

Budgetary Politics and Veto Players

Thomas KÖNIG, *German University of Administrative Sciences, Speyer*
Vera E. TROEGER, *University of Exeter*

Abstract

In this article we examine whether and how the policy-oriented coalition building and the gridlock model of legislative choice explain changes in the allocation of German budgetary items between 1961 and 1994. The policy-oriented coalition-building approach suggests that only policy-connected budgetary actors can make changes in the budgetary composition, while the location of the status quo is essential for budgetary modifications according to the veto players model. We also draw the attention to the identification of the set of relevant budgetary veto players and their preferences by distinguishing between models of the government, the political parties of the Bundestag, and the two of them. We test the predictive power of these approaches and conceptions in a competitive manner and control for macroeconomic and other political factors that might influence changes in the budgetary allocation. Our findings show that the veto players model better explains budgetary changes, and that the government is responsible for decreasing, but the political parties of the Bundestag majority are decisive for increasing the size of budgetary items. We conclude that identifying the relevant veto players and using these more sophisticated approaches on budgetary decision making provide significant insights into the political reasons for changing the allocation of the German budget.

Keywords: Veto Players, Budgetary Politics, Germany

Explaining budgetary spending

Research on fiscal spending and budgetary processes can roughly be divided into two parts. One part focuses on the size of the budget and explains the increasing size with respect to Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Some earlier studies assume governments to always increase budgetary spending (Wagner's Law 1883, 1890) - that is they explain government expenditure as a percentage of GDP. Another strand of the literature deals with the debt-financed spending. These studies

primarily analyse the reasons that lead to budget deficits or rather (increased) public debt (Hallerberg et al. 2001). According to Hibbs (1992), the political orientation of political parties explains the variation in policy-outcomes among Western democracies. The majority of empirical work compares budgetary politics and expenditure in Western democracies and attributes variations in the level of expenditure and the ratio of government spending to institutional factors, such as the electoral system, the type of government or the relative power of the finance minister (Persson and Tabellini 2003).

In political science a central question is whether economic or political factors explain political decision making. One field of application are budgetary politics or fiscal outcomes, and many fiscal studies have examined the factors explaining budgetary size and deficit (Hibbs 1977; Cusack 1997). The classical literature portrays the finance minister as the guardian of the treasury who keeps the spending ministers in check (Wildavsky 1975). This suggests that the power of the finance minister in the budgetary decision-making process determines fiscal discipline (von Hagen and Harden 1994; Hahm et al. 1996). Others emphasize that negotiating clear spending targets at the beginning can yield similar fiscal discipline (Hallerberg et al. 2001). Another argument contends that coalition governments are poor managers and a war of attrition develops during economic downturns in which coalition partners increase deficits and overall debt (Alesina and Drazen 1991), in particular in countries with proportional representation systems (Persson and Tabellini 2003). The early veto players theory argues that increasing the number of veto players increases the size of budget deficits (Tsebelis 1995), while more recent applications point to the lock-in-effect, according to which countries with more veto players have consistently low, or, consistently high deficits (Tsebelis 2002; Franzese 2002). Schmidt (1996: 160f.) emphasizes the relative positions of Western governments on a left-right scale, and in a recent quantitative study, Tsebelis and Chang (2001) confirm this claim: The results of their study on budgetary politics in 19 OECD countries between 1973-1990 provides evidence that the most significant changes in national budgets occur after a significant change in government (from left to right or vice versa).

Compared to the focus on budgetary size and deficit, a few recent studies draw the attention to the budgetary allocation and the changes across budgetary items, raising the question whether macroeconomic factors or political parties determine the composition of the budget (Bawn 1999; Bräuninger 2004)? This study also concentrates on budgetary allocation and attempts to identify the decisive influence of specific actors in budgetary decision making - is it the government or the partisan majority of the Parliament who exert greater influence on the composition of the budget, and do these actors form connected coalitions or do they consider the location of the status quo? Compared to previous studies,

the following analysis provides innovation in three important ways. While research on budgetary allocation focuses on the impact of political parties, we examine whether the finance minister can also have veto power on budgetary amendments of the parliamentary majority – a fact that is known from the classical literature on budgetary spending. To clarify the impact of actors' preferences, we distinguish between item-specific partisan and governmental preferences for budgetary spending. Finally, we evaluate two competing theoretical views on budgetary decision making and ask whether budgetary actors form policy-connected winning coalitions or whether they take into account the location of the status quo when making changes in the budgetary composition?

In the following, we present a longitudinal analysis of German budgetary politics and attempt to identify the factors determining federal budget allocations. For Germany, Schmidt (1996: 170) identifies a form of “politics of the middle way” which precludes any drastic political and therefore significant budgetary change. Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990: 295) show a high correlation between federal spending and governmental positions found in government declarations between 1949 and 1987, which in turn were very similar to those expressed in party manifestos. Particularly the FDP was shown to have influenced federal spending considerably. Bawn (1999) comes to similar conclusions in her study on German federal spending between 1961 and 1989. She finds that first, from 1969 to the beginning of the 1980s, a SPD/FDP majority cut spending on “right-wing” items and, from 1982 until German unification in 1990, a CDU/FDP majority on “left-wing” items; second, within these majority coalitions, the FDP has been a veto player curbing budgetary spending. Unlike Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990) however, she finds no correlation between spending allocations and the political preferences of SPD and CDU (Bawn 1999: 728).

