

<p style="text-align: center;">Elasticities of Regional and Local Administrations Expenditures – the Portuguese case</p>

44th European Congress of ERSA (Oporto, Portugal, August 2004)

Paulo Reis Mourão

(Economics Department at the University of Minho, Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal)

e-mail: paulom@eeg.uminho.pt

ABSTRACT

This work analyzes the evolution of real public expenditures of local and regional administrations (LRA), in Portugal, in the period after the Second World War. It also aims to estimate the elasticities associated to determinants, which explain the found growth. As most relevant results, it is focused that real public expenditures of LRA did not increase in a constant way – the most significant period of growth was between 1975 and 1990. A long-term relation was found among real public expenditures of LRA (as a proportion of real Gross National Product), the Number of Employees in Public Administration, the Number of Unemployed and Public Revenues. These results are consistent with modern versions of Wagner's Laws, with the role of lobbying groups and with the bureaucracy being a source of discouragement referring to the decentralized public expenditures.

JEL Codes: H50; H54; H72; C13

Keywords: Public Expenditures; Cointegration; Decentralization

Section 1: Introduction

How did a decentralized public expenditure in Portugal develop after the Second World War? And why? These questions are the beginning of the following discussion.

The study of the evolution of national public expenditures has received the focus from some researchers such as, for example, André and Delorme (1978), Beck (1981), Musgrave and Musgrave (1980), Trotman-Dickenson (1996), Rosen (1998), Demirbas (1999) or Jackson *et al.* (1999). We can point Carreira (1989), Silva and Neves (1992), Afonso (2000) or Bronchi (2003) being some analysts for the Portuguese aggregates.

The major contribute of this work is to give evidence to the fact that a decentralized public outlay of Portugal – the real public expenditures of local and regional administrations (LRA) - had distinct phases of growth but, mainly, to show that determinants of this evolution can be explained. These determinants are the Number of Unemployed, the Number of Public Administration Employees and Public Revenues.

For the study of the first suggestion (which consists in the heterogeneous development of real public expenditures of Portuguese LRA), I used a Markov Switching Model, which is a method used for identifying structural breaks in time series. For testing the long-term relation among the introduced determinants and real public expenditures of LRA, as a ratio of Portuguese real Gross National Product (GNP), I used the traditional framework of proceedings to evaluate the cointegration relation among economic variables.

Via the Long Series of the Bank of Portugal data, observed between 1947 and 2002, I intended to appreciate the evolution of the Portuguese real public expenditures of LRA and to find evidence favoring some determinants suggested by the Economic Literature. Some theories are introduced to explain the growth of public expenditures. We can report them in two groups: Theories of the growth of public expenditures because of movements on Demand or, alternatively, on Supply of the goods and services provided by the Government. In the first group, in addition to the seminal work of Wagner (1883), we find Downs (1957), Peacock and Wiseman (1961), Buchanan and Wagner (1977) or Cameron (1978). In the second “school”, we can point Niskanen (1971), Bush and

Denzau (1977), Beck (1981) or Castles (1982). For testing the significance of the long term relation among some economic variables pointed by the two groups of researchers, I appealed to a Model derived from Median Voter Theory, developed by Kirchgässner and Pommerehne (1997).

This work is organized as the following: Section 2 is composed by a conceptual framework; Section 3 explains the application of the Markov Switching Model, introducing data and some results; Section 4 synthesizes the major theories which try to explain the growth of public expenditures; in Section 5 it will be inserted the discussion influenced by the Median Voter Theory, describing data, the purposed Methodology and the returned estimations; Section 6 presents the conclusion.

Section 2: A conceptual framework

In the last 50 years, many countries have been characterized by the phenomenon of the growth of their public expenditures. However, it is particularly necessary to define the phenomenon and to specify the object of this work.

The phenomenon is restricted to an analysis on the evolution of the Portuguese real public expenditures of Local and Regional Administrations (LRA), between the years 1947 to 2002. These temporal limits focus on the period after the Second World War to nowadays (beginning of the Twenty-First century).

The object of this study is identified with an economic aggregate– the real public expenditures of LRA– that can be described as the global amount of deflated expenditures spent by decentralized instances of Portuguese public administration.

The Long Series of the Bank of Portugal mainly provided data.

Without intending to give an exhaustive list of authors, we can find some national studies on the growth of public expenditures, for example, by Trotman-Dickenson (1996) who gave attention to the English reality. Musgrave and Musgrave (1980), Rosen (1998) or Beck (1981) studied the Public Expenditures of the United States of America. Some European studies were developed by André and Delorme (1978), who analyzed the evolution of French Public Outlays, by Demirbas (1999), who observed the Turkish

aggregates, or by Jackson, Fethi and Fethi (1999) who studied the Northern Cyprian expenditures. In Portugal, we can cite Medina Carreira (1989), Silva and Neves (1992), Afonso (2000) or Bronchi (2003), among many others. Alternatively, for example, we can find Manasan (1985), who analyzed the public finances of Philippines.

In general, only after 1985, different indicators assumed a stabilization of the growth of public expenditures.

Analyzing Figures A1, A2, A3 and A4, we find four representations that express the evolution of the logs of the following Portuguese public expenditures series: Total LRA Expenditures in nominal terms, Total LRA Expenditures in real terms, percentual relation between nominal Total LRA expenditures and nominal Gross Nominal Product, and percentual relation between real Total LRA expenditures and real Gross Nominal Product. According to Musgrave and Musgrave (1980) and Beck (1981), Portuguese Public Expenditures were deflated by a calibrated average between Public Consumption Deflator Index and Private Consumption Deflator Index. As usually, its own index deflated nominal Gross Domestic Product.

Due to the suggested development and according to Herber (1971), we are tempted to graphically recognize Wagner's Hypothesis: under pre or post industrialization efforts, the growth of public expenditures has slower rates than those related to periods characterized by vigorous industrialization. In these periods of strong industrialization, Government's expenditures try to follow efforts of the private sector. However, Wagner's Hypothesis, according to this suggestion, purposes an "S" curve. Watching the first figure (A1), it seems that, between 1947 and 1975 and between 1992 and 2002, the public expenditures aggregate has been defined by slower growth rates than those observed between 1975 and 1992. We can depurate this suggestion using the real public Expenditures of LRA whose representation highlights some inflexion points, associated to the observations of the middle of 1970, reported by the lectures on graphics A3 and A4 (percentual relation between nominal and real total public expenditure and, respectively, nominal and real gross nominal product).

Annual average growth rates of the Portuguese LRA public expenditures, between 1947 and 2002, are: 13,09% (nominal series), 5,51% (real series), 1,74% (percentual

relation between nominal LRA expenditures and nominal GDP) and 1,60% (percentual relation between real expenditures of LRA and real GDP).

Section 3: the behaviour of real public expenditures of LRA in Portugal: some evidence through a Markov-Switching Model

The analysis of structural shifts in a time series context is due to authors like Quandt (1958), Goldfeld and Quandt (1973) and Cosslett and Lee (1985). According to Maddala and Kim (1998), Quandt (1958) has begun with a dichotomic suggestion that was used to describe a time series. Goldfeld and Quandt (1973) purposed the introduction of constant transition probabilities between two different regimes, which could characterize a series, incorporating the concept of *markov chain*. However, this sort of *Markov switching regressions* became more popular after Hamilton's (1989) seminal work.

