómez-Sancho, J.M.:** "Does educational management model matter? New evidence for Spain by a quasiexperimental approach"
- 2015/41, **Daniele, G.; Geys, B.:** "Exposing politicians' ties to criminal organizations: the effects of local government dissolutions on electoral outcomes in Southern Italian municipalities"
- 2015/42, **Ooghe, E.:** "Wage policies, employment, and redistributive efficiency"

2016

- 2016/1, **Galletta, S.:** "Law enforcement, municipal budgets and spillover effects: evidence from a quasi-experiment in Italy"
- 2016/2, **Flatley, L.; Giuliotti, M.; Grossi, L.; Trujillo-Baute, E.; Waterson, M.:** "Analysing the potential economic value of energy storage"
- 2016/3, **Calero, J.; Murillo Huertas, I.P.; Raymond Bara, J.L.:** "Education, age and skills: an analysis using the PIAAC survey"
- 2016/4, **Costa-Campi, M.T.; Daví-Arderius, D.; Trujillo-Baute, E.:** "The economic impact of electricity losses"
- 2016/5, **Falck, O.; Heimisch, A.; Wiederhold, S.:** "Returns to ICT skills"
- 2016/6, **Halmenschlager, C.; Mantovani, A.:** "On the private and social desirability of mixed bundling in complementary markets with cost savings"
- 2016/7, **Choi, A.; Gil, M.; Mediavilla, M.; Valbuena, J.:** "Double toil and trouble: grade retention and academic performance"
- 2016/8, **González-Val, R.:** "Historical urban growth in Europe (1300–1800)"
- 2016/9, **Guio, J.; Choi, A.; Escardíbul, J.O.:** "Labor markets, academic performance and the risk of school dropout: evidence for Spain"
- 2016/10, **Bianchini, S.; Pellegrino, G.; Tamagni, F.:** "Innovation strategies and firm growth"
- 2016/11, **Jofre-Monseny, J.; Silva, J.I.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.:** "Local labor market effects of public employment"
- 2016/12, **Sanchez-Vidal, M.:** "Small shops for sale! The effects of big-box openings on grocery stores"
- 2016/13, **Costa-Campi, M.T.; García-Quevedo, J.; Martínez-Ros, E.:** "What are the determinants of investment in environmental R&D?"
- 2016/14, **García-López, M.A.; Hémet, C.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Next train to the polycentric city: The effect of railroads on subcenter formation"
- 2016/15, **Matas, A.; Raymond, J.L.; Dominguez, A.:** "Changes in fuel economy: An analysis of the Spanish car market"
- 2016/16, **Leme, A.; Escardíbul, J.O.:** "The effect of a specialized versus a general upper secondary school curriculum on students' performance and inequality. A difference-in-differences cross country comparison"
- 2016/17, **Scandurra, R.I.; Calero, J.:** "Modelling adult skills in OECD countries"
- 2016/18, **Fernández-Gutiérrez, M.; Calero, J.:** "Leisure and education: insights from a time-use analysis"
- 2016/19, **Del Rio, P.; Mir-Artigues, P.; Trujillo-Baute, E.:** "Analysing the impact of renewable energy regulation on retail electricity prices"
- 2016/20, **Taltavull de la Paz, P.; Juárez, F.; Monllor, P.:** "Fuel Poverty: Evidence from housing perspective"
- 2016/21, **Ferraresi, M.; Galmarini, U.; Rizzo, L.; Zanardi, A.:** "Switch towards tax centralization in Italy: A wake up for the local political budget cycle"
- 2016/22, **Ferraresi, M.; Migali, G.; Nordi, F.; Rizzo, L.:** "Spatial interaction in local expenditures among Italian municipalities: evidence from Italy 2001-2011"
- 2016/23, **Daví-Arderius, D.; Sanin, M.E.; Trujillo-Baute, E.:** "CO2 content of electricity losses"