Our study builds on this previous work on German federal spending and complements it in three ways.¹ Compared to previous studies that focused on levels of partisan spending in terms of (majority-) party preferences we regard the government as an independent actor in budgetary politics. We motivate our conception with respect to the procedural rules of the budgetary decision-making process which explicitly prescribe the co-operation of government and Bundestag. Our design enables us to examine whether the government, which has agenda-setting- and veto-powers, controls federal spending, or whether

¹ Theoretically, our study builds on Bawn's (1999) work as we also estimate the relative importance of political parties and macroeconomic factors by testing the predictive power of rational choice approaches. There are empirical parallels to the work of Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990) in the measurement as we use the government and party positions resulting from their document analyses.

a partisan majority in the Bundestag can dominate budgetary politics? Using budget-specific preference measures for the actors from government declarations and party manifestos, we also address the question of relevant veto players from the perspective of a policy-oriented coalition-building approach (de Swaan 1973; van Deemen 1991) and from a veto players model approach (Krehbiel 1996; König and Bräuniger 1997; Tsebelis 2002). Does the policy-connectedness of budgetary actors or the location of the status quo explain budgetary outcomes? We finally abstain from studying budgetary spending in absolute terms and propose to examine the changes in budgetary allocation. This focus on the change in budget allocations also refers to Kahneman and Tversky (1979: 277) according to whom “our perceptual apparatus is attuned to the evaluation of changes or differences rather than to the evaluation of absolute magnitudes”.²

The article is structured into four parts: The first part presents the procedural rules of German budgetary decision making and identifies the relevant political actors that might have an impact on the composition of the German federal budget. We introduce a total of six different explanations for changes in budgetary allocation, three of which differ in the set of veto players: the government, the political parties of the Bundestag majority, and the two of them. It is for these three conceptions of veto players that the predictive power of the two theoretical foundations will be tested. Subsequently, we present our measures for actors’ positions on the budgetary items. We discuss several instruments for measuring actors’ positions, and after considering the pros and cons of each instrument, we motivate our choice for using the method of content analysis. We will then present the approaches used for predicting changes in the federal budgetary allocations. Before presenting our econometric findings, we illustrate the differences of our six explanations using an example from the labour market item. We finally explain our estimation procedure, the operationalisation of the dependent and independent variables and justify our control variables.

The Budgetary Actors: Government, Bundestag and Bundesrat

Each year, the federal budget determines the level of federal revenue and sets the level of expenditure for particular purposes. The budget, also called the “government programme in numbers”, is laid down in the Budget Act. Article 114 of the Basic Law states that the Minister of Finance, on behalf of the government, has to annually submit an account to the Bundestag and Bundesrat for their

² Numerous experiments and empirical observations on fiscal politics use this approach (i.e. Alt, Lassen and Skilling 2002; Hansen 1998).

approval. Following Article 78 “[a] bill adopted by the Bundestag becomes a statute where the Bundesrat consents to it, or fails to make a demand pursuant to Article 77 II, or fails to enter an objection within the period stipulated in Article 77 III, or withdraws such objection, or where the objection is overridden by the Bundestag” (Tschetschner 2002). For those parts of the budget that deal with the federal revenue and expenditure, the Bundesrat has only the right to file an objection that can be overruled by a majority in the Bundestag. Scholars estimate that 90-95 % of budgetary spending is determined by regular activities and legislation (Korff 1975: 52; Moeser 1978: 125; Rose and Faltauser 1990: 9). These activities primarily result from obligations towards third parties that the legislator has to fulfil. For example, a large part of social legislation falls into this category and, as a result, can hardly be changed in the budget process. Only a few budget items have no other legal basis though. These are predominantly in the area of the politically contested subsidies, and they only form a very small part of the whole budget (Horst 1995: 293). Following these scholars the question is, to what extent influence on the budgetary composition can be asserted at all?

The Budget Act provides for interaction between the government and a majority in the Bundestag, while the Bundesrat can only informally influence the outcome.³ In most cases, the Bundesrat does not even file an objection against the budgetary composition. Only in 1963, the Bundesrat called for a mediation committee in the second reading but it has never blocked a budget yet (Sturm 1988: 267). Consequently, we do not consider the Bundesrat as a relevant actor in German budgetary decision making. A similar argument could be made on the basis of the close relationship between the government and the Bundestag majority. Such a perspective suggests that the finance minister’s draft already includes the views of the Bundestag majority. However, the explicit reference to the finance minister’s power to veto parliamentary amendments indicates possible governmental tensions vis-à-vis the Bundestag majority. Such tensions are also manifested in the parliamentary rules for the budget committee’s duty to report (§ 96 GOBT), according to which all financial proposals are not only checked by the relevant specialist committee but also by the budget committee for compatibility with the budget. Compared to the provisions for regular legislation, Paragraph I and II of Article 113 of the Basic Law state that “(I) Statutes increasing the budget expenditures proposed by the Government or involving or likely in future to cause new expenditures requires the consent of the Government. This also applies to statutes involving or likely in future to cause decreases in revenue. The Government may demand that the Bundestag

³ As the Bundesrat does not have a formal veto position, it could signal that it wants to extend the procedure or make amendments via a mediation committee.

postpones its vote on such bills. In this case the Government states its position to the Bundestag within six weeks. (II) Within four weeks after the Bundestag has adopted such a bill, the Government may demand that it votes on that bill again." These provisions obviously limit the amendment rights of a Bundestag majority over the veto position of the government in budgetary decisions. Only under the assumption of identical preferences of government and Bundestag majority, we can either implicitly (Schmidt 1996; Tsebelis and Chang 2001) or explicitly (Bawn 1999) disregard this provision of governmental veto power in the budgetary decision-making process. Instead of using this strong assumption, we propose to consider the government as an independent actor and veto player in its own right, whose agenda-setting powers are limited by the right of amendment of the Bundestag. Likewise, the Bundestag cannot change budget items without governmental consent, but has to approve of the draft budget. Such inter-institutional stipulations raise the question of which veto player is actually responsible for the composition of the budget. In order to answer this question, we have to distinguish between the budgetary preferences of the government, of the majority parties, as well as those evolving through the interplay of government and majority parties.