In Hamilton (1989), the phases ("regimes") of contraction or expansion are modeled as switching regimes of the inherent stochastic process:

$$\Delta y_t - \mathbf{m}(s_t) = \mathbf{a}_1(\Delta y_{t-1} - \mathbf{m}(s_{t-1})) + \dots + \mathbf{a}_2(\Delta y_{t-4} - \mathbf{m}(s_{t-4})) + u_t \quad (1)$$

In (1), these two regimes are defined by two different conditional distributions of the growth rate of real output (Δy_t), where \mathbf{m} , the mean growth rate, is depending on the state s_t . So, \mathbf{m} is expected to be negative (contraction) and \mathbf{m} is expected to be positive (expansion). In his original work, Hamilton (1989) used a unique variance of the disturbance term, independently of the regimes, $u_t \sim NID(0, \mathbf{s}^2)$.

An ergodic *Markov chain* generates the stochastic process. This ergodic Markov chain is defined by the transition probabilities (2):

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ij} &= \Pr(s_{t+1} = j \mid s_t = i) \\ \sum_{j=1}^M p_{iz} &= 1 \\ \forall i, j &\in \{1, \dots, M\} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

With a two-regime business cycle, there are two transition probabilities:

$$p_{12} = Pr(\text{recession in } t \mid \text{expansion in } t-1)$$

$$p_{21} = Pr(\text{expansion in } t \mid \text{recession in } t-1)$$

These transition probabilities should be estimated together with the parameters of equation (1), as stated by Krolzig (2001). For this aim, we can appeal to the Expectation-Maximization algorithm that was discussed by Hamilton (1990).

To analyze the regimes that characterize the evolution of the Portuguese LRA real expenditures, between 1947 and 2002, firstly, I extracted the global data from the Long Series of the Bank of Portugal until 1995 and, after this period, from an official document, which describes, *a posteriori*, a budgetary year – the *Estate General Account*, “Conta Geral do Estado”.

After the data collection, the (nominal) series were deflated, using the contribution of Musgrave and Musgrave (1980) and Beck (1981) where the global expenditures suffer the effect of a calibrated average between the deflators of public and private consumption. At last, the logs of real series were first-differenced to create a new series: the growth rate of Portuguese LRA real expenditures.

To select the number of lags included in a *markov switching regression*, it is preferred to minimize the returned values by the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC), Hanna-Quinn Criteria (HQ) or Schwarz Bayesian Information Criteria (SC). The Table A1 synthesizes the results according to different number of lags (from 0 to 5).

Observing Table A1, no lags will be included in the regression.

To discuss the correct number of regimes, Ang and Beakaert’s (1998) suggestion was followed. According to these authors, we can use the distribution $\chi^2(q)$ to test the validity of some restrictions, where q is identified with the number of restrictions to be tested. Usually, the restrictions are formulated to test the equivalence between two means or between two variances, parameters associated to different regimes.

Testing two restrictions (equivalence between the means and between the variances of two states), I got a value of 8,85. According to this value, we can reject the null hypothesis of a single regime (the associated *p-value* is 1,19%).

In the sequence of these tests, the series associated to the growth rates in the real public expenditures of LRA (DDTOTR) will be suggested by a *Markov Switching Model* with state-dependent mean and variance. This model has two regimes and no lags of the regressand are included as regressors:

$$\begin{aligned} DDTOTR_t - \mathbf{m}(s_t) &= u_t \\ u_t &\sim NID(0, \mathbf{d}_{s_t}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The estimated parameters of the model (3) are shown in Table A2. The estimation of parameters and the figures A1 and A2 were brought in from MSVAR module, version 1.3, for Ox v.3.3.

The regime-associated probabilities are referred in Figure A1 panels. The filtered probability can be understood as an optimal inference on the state variable (identifying a contraction or an expansion phase) at time t getting the information up to time t :

$$Pr(s_t / y_1, \dots, y_t; \hat{\theta})$$

The smoothed probability gives the optimal inference on the regime at time t considering the full sample information:

$$Pr(s_t / y_1, \dots, y_T; \hat{\theta})$$

The set of population parameters, θ , is identified with

$$\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, p_{11}, p_{22})$$

However, θ collects the information concerning the regimes: which means, standard deviations and persistence probabilities.

From an integral lecture on Figure A1 and on data present in Table A2 we can suggest that the growth rates of the real public expenditures of Portuguese LRA, in the last 54 years, had two states. Regime 1 (low rates) was found between 1948 and 1972 and between 1989 and 2002. This phase has a mean growth rate of about 4,58%. Regime 2 (high rates) took place between 1973 and 1988 with a mean growth rate of 7,46%. The respective standard errors associated to states 1 and 2 are 0,053 and 0,115.

In following periods, some political events marked the course of Portugal:

- From 1961 until 1975, Portugal was involved in a military conflict, against independentist forces from the actual States of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, S. Tomé and Príncipe and Cabo Verde. These States were then recognized as Ultramarine Provinces.
- The Economic Development Policy, during the decade of 1960, had a special vigour in the “Planos de Fomento”, macro programs organized for five years that were obligatory to the Public Sector and relating to the Private Sector, evolving the modernization of Central and Local Public Administrations and the building of some important infrastructures (roads, airports and hydroelectric centrals).
- In 1974, a political revolution, started by a military coup on 25th April, substituted the II Republic, the Corporative, for the (actual) III Republic, the Democratic.
- At the end of the 1970-decade, the International Monetary Fund acts on the Portuguese financial situation, imposing restrictions on the performance of the public finances. This fact marks the beginning of a period of slow growth rates in the aggregate of the public expenditures.
- Since 1986, Portugal became part of the European Economic Community. This fact had accentuated the interdependence of public finances aggregates, as public expenditures, in an International context.

Since 1974, partisans disputing electoral moments have characterized the democratic experience. But the simple visualization on Figures A1, A2, A3 or A4 does not seem to suggest significant political influences on DDTOTR. We point this observation based on the absence of structural shifts in the series, caused by electoral

moments, since 1980. A possible hypothesis of justification is found in the preferred classification of real public expenditures of LRA. Due to the economic classification, it is very difficult to identify shifts in the series. If functional or organic classifications were preferred we could expect different perceptions motivated by electoral moments.

Combining the evidence, the period of higher growth of this series starts with the transition period between the two models of Republic Systems (1974-1976), and it was delayed until the end of the decade of 1980, where we can recognize the influence of the European integration, with other sources of challenges to national budgetary policies.

The transition matrix (P_{ij}) is given by

$$P_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0,954 & 0,0461 \\ 0,107 & 0,893 \end{bmatrix}$$

So, we expect that State 1 has a prevalence of 22 years while State 2 remains, on average, during 9 years. This duration is calculated by $\frac{1}{1 - p_{ii}}$.

Observing the Figure A2, the desired statistical properties of the estimated residues can be induced. So, we confirm the absence of significant residual autocorrelation and the absence of residual non-normality.