- 2016/24, Arqué-Castells, P.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** “Banking the unbanked: Evidence from the Spanish banking expansion plan”
- 2016/25 Choi, Á.; Gil, M.; Mediavilla, M.; Valbuena, J.:** “The evolution of educational inequalities in Spain: Dynamic evidence from repeated cross-sections”
- 2016/26, Brutti, Z.:** “Cities drifting apart: Heterogeneous outcomes of decentralizing public education”
- 2016/27, Backus, P.; Cubel, M.; Guid, M.; Sánchez-Pages, S.; Lopez Manas, E.:** “Gender, competition and performance: evidence from real tournaments”
- 2016/28, Costa-Campi, M.T.; Duch-Brown, N.; García-Quevedo, J.:** “Innovation strategies of energy firms”
- 2016/29, Daniele, G.; Dipoppa, G.:** “Mafia, elections and violence against politicians”
- 2016/30, Di Cosmo, V.; Malaguzzi Valeri, L.:** “Wind, storage, interconnection and the cost of electricity”

2017

- 2017/1, González Pampillón, N.; Jofre-Monseny, J.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** “Can urban renewal policies reverse neighborhood ethnic dynamics?”
- 2017/2, Gómez San Román, T.:** “Integration of DERs on power systems: challenges and opportunities”
- 2017/3, Bianchini, S.; Pellegrino, G.:** “Innovation persistence and employment dynamics”
- 2017/4, Curto-Grau, M.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.:** “Does electoral competition curb party favoritism?”
- 2017/5, Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** “Housing booms and busts and local fiscal policy”
- 2017/6, Esteller, A.; Piolatto, A.; Rablen, M.D.:** “Taxing high-income earners: Tax avoidance and mobility”
- 2017/7, Combes, P.P.; Duranton, G.; Gobillon, L.:** “The production function for housing: Evidence from France”
- 2017/8, Nepal, R.; Cram, L.; Jamasb, T.; Sen, A.:** “Small systems, big targets: power sector reforms and renewable energy development in small electricity systems”
- 2017/9, Carozzi, F.; Repetto, L.:** “Distributive politics inside the city? The political economy of Spain’s plan E”
- 2017/10, Neisser, C.:** “The elasticity of taxable income: A meta-regression analysis”
- 2017/11, Baker, E.; Bosetti, V.; Salo, A.:** “Finding common ground when experts disagree: robust portfolio decision analysis”
- 2017/12, Murillo, I.P.; Raymond, J.L.; Calero, J.:** “Efficiency in the transformation of schooling into competences: A cross-country analysis using PIAAC data”
- 2017/13, Ferrer-Esteban, G.; Mediavilla, M.:** “The more educated, the more engaged? An analysis of social capital and education”
- 2017/14, Sanchis-Guarner, R.:** “Decomposing the impact of immigration on house prices”
- 2017/15, Schwab, T.; Todtenhaupt, M.:** “Spillover from the haven: Cross-border externalities of patent box regimes within multinational firms”
- 2017/16, Chacón, M.; Jensen, J.:** “The institutional determinants of Southern secession”
- 2017/17, Gancia, G.; Ponzetto, G.A.M.; Ventura, J.:** “Globalization and political structure”
- 2017/18, González-Val, R.:** “City size distribution and space”
- 2017/19, García-Quevedo, J.; Mas-Verdú, F.; Pellegrino, G.:** “What firms don’t know can hurt them: Overcoming a lack of information on technology”
- 2017/20, Costa-Campi, M.T.; García-Quevedo, J.:** “Why do manufacturing industries invest in energy R&D?”
- 2017/21, Costa-Campi, M.T.; García-Quevedo, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.:** “Electricity regulation and economic growth”

2018

- 2018/1, Boadway, R.; Pestieau, P.:** “The tenuous case for an annual wealth tax”
- 2018/2, García-López, M.Á.:** “All roads lead to Rome ... and to sprawl? Evidence from European cities”
- 2018/3, Daniele, G.; Galletta, S.; Geys, B.:** “Abandon ship? Party brands and politicians’ responses to a political scandal”