Theoretical Concepts: Coalition and Veto Players Theory

Along with identifying the key actors in German budgetary politics, we attempt to provide a better understanding of budgetary decision making by examining alternative explanations of budgetary policy making. For this purpose, we distinguish two approaches which focus on the interaction between institutions and actor positions (Romer and Rosenthal 1978; Shepsle and Weingast 1981; Tsebelis 1995, 1999). By actor position we mean an ideal point that an actor prefers over all other policy choices on a specific policy dimension (Hotelling 1929; Downs 1957; Black 1958).⁴ For an actor, any deviation from his ideal position means a loss in utility (Hinich and Munger 1994).⁵ Such positions can be located on a more general dimension like an economic- or societal dimension or a more specific issue provided by the social security- or immigration policy item (König and Pöter 2001). Locating these points allows us to operationalize the connectedness assumption of the coalition model. For the veto players approach we must also include the spatial position of the status quo in the preference function of the actors as a point of reference, which is also located in that particular dimension. Here, an actor's utility is defined by his relative distance to the draft and the status quo (König and Bräuninger 1997, 2000).

⁴ Veto players theory uses spatial models which represent policy alternatives as spatial positions in a one- or multi-dimensional policy space.

⁵ Actor's preferences are represented as spatial utility functions, which comprise an ideal point and any spatial distance from this ideal point is interpreted as a loss in utility.

According to the policy-oriented coalition theory, actors are only able to form winning coalitions when their positions are connected. Otherwise, their policies would also benefit the opposition (de Swaan 1973; van Deemen 1991). In the following, we consider a coalition of only able to change budget items if the actors are located at adjacent positions in one budgetary dimension. Imagine a budgetary item with a position to increase the budgetary size on the left side and decrease it on the right side, where actors A, B and C take up positions in that order, and the left-wing party A forms a government coalition with C of the right side. Following this approach, no change of the budgetary item is to be expected because A and C are not connected. A necessary condition for budgetary change would be the configuration A-C-B or C-A-B for an increase and B-A-C or B-C-A for an decrease of the size of the budgetary item.

From the veto players model we infer that the size of the budgetary item can only be modified once veto players can change the status quo. Thus, excluded are changes in the Pareto-set where the status quo is located between the positions of the veto players. To identify the status quo we propose that a budgetary change can only take place if there is no overlap of the present with the previous Pareto-set of a particular budgetary item (König and Bräuninger 2000). Take actors A, B and C, again in this order, and with the government coalition A and B at a point in time t_0 , then the size of this item would be decreased in the following budgetary period if either the order of their preferences changes to C,B and A, or, C,A and B, or, if there is a new coalition with B and C with the same preference order of the actors in time t_1 . Consequently, the Pareto-set A,B which was previously situated to the left, expenditure-increasing side would shift towards the right in t_1 , and we would expect that with the necessary majority the status quo between A and B would move in the direction of a budget decrease (Bawn 1999: 710). A status-quo change can therefore take place either with a change in government or a change of the actors' budgetary positions over time.

In conclusion, we distinguish between three concepts of relevant actors and two alternative approaches for explaining budgetary decision making. With respect to the concept of the actors we test whether the government, the majority parties or perhaps an interaction of the two have the greatest influence on budget outcomes. For the evaluation of the two approaches we distinguish between the policy-connected coalition model and the temporal perspective of the status quo position provided by the veto players model. Regarding the policy-oriented coalition theory, coalitions are only successful if positions are connected - positioned adjacently in a spatial model - on a particular political dimension. Alternatively, the veto players model underlines the temporal aspect of the budgetary process with the restriction of a status quo change. In order to test these models, the measurement of actors' budgetary positions is of great importance and the methods to measure them will be the topic of the next section.

Actor Positions in Budgetary Politics

Veto player theory is based on two elements, namely the positions of actors and the rules of their interaction. The theory offers a very general analytical tool that can be applied to most areas of political life. Without being restricted by the degree of formalisation of the interaction-rules and regardless of the type of actors involved, veto player theory draws the attention to policy change that affects government and regime stability as well as the independence of the bureaucracy and judiciary (Tsebelis 1995, 1999, 2002). Focussing on policy change, veto player theory restricts the view to policies, on the other hand it is open to a variety of areas of application and ways of operationalization. Important for operationalization are the specification of the rules and the measurement of the actors' positions that have to be carried out before studying policy change. Concerning the specification of the rules we already referred to the Budget Act, which prescribes an interaction of the government and a majority in the Bundestag. Therefore, we still have to resolve the issue of measuring the actors' positions.

Basically three ways of measuring budgetary actors' positions prevail in the political science literature. First, they can be determined exogenously. Bawn (1999), for example, assumes in her study of the German federal budget process between 1962 and 1989 that the FDP will act fiscally more conservative in all budget categories than its coalition partners CDU or SPD. From the six theoretically possible configurations for budgetary politics resulting from the permutation of the three actors', FDP, SPD and CDU, she excludes four on the grounds of postulating a liberal FDP programme on the one hand, and the CDU and SPD's claim to be a people's party on the other hand. As a result, only two configurations remain in which either the SPD or the CDU are in favor of increasing the budget. For example, the CDU is supposed to demand a budget increase in defence, research and infrastructure, while the SPD wants to increase expenditure for education, employment and the environment (Bawn 1999: 718). While Bawn motivates these assumptions on behalf of Kirchheimer's (1966) "catch-all-party"-thesis, another interpretation is that the preferences of catch-all-parties will collapse. Another way of measuring actors' positions are expert judgements, which usually involve positioning political parties on a left-right scale. Following Schmidt (1996: 157), who provides an overview on the subject, this method is frequently chosen in cross-country comparative studies. Tsebelis and Chang (2001), for example, base their budgetary study of 19 countries on an experts' survey by Castles and Mair (1984) - who asked 115 political scientist about their opinions on the party system in Western Europe and the USA and one by Laver and Hunt (1992) that asked for an estimation regarding an "increase of

service as opposed to tax cuts". These estimates are sometimes weighted by the parliamentary seats that a party won in a particular legislature (Cusack 1995).