Section 4: Theories on the growth of Public Expenditures: a synthesis

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Adolph Wagner (1883) enunciated two purposes of explanation on the growth of public expenditures. The first of Wagner's explanations identified the social transformation between a society based on primary activities (as agriculture or fishery) and a society with the rising of the industrial sector. The second "law" of Wagner suggested that public goods were characterized by higher income elasticities (as, in a microeconomics context, the luxury goods): so, with rising national product and national income, public expenditures tended to grow.

Peacock and Wiseman (1961) identified "Displacement Effects" as a reason for the shift of the demand of public goods and services. Facing obligations assumed during

special periods, like wars or social convulsions, governments have difficulties when they try to re-establish the structures of public expenditures, which were verified before these unusual moments. Therefore, there is a tendency to increase the amount of public outlays.

Other authors, as Downs (1957), Romer and Rosenthal (1979) or Meltzer and Richard (1981) appealed to the redistribution processes as a possible cause of public growth expenditures.

Buchanan and Wagner (1977) or Romer (1999) argue that imperfect knowledge promote the growth of budgetary deficits (a popular example is the fiscal illusion). In the context of understanding what stresses public expenditures attending on the demand side, Tabellini and Alesina (1990) wrote about the public strategic debt choice, Alesina and Drazen (1991) studied the absence of an agreement among political forces and Rogoff (1990) pointed fiscal cycles as possible reasons.

Buchanan and Tullock (1962), Cameron (1978) and Becker (1983) also appreciated the role of lobbying groups as motors of the public growth expenditures.

However, there remains a set of authors who argue that the strongest focus on the public growth expenditures should be put on Supply-Side.

Baumol (1967), Beck (1981) and Pommerehne and Schneider (1982) identify the relative prices (between private and public deflators) and the inelastic demand being the main cause of the evolution of public budgetary outlays.

Frey and Schneider (1981) wrote about the temporal distance between electoral moments as responsible events for expenditures cyclical peaks.

Niskanen (1971) and Romer and Rosenthal (1978) study this problem according to an Adverse Selection perspective: because of the absence of precise knowledge of budget consequences, decision-makers, often, make the most expensive choice. This choice is especially interesting to bureaucrat groups.

Bush and Denzau (1977), Frey and Pommerehne (1984), Cameron (1978) and Castles (1982) also observe the bureaucratic preferences, but now bureaucrats are studied as representative voters.

Castles (1982) developed other explanation - he finds ideological differences (of “right” or “left” parties) as contributors to the observed differences in outlays during legislative governments.

Brennan and Buchanan (1977) and Oates (1985) advise to the heterogeneous bias because of decentralized decisions (sometimes, there is an increment of public expenditures, sometimes, a reduction is observed).

Wildavsky (1964) recognizes that institutional causes (for example, what is behind a budgetary decision) may influence the rhythms of public expenditures growth.

Section 5: The Model of Median Voter as a suggestion of the elasticities of real public expenditures of LRA

After these studies, two questions remain:

- Is there a long-term relationship among real public expenditures of LRA and a set of explicative variables?

- And if there is, what are the estimated elasticities?

In an Economic context, the notion of elasticity suggests the response of a variable to percentual changes in another variable, *coeteris paribus*. According to Greene (2003), the estimation is often purposed by log-linear models.

To describe the behaviour associated to a political decision-maker, I will suggest a model related to the discussion involving the median voter, as stated by Kirchgässner and Pommerehne (1997). So that a political decision-maker – a government or the median voter – wants to maximize the utility associated to the following objective function:

$$U = U(x, q, Tr, T, D) \tag{3}$$

with x designating the private set of disposable goods and services, q the public acquirable basket of goods and services, Tr the Public Transfers to the private sector, T the Public Revenues and D the Public Deficit. The Marginal Utilities are positive for x , q and Tr ; T and D have negative marginal utilities.

We have to fulfill two restrictions. The first one synthesizes the Gross National Product (Y):

$$Y = x * p_x + q * p_q \quad (4)$$

p_x and p_q are, respectively, two variables associated to the private consumption price index and to the public consumption price series.

The second restriction is the popular budget constraint:

$$q * p_q + Tr * p_{Tr} - T * p_T - D * p_D = 0 \quad (5)$$

where p_{tr} , p_t , and p_d are respectively identified with the valorizations given to the Transfers, to the Public Revenues and to the Budget value.

In the median voter discussion it is usual to develop the model starting by an indirect utility function:

$$V = V(p_x, p_q, p_{Tr}, p_T, p_D, Y) \quad (6)$$

This indirect utility function has the following expected marginal utilities:

$$V_{p_x} < 0 \quad (7)$$

$$V_{p_q} < 0 \quad (8)$$

$$V_{p_{tr}} < 0 \quad (9)$$

$$V_{p_t} > 0 \quad (10)$$

$$V_{p_d} > 0 \quad (11)$$

$$V_y > 0 \quad (12)$$

The indirect utility function will be maximized according to (5) and respecting the transformed constraint (13):

$$q * \frac{p_q}{Y} + Tr * \frac{p_{Tr}}{Y} - T * \frac{p_T}{Y} - D * \frac{p_D}{Y} = 0 \quad (13)$$

As a solution, a “system of demand functions” is returned, specifically, an *AIDS* (“Almost Ideal Demand System”), which has ratios assuming the variables:

$$s_i = \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{b}_i * \ln\left(\frac{Y}{P^*}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathbf{g}_{ij} * \ln\left(\frac{p_j}{p_5}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{d}_{ij} * z_j \quad (14)$$

where $p_1 = p_q$, $p_2 = p_{Tr}$, $p_3 = p_T$, $p_4 = p_D$ and $p_5 = p_x$.

P^* is assumed as the Gross National Product Price Index. The variables z_j are explicative variables of the decisions in public budget.

Additionally, there are some restrictions in order to offer a solution to the *AIDS* :

$$\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_3 - \mathbf{a}_4 = 0 \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 - \mathbf{b}_3 - \mathbf{b}_4 = 0 \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{1j} + \mathbf{g}_{2j} - \mathbf{g}_{3j} - \mathbf{g}_{4j} = 0, j = 1, \dots, 4 \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_{1j} + \mathbf{d}_{2j} - \mathbf{d}_{3j} - \mathbf{d}_{4j} = 0, j = 1, \dots, k \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_5 = 1 \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_5 = 0 \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{1j} + \mathbf{g}_{5j} = 0, j = 2, \dots, 5 \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_{1j} + \mathbf{d}_{5j} = 0, j = 1, \dots, k \quad (22)$$

According to the Demand Theory, the symmetry between the coefficients associated to the relative prices can be suggested as

$$\mathbf{g}_{ij} = \mathbf{g}_{ji}, i, j = 2, \dots, 5 \quad (23)$$

We can also conceive that the fluctuation of prices, concerning Transfers, Taxes and the Deficit, is equivalent:

$$p_i = p_j, i, j = 2, 3, 4 \quad (24)$$

However, as interesting prices in this *AIDS*, we have P^* , p_q (public consumption price index) and p_x (private consumption price index). These equivalences (15-24) reduce the complexity in the system.

Now, we are able to estimate the elasticities of the set of suggested exogenous variables in a model where real public expenditures of LRA of Portugal are the regressand.