We believe that three problems are related to the experts' judgement approach: i) it is assumed that "left" parties have an incentive to increase spending in all categories while "right" parties are fiscally conservative; ii) although the expert surveys yield different results in terms of party positions on the left-right scale, it is still claimed that any variation is due to the relative number of seats rather than a shift in policy; iii) a more general problem is that budgetary outcomes cannot be separated from the experts' judgements. The third instrument has been developed by the Manifesto Research Group (MRG), and Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990) applied it to German budgetary politics. The MRG has developed a coding scheme that serves to categorize the content of political manifestos and government declarations (Volkens 1998). In a second step statements in favor and against can be added up. A disadvantage of this approach is that programmatic statements may be used which have an (election-) strategic background. Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990: 286) emphasize, however, that manifestos are normally voted on at party congresses and serve more the strengthening of party discipline rather than the mobilisation of the electorate. A further disadvantage for our study may be the use of the same categories over time which could lead to an underestimation of the importance of a relative change in the meaning of budget items.

In our opinion determining positions exogenously is particularly problematic for tracing the differences between actors and the changes over time. Experts' surveys also tend to provide a stable picture of party systems, have a survey background more rooted in social policy research and lastly can hardly convey a multidimensional picture of (budgetary-) politics (Mair 1990). A deficit for our application is that data are restricted to illustrating party positions and data on governments do not exist, which in our analysis are considered as independent actors. We thus believe that measuring preferences based on content analysis has still an advantage over all other approaches, since policy positions can be identified across time, space, policy areas and parties. Experts can't be questioned repeatedly on detailed budget items. Moreover, expert surveys and interviews (Castles and Mair 1984; Laver and Hunt 1992) supply second hand information which is most likely biased by the personal views and interpretations of the interviewees (Budge et al. 2000). Such distortions rise fundamental questions of reversed causality as policy positions of actors are to be evaluated before the actual election, but to the result of which they eventually contribute (Laver and Garry 2000). (Ex-post-) Expert surveys violate this rule. Thus, when comparing the pros and cons of the three approaches, we decided to apply actor positions gained by content analysis. In comparison, with the document analysis of Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990) we find a reliable record of party- and

government positions, which can also vary across actors and time. The MRG uses government declarations in order to evaluate the position of the government and party manifestos for party positions. We would like to point out, however, that our analysis of budgetary change is not ideally supported by the MRG coding scheme. MRG positions only correspond on selected items with those of the annual budget, since they have been evaluated with a relatively unspecific categorization scheme not geared towards budgetary questions. Even so, this method still promises to deal with variance across parties and time which is a fundamental aspect of this analysis.

Table 1: Coding of actors' positions to individual budget items

<i>Budget items (financial reports)</i>	<i>Coding Scheme (Volkens 1998)</i>	<i>Highest spending preference</i>	<i>In % of Budget</i>
01 Political leadership and bureaucracy	302 Centralisation (positive) 301 Decentralisation(positive)	CDU	2,4
02 External Affairs	101 Foreign Special Relationships (positive) 102 Foreign Special Relationships (negative), 107 Internationalism (positive) 109 Internationalism (negative), 108 European Union (positive) 110 European Union (negative)	FDP	3,3
03 Defence	104 Military (positive) 105 Military (negative)	CDU	18,8
10 Education, Science and Research, Cultural Affairs	506 Education Expansion 507 Education Limitation	FDP	5,5
22 Social Security (incl. Unemployment Benefit)	504 Welfare State Expansion 505 Welfare State Limitation	SPD	17,2
23 Family- Social- Youth Welfare	503 Social Justice (positive)	SPD	8,0
25 Labour Market	405 Corporatism (positive), 409 Keynesian Demand Management (positive), 701 Labour Groups (positive) 702 Labour Groups (negative)	SPD	2,4
27 Capital Formation	402 Incentives (positive), 401 Free Enterprise (positive)	FDP	1,1
30 Health and Sports	501 Environmental Protection (positive), 502 Culture (positive)	FDP	0,8
52 Improvement of Agricultural Structure	703 Agriculture	SPD	0,3
53 Measures for Stabilisation of Income	412 Controlled Economy (positive)	FDP	0,3
69 Regional Subsidies	406 Protectionism (positive) 407 Protectionism (negative), 301 Decentralisation (positive) 302 Centralisation (positive)	Ambiguous	0,2
70 Transport and Communication Technologies	411 Technology and Infrastructure	FDP	5,4
80 Business, General- and Capital Assets, Special Assets	413 Nationalisation (positive) 403 Market Regulation (positive)	Ambiguous	5,7
90 General Finance	414 Economic Orthodoxy (positive)	FDP	18,0
		Total:	89,4

Table 1 shows our coding of the actors' positions for the individual budget items derived from the coding scheme presented. The first column shows the budget items documented in the financial reports - they are displayed at different levels. The second column depicts the categories of the coding scheme based on content analysis. We can only apply the general, and sometimes a more specific, but never a very specific classification of budget items. The terms used by the MRG-coding scheme only give a superficial impression of the method, that is explained in more detail in Volkens (1998).

As can be seen from the last column, these coding categories cover many budget items in the financial reports and approximately 80% of budget expenditure. In order to establish a rank order of actors' positions we consider the "negative" expenditure reducing statements allocated to an actor by the content analysis as well as the "positive" expenditure increasing ones. We then calculate from these positive and negative statements an ordinal position for each actor on a specific budget item. The third column in table 1 contains the party that, in the respective budget period, most clearly advocated an increase for the particular budget item. Obviously all parties CDU, SPD and FDP had very heterogeneous preferences for the different items and consequently exhibited greater variation than had been assumed on the strength of experts' judgements or the exogenous determination of the policy positions. On the basis of these ideal points we now determine the influence of the different actors and the predictive power of the two described rational choice approaches.