The set of some exogenous variables, as suggested in Section 3, is composed by the following:

- Real Gross National Product (usually, this variable appears as exogenous in models in which Wagner's Hypotheses are tested; it is expected that the estimated coefficient returns positive values);

- Number of Unemployed people (this variable can be interpreted, simultaneously, as a target-group of redistributive public pretensions and as a lobbying crowd; it is not sure that the estimated coefficient is characterized by positive amounts, what could induce a complementary relation between real public expenditures of LRA and national current transfers, for example; if a negative signal characterizes the estimated coefficient, it can be due to an inherent relation of substitutability);
- Number of Employees in Public Administration (this variable is tested for analyzing the power of bureaucracy as an explanatory variable in the growth of expenditures; as verified with the Number of Unemployed people, there is not an unique direction of the predictable signal of the estimated coefficient);
- Public Revenues (According to Barbosa (1997), as another instrument of Budgetary Policy, this variable is used because it can induce positive effects on public expenditures, as suggested by the traditional short-term budget restriction; thus it is expected that the estimated coefficient has a positive signal).

Therefore, according to the specifications of the *AIDS*, in a first step it is intended to estimate the long-term relation among real public expenditures of LRA (*LDTOTR*), real GNP (*LPIBR*) and the z_j variables (Number of Unemployed, Number of Public Administration Employees and Public Revenues). Thus the following cointegration regression was estimated:

$$LDTOTR_t = \mathbf{a} + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{d}_{ij} * z_j + \mathbf{g} * LPIBR_t + u_t \quad (25)$$

However, some authors like Musgrave (1969) and Gupta (1967) purpose to test public expenditures as a ratio of production:

$$LDTOTR_t - LPIBR_t = \mathbf{a} + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{d}_{ij} * z_j + u_t \quad (26)$$

A short appointment should be introduced here. It is related to the omission of political variables, like years of elections or periods characterized by the governance of a party. Using dummies variables for years of (legislative, municipal or presidential)

elections, there was no statistical significance of the estimated parameters detected. A hypothesis for this apparent irrelevance of political explanations in the growth of Portuguese public expenditures is due to the preferred classification of public expenditures. If organic classification was chosen, which divides public expenditures according to outlays as Defense, Education, Health or Social Security (in the place of the preferred economic one), then it would be probable that a different lecture could have been done, as noted in Section 2. A second reason points out the unaltered regime felt for almost twenty years in Portugal, as Figure A2 expresses it.

DATA

The characterization of the logarithmized variables is the following:

LDTOTR is identified with the logs of the real public expenditures of LRA of Portugal, observed between 1947 and 2002. Its sources were the Long Series of the Bank of Portugal, between 1947 and 1995, edited by Pinheiro (1997), and between 1996 and 2002, in which the official report of budgetary execution was consulted, the “Conta Geral do Estado”. This variable is composed by all the expenditures that the Portuguese Government spends with the decentralized public administration. For the purpose of deflating the nominal series, I followed Musgrave and Musgrave (1980) and Beck (1981). The primary deflators were imported from the same sources of real public expenditures of LRA.

LPIBR represents the logs of real Gross National Product of Portugal, from 1947 to 2002. Its sources were Andrade (2000), between 1947 and 1955, Pinheiro (1997), between 1955 and 1995, and the official department of research of Portuguese Ministry of Finances, the “Gabinete de Estratégia e Planeamento (GEE)”, between 1996 and 2002.

LDESEMP corresponds to the logs of the Number of Unemployed, in Portugal, during the observed period. The sources of this series were Pinheiro (1997), until 1995, and the GEE, after that observation.

LFUN symbolizes the logs of the Number of Public Administration Employees since 1947 to 2002. Its sources were Neves (1994), between 1947 and 1989, and the

official Institute of Employment and Professional Training (“Instituto do Emprego e de Formação Profissional”, IEFP), between 1989 and 2002.

LREC signifies the logs of the Public Revenues, observed between 1947 and 2002. The sources of this series were the same that were used in the real public expenditures of LRA.

METHODOLOGY

To study the long-term relation among variables, econometricians have been purposing the analysis on the possibility of cointegration regressions, since the seminal works of Sargan (1964), Davidson, Hendry, Srba and Yeo (1978) or Engle and Granger (1987).

If two variables x_t and y_t are integrated by the first order, i.e., they are $I(1)$, and if they can generate a third one, z_t , in a way that

$$\begin{aligned} z_t &= y_t - \mathbf{b}x_t \\ z_t &\sim I(0) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

then, we will identify x_t and y_t as cointegrated.

Generally, after recognizing that

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &\sim I(d) \\ x_t &\sim I(b) \end{aligned}$$

we will identify x_t and y_t as cointegrated if z_t can be characterized as

$$\begin{aligned} z_t &= y_t - \mathbf{b}x_t \\ z_t &\sim I(d-b) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

with b positive, necessarily. If b is null then $z_t \sim I(d)$ and the relation found between x_t and y_t is called ‘spurious’ according to Granger and Newbold (1974).

To test the null hypothesis of non-cointegration relation, as stated by Hamilton (1994), Phillips and Loretan (1991) or Haldrup (1994b), it is previously necessary to analyze the stationarity of each series involved in the observed relationship.

There is a considerable set of tests on stationarity. However, I used the following Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF), the Dickey-Fuller Generalized Least Squares (DF-

GLS) as stated by Elliott, Rothenberg and Stock (1996), the Leybourne and McCabe (1994) and Dickey and Pantula (1987) tests.

I began with the popular Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test.

The null hypothesis of the ADF identifies the presence of a unit root in the series Y_t (so, Y_t is not stationary). According to this purpose, the significance of \mathbf{d} in the regression (29) is observed according to critical values present in Phillips (1987) or in MacKinnon (1991).

$$\Delta Y_t = \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 t + \mathbf{d} Y_{t-1} + \mathbf{a}_i \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta Y_{t-i} + \mathbf{e}_t \quad (29)$$

In (29), ΔY_t identifies the series of first-differences of Y_t and t indicates the eventual temporal trend.

As an answer to the need of identifying the length of lags (p) to be included in the test regressions, the cited Information Criteria – Akaike Information Criteria, $AIC(p)$, Schwarz Information Criteria, $SC(p)$ or Hannan and Quinn, $HQ(p)$, are frequently used.

Elliott, Rothenberg and Stock (1996) also developed a test with the null hypothesis identified with the assumption of the non-stationarity of a series. According to King (1980), they searched optimizing properties of the test for small samples.

Identifying y_t^d with the detrended series of y_t , the null hypothesis assumes the absence of significance of the coefficient of \mathbf{a}_0 in the following regression (30):

$$\Delta y_t^d = \mathbf{a}_0 y_{t-1}^d + \mathbf{a}_1 \Delta y_{t-1}^d + \dots + \mathbf{a}_p \Delta y_{t-1}^d + \mathbf{e}_t \quad (30)$$

As stated by Ng and Perron (1995), I also preferred the Modified Akaike Information Criteria (MAIC), for the choice of the lag length to include in the test.

Although these tests (ADF and DF-GLS) returned convergent results, I also used the Leybourne and McCabe (1994) test. Contrary to the priors, Leybourne and McCabe (1994) test has the null hypothesis assuming the stationarity of a series. Their structural model is assumed as the following ($f(L)y_t$ is identified with a lag operator of y_t):

$$f(L)y_t = \mathbf{a}_t + \mathbf{b}_t + \mathbf{e}_t \quad (31)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_t = \mathbf{a}_{t-1} + \mathbf{h}_t \quad (32)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_0 = \mathbf{a} \quad (33)$$

$$t = 1, 2, \dots, T$$

$$\mathbf{e}_t \sim iid(0, \mathbf{s}_e^2)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_t \sim iid(0, \mathbf{s}_h^2)$$

\mathbf{e}_t and \mathbf{h}_t are independent.

The results in Table A3 confirmed the presence of double unit-roots in the series LDTOT, LPIB, LREC, LDPIB (logs of GNP deflator) and LDDESP (logs of the deflator of real public expenditures of LRA) while LDTOTR, LPIBR, LDESEMP and LFUN can be characterized as I(1).

To strengthen the evidence of the accused double unit-roots, I used Dickey and Pantula (1987) test. It starts from an AR(3) model as (34):

$$x_t = \mathbf{q}_1 y_{t-1} + \mathbf{q}_2 z_{t-1} + \mathbf{q}_3 w_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t \quad (34)$$

$$z_t = y_t - y_{t-1} \quad (35)$$

$$w_t = z_t - z_{t-1} \quad (36)$$

$$x_t = w_t - w_{t-1} \quad (37)$$

This test tries to evaluate the presence of a diminishing number of unit roots, descending from 3 (H_3) to 0 (H_0). After recognizing that the estimated coefficient for \mathbf{q}_3 in (38) is not null, according to a t -test in the regression

$$x_t = \mathbf{q}_3 w_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t \quad (38)$$

the null hypothesis of 2 (H_2) unit roots against only one can be tested using the regression

$$x_t = \mathbf{q}_2 z_{t-1} + \mathbf{q}_3 w_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t \quad (39)$$

The null hypothesis of H_2 is not rejected if there is evidence in the sense that \mathbf{q}_2 is not significant.

The Table A4 confirms the prior observations: LDTOT, LPIB, LREC, LDPIB and LDDESP are I(2) while LPIBR, LDTOTR, LDESEMP and LFUN are I(1).

The cointegration among I(2) variables

With the presence of I(2) variables in the cointegration regression, some considerations remain. According to Haldrup (1998), there are three kinds of cointegration in this context:

$$\mathbf{b}'_1 X_{2t} \sim I(0) \quad (40)$$

$$\mathbf{b}'_1 X_{2t} \sim I(1) \quad (41)$$

$$\mathbf{b}'_3 X_{2t} + \mathbf{b}'_4 X_{1t} + \mathbf{b}'_5 \Delta X_{2t} \sim I(0) \quad (42)$$

In this formalization, $\mathbf{b}_i, i=1, \dots, 5$ refers to the estimated cointegration vectors while the subscript i ($i=1$ or $i=2$), associated to X_t variables, indicates the inherent order of integration.

As stated by Granger and Lee (1989), in (40) the variables are multicointegrated because they are cointegrated by levels and by their differences.

In (41) the I(2) variables are only cointegrated by their differences (if they are in logs, only their growth rates are cointegrated).

In (42), we are facing polynomial cointegration (cointegration among I(2) variables, I(1) variables and the first differences of I(2) variables).

Haldrup (1994b) recognizes that when the residual series of a cointegration regression, u_t , is I(1) or I(2), the F-test of any hypothesis diverges to ∞ with the order $O_p(T)$ even if the null is true. Whilst, R^2 converges to 1 and the Durbin-Watson statistic converges to 0. The estimated coefficients for X_{1t} converge with a rate of $O_p(T^{d-1})$ and for X_{2t} with a rate of $O_p(T^{d-2})$.

With this sequence, Haldrup (1994b) developed a set of tests for the null hypothesis of the non-cointegration based in the observation in the residuals from the regression of cointegration. The null hypothesis is not rejected if some evidence favoring the presence of an I(1) or an I(2) series is found. Haldrup (1994b) revealed critical values for rejecting the null in function of m (the number of I(1) regressors) and of m (the number of I(2) regressors).

Efficient estimation

As suggested by Stock and Watson (1993), the estimated results by *Static Ordinary Least Squares* (SOLS) may not be the most efficient, although, in a cointegration relation, they are super-consistent (for a definition of the concepts of efficiency and consistency, it is purposed a lecture on Hamilton (1994)). This may eventually be due to the small sample (56 observations).

In order to get more efficient estimators, I added to the SOLS estimations the results from the computation by Dynamic OLS (DOLS), firstly suggested by Saikonen (1991) and preferred in Stock and Watson (1993), and by Non Linear Squares (NLS), according to Phillips and Loretan (1991).

The DOLS method purposes the efficient estimation by adding lags and leads of the first-differences of the exogenous series (or second-differences if these exogenous series are I(2)) to the cointegration regression. The NLS method substitutes the set of lags and leads of the DOLS method by lags of the exogenous variables and by lags of the residuals obtained from the cointegration regression.

ESTIMATION

Results obtained by SOLS, DOLS and NLS

Table A5 synthesizes the results from the estimation by SOLS, according to (25). Considering it, and according to ADF test statistic on the residuals from cointegration regression (see Haldrup,1994b), we can reject the hypothesis of cointegration among LDTOTR (regressand), LPIBR, LREC, LDESEMP and LFUN.

However, I also tested the hypothesis of cointegration among a new related regressand (percentual relation between real public expenditures of LRA and real GNP) and the set of exogenous variables (LREC, LDESEMP and LFUN), according to regression (26).

According to Haldrup (1994b) and observing the respective series of residuals from this cointegration regression, we reject the null hypothesis of a non-cointegration relation among $LDTOTR-LPIBR$, the log of real public expenditures of LRA as a ratio of real GNP, and $LFUN$, the log of the Number of Public Administration Employees, $LREC$, the log of Public Revenues, and $LDESEMP$, the log of the Number of Unemployed. Thus, it is expected that there is a long-term relationship among these variables. From a first lecture, the estimated coefficient for $LFUN$ (-0,678) may be interpreted as confirming a relation of substitutability between the regressand and the public expenditures destined to Public Administration Employees (correlationated with $LFUN$). There are significant and positive elasticities associated to public revenues (0,180) and to the Number of Unemployed (0,228). Being essentially constituted by Taxes as an instrument of financing public budget deficit, as stated by Barbosa (1997), public revenues offer a reason for increasing the proportion of real public expenditures of LRA in GNP. The number of Unemployed increases the proportion between the observed expenditures and the real GNP. This fact induces that increasing unemployment amplifies real public expenditures of LRA, especially, its outlay that is concerned to decentralized support (for example, current transfers).

Table A6 shows the estimated coefficients for the cointegration relations tested in (26), following the SOLS, DOLS and NLS methods.

As it can be verified, the returned estimations by these three methods do not give back substantially different values. Thus, it can be expected that $LREC$ remains in an interval between 0,16 and 0,18, $LDESEMP$ has its estimated elasticities between 0,23 and 0,26 and $LFUN$ preserves its estimations between -0,68 and -0,61.