Policy Connectedness or Location of the Status Quo

A number of important events fall into the period from 1961 to 1994, in particular the changes in government in 1966, 1969 and 1982 and German re-unification in 1990. In addition governments and parties have issued declarations and manifestos in these overall twelve periods of investigation that could lead to a changed order of actors' budgetary positions. Before entering into the econometric analysis, we will consider the mentioned events and illustrate our approach with simplest example, namely the policy oriented prediction for government. We will continue with the policy-oriented majority-party-prediction and finally with a prediction for the interaction between government and majority parties. Subsequently we illustrate our approach with the three options to test the veto players approach. Afterwards we evaluate our hypotheses empirically and discuss the statistical results.

Figure 1: Coalition Model for Budgetary Spending in Labor Politics

<i>Year/Coalition</i>	<i>Spending Profile</i>	<i>Prediction</i>		
1961 CDU/FDP		Re	Pa	Re+Pa
1965 CDU/FDP		0	-	-
1966 CDU/SPD		0	+	+
1969 SPD/FDP		+	0	0
·	·	·	·	·
·	·	·	·	·
·	·	·	·	·
·	·	·	·	·
1987 CDU/FDP		0	-	-
1990 CDU/FDP		-	0	0
1994 CDU/FDP		-	-	-

Legend: Re = Only Government; Pa = Parties in Bundestag; Re+Pa = Government and Parties in Bundestag; + = Increase of Spendings; - = Decrease of Spending; 0 = No Change.

Figure 1 illustrates the policy-oriented prediction for governmental spending in the field of “labour market policies”. The government (Re) followed in the starting year of our analysis, 1961, an expenditure reducing policy together with the CDU. We underline the government to flag it as an instrumental actor. With this simple option we assume that there can only be a change in this budget item if the government has an extreme position on labour market policies, i.e. that it is positioned to the left or the right of all other actors. From this assumption we derive that in 1965 and 1966 the government did not increase spending in

the labour market, but that in 1969 (until 1976) it did. We predict a decrease in the labour market item of the budget for 1983, 1990, and 1994, where the government (together with the CDU) favored an extreme expenditure reducing position. The second prediction column of Figure 1 illustrates our approach for the majority party prediction (Pa). Here, we expect an increase or decrease of labour policy expenditures respectively if the two majority party actors are connected, which means spatially adjacent to each other on a left/right scale, as well as occupying an extreme position. This option, which most closely reflects previous approaches on budgetary politics, excludes the government from the analysis. In comparison to the government option, with the majority party concept we predict a reduction of expenditure in the labour market policy item for 1965, 1976, 1982, 1983, 1987 and 1994 and an increase in 1980 only. In the third prediction column of Figure 1, we merge both options and claim that changes in expenditure of the labour market item can only take place if both government and majority parties (Re&Pa) are connected and occupy an extreme position. For 1965, 1982, 1983, 1987 and 1990 we would accordingly expect a cut- and for 1966 and 1980 an increase of the budget item. These examples illustrate that there is great variation between the different approaches for identifying the relevant actors. In our example, the predictions for the government, majority party- and combined options are only accurate in two out of eleven cases. Only the party- and combined option came out with better results, although here too, there are different predictions for expenditure reducing- as well as increasing effects.

The veto players model, as has been mentioned above, also relates to the location of the status quo which in turn is determined by the budget allocation of the preceding period. This conception introduces an additional time constraint for policy change. In contrast to the policy-oriented coalition-building approach, neither closeness nor occupying an extreme position are relevant here, but the change in positions compared to the previous period. For the simple government option (Re) we then expect an increase/decrease of the budget item if the government position moves towards the left or right. In this instance, the Pareto-set corresponds to the ideal position in the preceding period, or rather the model of an ideal majority system.

Figure 2: Gridlock Model for Spendings in Labor Politics

Year/Coalition	Spending Profile	Prediction		
1961 CDU/FDP		Re	Pa	Re+Pa
1965 CDU/FDP		+	0	0
1966 CDU/SPD		0	+	+
1969 SPD/FDP		+	0	0
·	·	·	·	·
·	·	·	·	·
·	·	·	·	·
1987 CDU/FDP		+	0	0
1990 CDU/FDP		-	0	0
1994 CDU/FDP		0	0/-	0

Legend: Re = Only Government; Pa = Parties in Bundestag; Re+Pa = Government and Parties in Bundestag; + = Increase of Spendings; - = Decrease of Spending; 0 = No Change.

This concept predicts (Figure 2) an increase in spending for labour market policy in 1965, 1969 and 1987 and a reduction for 1980, 1982 and 1990. The second prediction in column of Figure 2 illustrates our approach when applying the veto players model to the majority party option (Pa). In contrast to the government approach (Re) it is not only the change in the current labour market budget item that is relevant but also an overlap with the former position of the Pareto-set. In our example, the Pareto-set is determined by the position of the CDU/FDP-coalition in 1961. The position does not change despite a change in position of the two coalition partners. It is only with the Grand Coalition of CDU/SPD

that this Pareto-set moves towards an increase from 1966 onwards. With the change of government in 1969, only its area is changed so that we would not expect a change in the size of the budgetary item. Only a moving of the SPD should lead to a cut in the labour market expenditures, while the changes of SPD and FDP in 1980 leave us to expect an increase again. Following the change of government in 1982 there should be a decrease again whereas for the next periods we expect no additional changes. Finally, the third column of Figure 2 displays our predictions for the interaction of government and majority parties following the veto players model (Re&Pa). Here, the Pareto-set is determined by the greatest distance between the partisan actors plus government. A change in budgetary items only occurs if first, the Pareto-set of the preceding period does not overlap with the current one and second, the Government is in favour of an increase/decrease. In contrast to the party option our example does not result in a change in the prediction of budget items. Overall, the predictions of the individual options rarely correspond though.⁶