ERROR CORRECTION MODELS AND COINTEGRATION

Under the pretense of evaluating the inherent dynamics of the Model, derived by (26), and after rejecting the hypothesis of non-cointegration among the variables, we are able to estimate the associated Error Correction Model (ECM):

$$\Delta(LDTOTR - LPIBR) = \mathbf{a} + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{d}_{ij} * \Delta z_j + \mathbf{e} * u_{t-1} + z_t \quad (43)$$

In a given period, the economic interpretation attributed to e_t , points to the proportion of correction of the verified deviation in the previous observation in order to the estimated long-term value.

This estimation suggests the velocity of adjustment of the Model. In this work, it is possible to reveal the speed with which real public expenditures of LRA correct any deviation from the projected long-term estimation.

From the study on Table A7, we can not reject the significance of the estimated first lagged coefficient of resulting residual series obtained from the cointegration regression. So, it can be interpreted that almost one third (-0,331) of any deviation from the long-term estimation, verified in a period, is annually corrected. The Durbin-Watson (DW) statistic and the Breusch-Godfrey (BG) test with two lags included allow us to reject the null hypothesis of serial correlation present in the model derived from (43). The White test also rejects the null of residual heterocedasticity. The ARCH (with two lags) and Jarque-Bera (JB) tests return values that certify the desired statistical properties of the estimation.

Section 6: Conclusion

This document reports a progressing work developed to test the distinction of regimes in the evolution of real public expenditures of local and regional administration (LRA) of Portugal, post World War II (1947-2002).

Its main contribution focuses on Portuguese public finances, specially, on the aggregate of decentralized expenditures devoted to local and regional structures. A second aim of this research was to find a long-term relation, according to various theories of the growth of public expenditures, among real public expenditures of LRA and a set of exogenous variables as real GNP, the Number of Public Administration Employees, the Number of Unemployed and the Public Revenues.

The strongest results confirm that real public expenditures of LRA can be characterized, between 1947 and 2002, by two states. The state associated to higher rates of annual growth of real public expenditures of LRA happened between 1973 and 1988. Since 1988, it is highly probable that the reality is characterized by the other state (low

rates of growth). After recognizing the homogeneity between the analyzed expenditures and the real output, the possibility of cointegration remains among the real public expenditures of LRA as a percentage of real GNP and the Number of Public Administration Employees, the Number of Unemployed and Public Revenues. Interestingly, there is a relation of substitutability between the observed ratio and the Number of Public Administration Employees (the estimated coefficient is $-0,678$). But the estimated coefficients for the Number of Employees ($0,228$) and for Public Revenues ($0,180$) indicate that, firstly, real public expenditures of LRA are used to attenuate the harmful of local and regional unemployment, and, secondly, that growing public revenues may increase the analyzed decentralized expenditures in Portugal.

References

- Afonso, A. (2000); *Fiscal Policy Sustainability: Some Unpleasant European Evidence*, Department of Economics, ISEG-UTL, Working Paper 12/2000/DE
- Alesina, A. and A. Drazen (1991); *Why are stabilizations delayed?*; American Economic Review; 81; 1170-1188
- Andrade, J. (2000); *Un essai d'application de la théorie quantitative de la monnaie à l'économie portugaise, 1854-1998*; in <http://www2.fe.uc.pt/~jasa/estudos/Tqm.PDF>
- André, C. and R. Delorme (1978); *Évolution de longue période des dépenses publiques en France: 1872-1971*; in Recktenwald, H. (ed.) (1978); *Tendances a long terme du secteur public*; Editions Cujas; Paris; 53-68
- Ang, A. and G. Bekaert (1998); *Regime switches in interest rates*; Research paper 1486; Stanford University
- Barbosa, A. (1997); *Economia Pública*; McGraw-Hill; Lisboa
- Baumol, W. (1967); *The Macroeconomics of Unbalanced Growth: The Anatomy of Urban Crisis*; The American Economic Review; 57; 3; 415-426
- Beck, M. (1981); *Government spending: trends and issues*; Greenwood Press; Westport
- Becker, G. (1983); *A Theory of Competition among Pressure Groups for Political Influence*; The Quarterly Journal of Economics; 98; 3; 371-400
- Brennan, G. and J. Buchanan (1977); *Towards a Tax Constitution for Leviathan*; Journal of Public Economics; 8; 255-274
- Bronchi, C. (2003); *The effectiveness of public expenditure in Portugal*; Economics Department Working Paper 349; OECD
- Buchanan, J. and G. Tullock (1962); *The Calculus of Consent*; University of Michigan Press; Michigan
- Buchanan, J. and R. Wagner (1977); *Democracy in deficit: the political legacy of Lord Keynes*; Academic Press, Inc.; New York
- Bush, W. and A. Denzau (1977); *The Voting Behavior of Bureaucrats and Public Sector Growth*; in T. Borcherding (ed.); *Budgets and Bureaucrats : The Sources of Government Growth*; Duke University Press; Durham; 90-99
- Cameron, D. (1978); *The Expansion of the Public Economy: A Comparative Analysis*; American Political Science Review; 72; 1243-1261
- Carreira, H. (1989); *Uma reforma fiscal falhada?*; Editorial Inquérito; Lisboa

- Castles, F., ed., (1982); *The impact of parties: politics and policies in democratic capitalist state*; Sage; Beverly Hills
- Cosslett, S. and L. Lee (1985); *Serial correlation in discrete variable models*; Journal of Econometrics; 27; 79-97
- Davidson, J., Hendry, E., Srba, D., and S. Yeo (1978); *Econometric Modelling of the Aggregate Time-Series Relationship between Consumers' Expenditure and Income in the United Kingdom*; The Economic Journal; 88; 661-692
- Demirbas, S. (1999); *Cointegration Analysis-Causality Testing and Wagner's Law: The Case of Turkey, 1950-1990*; Discussion Paper of Economic Series 99/3; Department of Economics University of Leicester
- Dickey, D. and S. [Pantula](#). (1987); *Determining the Order of Differencing in AR Processes*; Journal of Business and Economic Statistics; 5; 455-461
- Downs, A. (1957); *An Economic Theory of Democracy*; Harper and Row; New York
- Elliott, G., Rothenberg, T. e J. Stock (1996); *Efficient tests for an autoregressive unit root*; Econometrica; 64; 813-836
- Engle, R. and C. Granger (1987); *Co-integration and Error correction: representation, estimation and testing*; Econometrica; 35; 251-276
- Frey, B. and F. Schneider (1981); *A Politico-Economic Model of the U.K.: New Estimates and Predictions*; The Economic Journal; 91; 363; 737-740
- Frey, B. and W. Pommerehne (1984); *The Hidden Economy: State and Prospects for Measurement*; Review of Income and Wealth; 30; 1; 1-23
- Goldfeld, S. and R. Quandt (1972); *Nonlinear methods in econometrics*; North-Holland Publishing Co.; Amsterdam
- Granger, C. and P. Newbold (1974); *Spurious regressions in econometrics*; Journal of Econometrics; 2; 111-120
- Granger, C. and T. Lee (1989); *Investigation of Production, Sales and Inventory Relationships Using Multicointegration and Non-symmetric Error Correction Models*; Journal of Applied Econometrics; 4; 145-159
- Greene, W.(2003); *Econometric Analysis*; 3^a ed.; MacMillan; New York
- Gupta, S. (1967); *Public Expenditure and Economic Growth: A Time Series Analysis*; Public Finance; 22; 4; 423-66
- Haldrup, N. (1994a); *Semi-parametric tests for double unit roots*; Journal of Business and Economic Statistics; 12; 109-122

- Haldrup, N. (1994b); *The asymptotics of single-equation cointegration regressions with I(1) and I(2) variables*; Journal of Econometrics; 63; 153-181
- Haldrup, N. (1998); *An Econometric Analysis of I(2) Variables*; Journal of Economic Surveys; 12; 5; 595-650
- Hamilton, J. (1989); *A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle*; Econometrica; 57; 357-384
- Hamilton, J. (1990); *Analysis of time series subject to changes in regime*; Journal of Econometrics; 45; 39-70
- Hamilton, J.(1994); *Time Series Analysis*; Princeton University Press; Princeton
- Herber, B. (1971); *Modern Public Finance: the study of public sector economics*; Ed. Revista; Irwin; Homewood
- Jackson; P., Fethi, M. and S. Fethi (1999); *Cointegration, Causality and Wagner's Law: A test for Northern Cyprus, 1977-1996*; Discussion Paper in Public Sector Economic Series 99/2; Department of Economics University of Leicester
- King, M. (1980); *Robust tests for spherical symmetry and their application to least squares regression*; The Annals of Statistics; 8; 1265-1271
- Kirchgässner, G. and W. Pommerehne (1997); *Public Spending in federal states*; in Capros, P. and D. Meulders (ed.) (1997); *Budgetary Policy Modelling – Public Expenditures*; Routledge; London; 179-213
- Krolzig, H. (2001); *Markov-Switching procedures for dating the Euro-zone business cycle*; Vierteljahreshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung; 70 (3); 339-351
- Leybourne, S. and B. McCabe (1994); *A Simple Test for Cointegration*; Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics; 56; 1; 97-103
- MacKinnon, J.(1991); *Critical Values for Cointegration Tests*; in Engle, R. e C. Granger (1991); *Long-run Economic Relationships: Readings in Cointegration*; Oxford University Press; Oxford
- Maddala, G. and I. Kim (1998); *Unit roots, cointegration, and structural change*; Cambridge University Press; Cambridge
- Manasan, R. (1987); *An analysis of public sector expenditures*; Working Paper 1987-05; Phillipine Institute for Development Studies
- Meltzer, A. and S. Richard (1981); *A Rational Theory of the Size of Government*; Journal of Political Economy; 89;51; 914-927

- Musgrave, R. (1969); *Provision for Social Goods*; in Margolis, J. and H. Guitton, (eds.); *Public Economics*; London, McMillan; 124-144
- Musgrave, R and P. Musgrave (1980); *Public Finance in Theory and Practice*; McGraw-Hill; New York
- Neves, J. (1994); *The Portuguese Economy: a picture in figures*; Universidade Católica Editora; Lisboa
- Ng, S. and P. Perron, (1995); *Estimation and Inference in Nearly Unbalanced, Nearly Cointegrated Systems*; Cahiers de recherche 9534; Centre interuniversitaire de recherche en économie quantitative; CIREQ
- Niskanen, W. (1971); *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*; Aldine-Atherton; Chicago
- Oates, W. (1985); *Searching for Leviathan: An Empirical Study*; American Economic Review; 75; 748-757
- Peacock, A. and J. Wiseman (1961); *The growth in public expenditures in the United Kingdom*; Allen & Unwin; London
- Phillips, P. and M. Loretan (1991); *Estimating Long-run Economic Equilibria*; Review of Economic Studies; 58; 3; 407-436
- Phillips, P.(1987); *Time series regression with a unit root*; Econometrica; 55; 2; 277-301
- Pinheiro, M. (coord.) (1997); *Séries Longas para a Economia Portuguesa*; Vol. I; Séries Estatísticas do Banco de Portugal; Lisboa
- Pommerehne, W.and F. Schneider (1978); *Fiscal illusion, political institutions, and local public spending*; Kyklos; 31; 381-408
- Quandt, R. (1958); *The estimation of the parameters of a linear regression system obeying two separate regimes*; Journal of American Statistical Association; 53; 873-880
- Rogoff, K. (1985); *The optimal degree of commitment to an intermediate monetary target*; Quarterly Journal of Economics; 100; 1169-1189
- Romer, D. (1999); *Misconceptions and political outcomes*; unpublished paper; University of California; Berkeley
- Romer, T. and Rosenthal, H. (1978); *Political Resource Allocation, Controlled Agendas, and the Status Quo*; Public Choice; 33; 27-43
- Rosen, H. (1999); *Public Finance*; 5^a ed.; Irwin McGraw-Hill; New York
- Saikonen, P. (1991); *Asymptotically efficient estimation of cointegrating regressions*; Econometric Theory; 7; 1-21

Sargan, J. (1964); *Wages and prices in the U.K.: a study in econometric methodology*; in Hart, P. *et al.* (eds.); *Econometric Analysis for National Planning*; Butterworth; London; 25-59

Silva, A. and J. Neves (1992); *Finanças Públicas e Política Macroeconómica*; 2ª ed.; Universidade Nova de Lisboa; Lisboa

Stock, J. and M. Watson (1993); *A simple estimator of cointegrating vectors in higher order integrated systems*; *Econometrica*; 61; 4; 783-820

Tabellini, G. and A. Alesina (1990); *Voting on the budget deficit*; *American Economic Review*; 80; 37-49

Trotman-Dickenson, D. (1996); *Economics of the Public Sector*; Macmillan; London

Wagner, A. (1883); *Three Extracts on Public Finance*; in Musgrave, R. e A. Peacock (eds) (1958); *Classics in the Theory of Public Finance*; London; Macmillan

Wildavsky, A. (1964); *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*; Little, Brown and Company; Boston, Toronto

Annexes: Figures and Tables

Figure A1 – Nominal Public expenditures of LRA (logs), 1947-2002




Figure A2 – Real public expenditures of LRA (logs), 1947-2002




Figure A3 - % relation between nominal public expenditures of LRA and nominal GNP (logs), 1947-2002




Figure A4 - % relation between real public expenditures of LRA and real GNP (logs), 1947-2002




Figure A5 – Filtered, Smoothed and Predicted Probabilities of Regime 1 and 2 associated to the growth rates of real public expenditures of Portuguese LRA (series “DDTOTR”), 1948-2002





Figure A6 – Residual analysis

Table A1 – Selection of the number of lags (r) to be included in an Autorregression of the growth rates of real public expenditures of Portuguese LRA, 1948-2002

r	0	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	-2,185	-2,176	-2,118	-2,080	-2,021	-2,072
HQ	-2,080	-2,031	-1,947	-1,880	-1,826	-2,066
SC	-2,149	-2,102	-2,007	-1,930	-1,832	-1,843