The predictive power of the divers approaches has to be rated particularly highly if a sophisticated null model yields worse results. The simplest null model would, for example, explain budgetary politics without actors' positions. A more sophisticated null model that includes actors' positions could be formulated in reference to research on partisan politics that dominated the field of budgetary politics in the 1980's (Castles 1982; Hibbs 1987; Schmidt 1982). While we are interested in examining the changes of budget items over time, the alternative party approach simply tries to evaluate the influence of parties on the budget. It would therefore be necessary to test the extent to which parties are successful in achieving their budgetary goals. We will include this party model in our empirical analyses as a sophisticated null model.

Budgetary Politics from 1961-1994

We derive our dependent variable from the financial reports, which are only sufficiently detailed for our purposes since 1961. For the construction of the dependent variable - the change in expenditure of individual budget items (DlnRSP) - we follow the current state of research (Bawn 1999: 723). We will only consider the rate of change of spending and not the absolute level, as this varies only marginally due to the mentioned legislative constraints of the budget. In contrast, preferences in terms of expenditure should become visible in the first differences

⁶ A correlation analysis reveals a high correlation of 0.83 across all budgetary items between the policy-oriented majority party-model and interaction model of government and parties.

of individual budget items. In order to avoid problems of heteroskedasticity that may arise due to the greater variance of larger budget items (HP) as opposed to smaller ones, we will use the logarithm (ln) of the relative annual expenditure (RSP) for the individual budgetary items. As already mentioned, we will employ budgetary items from the general and specific level, but it is not possible to find any spending preferences for the very specific level of the financial reports. Our approach still covers about 80% of the annual expenditures, which we intend to explain by using political and other variables.

Political Variables

The predictions for the changes in budgetary items will be tested with dummy-variables (0/1). For that purpose, we combine the increased spending predictions (HPk+) and the decreased spending predictions (HPk-) for the changes of each individual budgetary item (that had been passed in post-election years) over the whole time period (Y66-95).⁷ We expect a preference shift for spending or a change in actor constellation due to elections or government change to have an effect on the following year's budget. Hereby, we distinguish between predictions for an increase (positive prediction) and a cut in spending (negative prediction) for the individual budgetary periods. The set of predictions can vary for each approach. For example, both approaches predict an increase of the labour market item in 1969 but for 1972, only the policy-oriented theory predicts another increase. Since the veto players model does not predict change, we do not test its prediction for 1972. By adding up the correct number of predictions for a shift, we test which of the six options are best suited to explaining budgetary politics.

The literature on political parties - some of the suggestions it provides we take up too - often claims that social democratic parties generally prefer more expenditure (Hibbs 1987; Garrett and Lange 1986, 1991). In contrast to our item specific approaches these are more concerned with the general party political goals of budget expenditure. We employ this idea as a null model and try to find its predictive value by coding the spending preferences of SPD (SPD_ITEM), CDU (CDU_ITEM) and FDP (FDP_ITEM). For this purpose, we combine the spending preferences of each party and test with dummy variables if the parties were better able to realise their preferences during their time in office (SPD_GOV, CDU_GOV and FDP_GOV). For the SPD, for example, all spending preferences are being combined (SPD_ITEM) and checked if the SPD was able to realise its goals better between 1967 and 1982 (SPD_GOV) compared to the rest of the study period. With these "political" variables we went to explain budgetary politics.

⁷ Because we used party manifestos and government declarations we only expect changes in those years.

They should help us in answering the question of relevant veto players and the most suitable theory of action. We also control for the political and economic effects of an election year (Preelect), which are expected to lead to an increase in spending. Following the business cycle-theory we propose that the government and/or the majority parties have an incentive to create favourable economic conditions for the election year by exerting more expansive macroeconomic policies the year before. Accordingly we add a dummy variable (0/1) for pre-election budgets. Additionally, we want to compare the predictive power of our approach to that of the political party research and test the influence of macroeconomic factors.

Control Variables

Apart from the “political” variables that are of main interest, we also control for the effects of general macroeconomic factors that are assumed to influence budgetary politics. From an economic point of view a rise in the rate of unemployment would be expected to have an impact on the labour market preferences of all actors involved. Following Bawn (1999: 724) we will include the first differenced natural logarithm of the unemployment rate (ALQ), the GDP as well as the inflation rate (Inflation), which sometimes showed deflationary tendencies in the period of our study. For the GDP and rate of unemployment we expect a positive effect on spending, as a higher rate of unemployment leads to attempts to combat unemployment, while a higher GDP is often linked to an expansion in infrastructure spending. Inflation, on the other hand, should lead to a decrease in spending as higher public expenditure can lead to a worsening of an inflation problem. All macroeconomic variables are taken from the OECD Statistical Compendium. Of course there are other economic variables that could have been used but we believe that the aforementioned represent macroeconomic influences most accurately. Since the dependent variable had been pooled for budgetary items and points in time, a pooled cross section time series analysis seemed to be the most adequate estimation procedure to use. As all control variables display a certain degree of path dependency for spending policy - meaning that all budget decision have an effect on later budgets - and that therefore our estimate may become inconsistent and inefficient, we will use a robust⁸ regression procedure for statistical testing. This guarantees an unbiased estimate. We also include period- and spending specific fixed effects in the model to take into account budget specific effects as well as features that influence change in a budget item over time.

⁸ OLS-regression where the influence of observations with large residuals is reduced with the weighting by analytical weights (weighting is determined by an iterative process).

Results

Table 2 depicts the results for the six options for predicting the logs of change in expenditure of budgetary items ($D\ln RSp$).⁹ In the first three columns, the estimates for the policy-oriented approach can be found, in the last three, the results for the gridlock approach. In contrast to our sophisticated null model, which does not consider all budgetary items, all six options proved to be statistically significant.¹⁰ Thus, the claims deduced from the literature on political parties can be rejected. Interestingly, the macro-economic variables do not have a statistically significant effect either. Neither the rate of unemployment (ALQ), rate of inflation (Inflation), nor GDP yield a statistically significant explanation for change in German budgetary composition. This possibly is due to a substitution effect between the individual budgetary items. It cannot be assumed that macroeconomic variables have the same impact on different budgetary items. It is more likely that budgetary actors react to macroeconomic changes with a redistribution among budgetary items (Troeger 2001: 82).

For the political variables, in contrast, we find significant effects.¹¹ The pre-election variable influences the spending almost always significantly and in the expected direction. Budgetary expenditure increases in a pre-election year, independent of the composition of veto players or approach used. The three policy-oriented options bore the same power of prediction for the change in budgetary items. Although the government - majority-party - and combined options predict an increase/decrease in different budgetary periods in a significantly way, they nevertheless yielded two correct and one false prediction. The total explained variance is 0.15 which is after all an increase of 50% compared to Bawn's (1999) results. Because we applied robust estimates, our adjusted R^2 should be only marginally lower.

$$\begin{aligned}
 D \ln RSp = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 ALQ + \beta_2 GDP + \beta_3 Inflation + \beta_4 Prelect + \beta_{i1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{90} HP_{k+} * Y_{66-95} \right) \\
 & + \beta_{i2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{90} HP_{k-} * Y_{66-95} \right) + \beta_7 SPD_ITEM + \beta_8 CDU_ITEM + \beta_9 FDP_ITEM + \beta_{10} SPD_GOV \\
 & + \beta_{11} CDU_GOV + \beta_{12} FDP_GOV + \varepsilon_{it}
 \end{aligned}$$

¹⁰ The null model, which contains the macroeconomic control variables, the business-cycle variables "pre-election year" as well as the variables SPD_ITEM to FDP_GOV, explains 3% of variance of the dependent variables.

¹¹ This result has to be seen against the background of substitution effects of economic variables and the redeployment of individual budget items. The result may be different if the coefficients of the economic variables are allowed to vary for the individual items.

Table 2: Results for a Change in Individual Budget Items (Robust Regression with Fixed Effects)

	POLICY-ORIENTED APPROACH			GRIDLOCK APPROACH		
	<i>Government</i>	<i>Majority Parties</i>	<i>Majority Parties + Government</i>	<i>Government</i>	<i>Majority Parties</i>	<i>Majority Parties + Government</i>
<i>Constant</i>	0,024	0,044	0,041	0,030	0,032	0,042
<i>Positive Predictions</i>						
1966	0,063	-0,158***	-0,150***	0,019		
1967	0,058	0,109	0,342	-0,023	0,062	0,624***
1970	-0,005	-0,076	-0,095	-0,045	0,096*	-0,159**
1972	-0,183	-0,077	-0,008	0,061	-0,030	0,418
1977	0,185**	-0,045	-0,088	0,175	-0,082	-0,005
1981	-0,051	0,151	0,179	0,022	0,002***	0,061
1983	0,011	0,108**	0,121***	0,082*	0,101**	-0,053
1988	0,010	0,040	0,053	-0,096	-0,053	-0,028
1991	0,047	-0,172	-0,168	-0,519***	-0,160	-0,098
1995	0,476***	0,060	0,073	0,182	-0,122	-0,413***
<i>Negative Predictions</i>						
1966	0,139***	-0,027	-0,053	0,076		0,022
1967	-0,0734	-0,152	-0,053	0,001	-0,141**	-0,045
1970	0,087	0,050	0,012	0,033	-0,018	-0,166***
1972		-0,317**		0,335**	-0,164	0,068
1977	0,042	0,093	-0,225***	-0,033		-0,181**
1981	-0,169	-0,129	-0,161	0,118	0,037	
1983	-0,044	0,033	0,031	0,146***	0,032	0,010
1988	-0,023	-0,042	-0,044	-0,008		-0,173
1991	0,191	0,132	0,125	-0,477**		-0,223
1995	0,053	0,278	0,273	0,053	-0,061	-0,233***
<i>SPD_ITEM</i>	-0,082*	-0,094**	-0,097**	-0,097**	-0,097**	-0,105**
<i>CDU_ITEM</i>	0,041	0,036	0,050	0,039	0,037	0,032
<i>FDP_ITEM</i>	0,027	0,014	0,025	0,018	-0,200	0,022
<i>SPD_GOV</i>	0,037	0,028	0,027	0,020	0,023	0,031
<i>CDU_GOV</i>	-0,057	-0,084**	-0,085**	-0,056*	-0,072*	-0,075**
<i>FDP_GOV</i>	-0,064	-0,074	-0,081	-0,060	-0,067	-0,078
<i>ALQ</i>	-0,019	-0,019	-0,019	-0,018	-0,019	-0,019
<i>GDP</i>	0,423	0,421	0,415	0,486	0,455	0,412
<i>Inflation</i>	0,009	0,009	0,009	0,009	0,009	0,009
<i>Preelect</i>	0,066*	0,066*	0,066*	0,066*	0,066*	0,066*
<i>R²</i>	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,17	0,13	0,16
<i>p>F</i>	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
<i>N</i>	525	525	525	525	525	525

*** significant for $p = 0,01$; ** significant for $p = 0,05$; * significant for $p = 0,1$.

For the predictions that had been made following the veto players approach, the government option yielded worse results. Here, the budget increases for 1991 and the reductions for 1972 and 1983 are predicted wrongly while only the increase for 1983 and the reduction for 1991 are predicted correctly. In contrast, the majority party option of the veto players approach predicts most changes correctly—the increases for 1970, 1981 and 1983 as well as the reduction of 1967. Slightly worse for the individual predictions, but with a higher predictive value, fares the combined option (government and majority parties), which predicts wrongly the increases of 1970 and 1995 but correctly the increases of 1967 and the reductions of 1970, 1977 and 1995. Interestingly, almost all options illustrate that spending favoured by the SPD was more likely to be cut and that the CDU was less likely to realise its preferences.