Table A2 – Estimates for the parameters of a Markov-Switching Model of growth rates of real public expenditures of Portuguese LRA, 1948-2002

	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value
Constant			
State 1 (slow growth)	0,045818	0,010024	4,5710
State 2 (high growth)	0,074616	0,029201	2,5552

Table A3 – Statistical values obtained from ADF, DF-GLS and Leybourne and McCabe (1994) Tests

Series (y_t)	$\Delta^d y_t$	ADF		DF-GLS	Leybourne and McCabe (1994)	
		<i>Interception</i>	<i>Interception and Trend</i>		<i>Interception</i>	<i>Interception and Trend</i>
LPIB	d=0	-1.783(3)	-2.284(3)	-1.688(1)	4.107(1)***	0.411(1)***
	d=1	-1.732(1)	-1.550(1)	-1.142(2)	2.090(2)***	0.719(2)***
	d=2	-7.620(1)***	-9.358(1)***	-6.688(2)***	0.090(2)*	0.089(2)*
LDTOT	d=0	0.24(1)	0.237(1)	-0.593(1)	3.835(1)***	0.717(1)***
	d=1	-2.481(1)	-2.677(1)	-2.482(1)	2.606(1)***	0.513(1)***
	d=2	-7.175(1)***	-7.704(1)***	-5.739(1)***	0.348(1)**	0.116(1)*
LDDESP	d=0	-0.678(1)	-1.818(1)	-2.073(2)	5.268(2)***	0.638(2)***
	d=1	-1.359(1)	-1.039(1)	-1.073(4)	1.971(4)***	0.883(4)***
	d=2	-4.489(2)***	-4.569(2)***	-3.822(2)***	0.481(2)**	0.203(2)**
LDPIB	d=0	-1.040(2)	-2.559(2)	-1.546(3)	4.959(3)***	0.587(3)***
	d=1	-1.304(1)	-1.542(1)	-1.222(1)	2.035(1)***	0.873(1)***
	d=2	-11.318(1)***	-11.360(1)***	-4.514(2)***	0.435(2)**	0.187(2)**
LREC	d=0	0.063(3)	0.729(3)	-0.054(3)	4.196(3)***	0.740(3)***
	d=1	-1.872(2)	-1.548(2)	-1.956(2)	3.157(2)***	0.572(2)***
	d=2	-9.478(2)***	-10.463(2)***	-9.404(2)***	0.090(2)*	0.089(2)*
LDESEMP	d=0	-1.589(2)	-1.209(2)	-1.673(2)	3.312(2)***	0.597(2)***
	d=1	-5.197(1)***	-5.441(1)***	-5.209(1)***	0.138(1)*	0.128(1)**
	d=2	-7.473(3)	-8.111(3)***	-7.440(3)***	0.016(3)*	0.085(3)*
LFUN	d=0	-0.637(3)	-0.092(3)	-0.740(3)	3.821(3)***	0.680(3)***
	d=1	-4.433(3)***	-4.545(3)***	-4.460(3)	0.079*(3)	0.003(3)*
	d=2	-6.221(1)***	-6.642(1)***	-6.213(1)***	0.008(1)*	0.002(1)*
LPIBR=LPIB-LDPIB	d=0	-1.534(2)	-1.663(2)	-1.825(2)	3.034(2)***	0.584(2)***
	d=1	-4.333(1)***	-4.661(1)***	-3.767(3)***	0.668(3)**	0.137(3)**
	d=2	-8.863(3)***	-9.512(3)***	-6.911(3)***	0.030(3)*	0.034(3)*
LDTOTR=LDTOT-LDDESP	d=0	-0.358(3)	-0.403(3)	-1.008(2)	3.565(2)***	0.672(2)***
	d=1	-4.534(2)***	-4.876(2)***	-3.907(1)***	0.678(1)**	0.135(1)**
	d=2	-7.841(2)***	-8.418(2)***	-6.202(1)***	0.183(1)*	0.111(1)*
LDTOTR-LPIBR	d=0	-0.529(3)	-0.587(3)	-1.127(2)	3.488(2)***	0.659(2)***
	d=1	-5.055(2)***	-5.434(2)***	-4.268(1)***	0.442(1)**	0.132(1)**
	d=2	-8.826(1)***	-9.473(1)***	-6.885(1)***	0.026(1)*	0.037(1)*

Note: *, **, *** identify the significance level when the null is rejected by, respectively, a level of 10%, 5% and 1%.

The column of $\Delta^d y_t$ identifies the order of differencing in each series (y_t) from 0 (levels of the series) to 2 (second-differences of y_t).

Between parentheses (“...”) the number of preferred lags appears according to the Bayesian Schwarz Criteria, in the columns associated to the ADF test. The preferred lag length, in DF-GLS and Leybourne and McCabe (1994) tests, was chosen respecting the MAIC as stated by Ng and Perron (1995).

TABLE A4 – Statistic values obtained from Dickey-Pantula (1987) test

Series (y_t)	$\hat{q}_1 / \hat{s}_{q_1}$	$\hat{q}_2 / \hat{s}_{q_2}$
LPIB	...	-0.643
LDTOT	...	-1.456
LDDESP	...	-0.886
LDPIB	...	-0.841
LREC	...	-0.998
LDESEMP	0.574	-5.175***
LFUN	-2.459*	-3.498***
LPIBR	-1.878*	-3.358***
LDTOTR	-2.573*	-3.228***
LDTOTR-LPIBR	-1.133	-4.929***

Note: *,**,*** identify the significance level when the null is rejected by, respectively, a level of 10%, 5% and 1%.

TABLE A5 – SOLS Estimation of the cointegration regression (25) (significance levels- 10%: *, 5%: **, 1%: ***)

	LDTOTR
C	-4.018* (2.269)
LPIBR	0.626*** (0.116)
LREC	0.199*** (0.024)
LDESEMP	0.121** (0.053)
LFUN	-0.008 (0.263)
ADF	-3.924

Note: Below the estimated coefficients, between parentheses, the respective standard errors are evidenced.

TABLE A6 – SOLS, DOLS and NLS Estimations of the cointegration regression (26)
(significance levels- 10%: *, 5%: **, 1%: ***)

Estimation Method	SOLS	DOLS	NLS
Dependent Variable	LDTOTR-LPIBR	LDTOTR-LPIBR	LDTOTR-LPIBR
C	1.048 (1.773)	0.370 (5.934)	0.889 (2.580)
LREC	0.180*** (0.025)	0.156* (0.083)	0.176*** (0.037)
LDESEMP	0.228*** (0.045)	0.261** (0.101)	0.246*** (0.059)
LFUN	-0.678*** (0.174)	-0.609 (0.594)	-0.668*** (0.254)
ADF	-4.063*

Note: Below the estimated coefficients, between parentheses, the respective standard errors are evidenced

TABLE A7 – Estimation of the Error Correction Model derived from (43)

	$\hat{\epsilon}_{t-1}$	R ²	SER	DW	JB	BG	ARCH	White
$\Delta(LDTOTR - LPIBR)$	-0.331*** (0.103)	0.179	0.078	1.661	2.843	3.543	6.807	11.906

Note: Below the estimated coefficient, between parentheses, the respective standard error is evidenced