Conclusion and Outlook

In this study we tested different conceptions of relevant actors and two different approaches on budgetary politics. The results show that political variables better explain budgetary politics than macroeconomic variables do. This suggests that there is room for political manoeuvre within the budgetary process. Political actors can realise their preferences for spending in terms of a change of individual budgetary items. Overall, the veto players model yielded better results than the policy-oriented approach. Budgetary actors thus consider the location of the status quo. Additionally evidence was raised that the government cannot amend the budget independently of the majority parties. Rather, it is the partisan veto players that play an important role in shaping the budget and have an expenditure increasing as well as decreasing effect.

If we compare our results with previous research on the federal budget, we can, to a large extent, confirm the findings of Bawn (1999). In her work too, the veto players model best predicts the changes of the budget. We believe, however, that our contribution gives a more realistic insight into the budgetary process, since we consider the government as an independent actor. Our government options, however, overestimate the expenditure reducing influence of the executive, while the majority party option better predicts an increase. This illustrates the considerable influence of partisan actors for increased spending but the predominant “pure” party view fails to predict spending cuts. Furthermore, our results characterize the CDU to be worse equipped to realise their policies in government. While Hofferbert and Klingemann (1990) and Bawn (1999) hold the FDP responsible for this observation and also attribute to it an expenditure reducing veto position in the coalition, we find that the FDP also pursues expenditure increasing policies, and following from that it cannot

be assigned an exogenous veto player position. In effect, the CDU could not even realise their policies during the Grand Coalition. This also holds true for the SPD, whose preferred items of spending had been marginally reduced, for the whole period. Our findings suggest that it is the government position - and not the small coalition partner - that puts restrictions on spending preferences. In addition, our study reveals that during pre-election years the spending is likely to grow. This effect is probably due to the majority parties, whose position better explains an upward shift in the budget. With a budget strategy set for expansion, they will try to create the foundations for their re-election. It must be noted that re-unification also had a strong effect on budgetary composition. If we control for the individual years with period-dummies, only 1991 has a significant effect.

From a theoretical point of view, it may be argued that other theories of budgetary politics may have more predictive power. We tried to deal with this claim by including a sophisticated null-model that incorporates insights from the research on political parties. As it turned out even our simplest option, the policy-oriented government option, is more successful at explaining budgetary politics than this null-model. In addition, we checked the impact of macroeconomic factors and included the "business-cycle-theory", which has the most significant effect among all control variables. This perspective finally points to the great predictive power of the veto players theory for federal budgetary politics. Our contribution also generates some questions. Especially the measurement of actors' positions, which is based on a very general MRG-coding scheme, leaves room for improvement. It would be preferable to have a more flexible way of measuring actors' positions - one that could be applied specifically to budgetary studies as well. Given the importance of actors' positions, however, we still prefer this instrument to all others available. Our empirical results clearly indicate that all of the parties and governments display great variance in policy positions. In our view, researches should be careful when testing a theory built on variance in actors' positions with invariant measuring instruments.

Appendix

Table A.1: Policy-oriented Approach: Government Perspective

T	61-65	65-66	66-69	69-72	72-76	76-80	80-82	82-83	83-87	87-90	90-94	94-98
<i>It/Gov</i>	CF	CF/66	CS/67	SF/70	SF/72	SF/77	SF/81	CF/83	CF/84	CF/88	CF/91	CF/95
1	S-R-FC	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0
2	C-F-R-S	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0
3	F-C-S-R	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	0
10	RC-S-F	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	-	-
22	C-R-F-S	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
23	R-CF-S	-	-	0	0	+	-	-	0	-	0	-
25	CR-F-S	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-
27	F-R-C-S	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
30	R-F-C-S	0	-	+	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-
52	CF-S-R	0	-	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	0	-
53	RCF S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	CFR-S	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0
70	C-S-F-R	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	0	-
80	R-S-F-C	0	+	0	-	-	+	+	0	-	0	+
90	S-F-R-C	-	-	-	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	0

Table A.2: Policy-oriented Approach: Party Majority Perspective

T	61-65	65-66	66-69	69-72	72-76	76-80	80-82	82-83	83-87	87-90	90-94	94-98
<i>It/Gov</i>	CF	CF/66	CS/67	SF/70	SF/72	SF/77	SF/81	CF/83	CF/84	CF/88	CF/91	CF/95
1	S-R-FC	+	-	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
2	C-F-R-S	-	0	+	-	+	+	0	0	0	+	0
3	F-C-S-R	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
10	RC-S-F	0	-	+	0	+	+	-	0	0	0	0
22	C-R-F-S	-	+	0	0	+	+	-	0	-	0	-
23	R-CF-S	-	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	0	0
25	CR-F-S	-	+	0	0	-	+	-	-	-	0	-
27	F-R-C-S	-	0	-	0	-	+	-	0	0	-	0
30	R-F-C-S	-	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
52	CF-S-R	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
53	RCFS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	CFR-S	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-
70	C-S-F-R	-	0	-	0	+	+	-	0	0	+	0
80	R-S-F-C	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
90	S-F-R-C	0	+	-	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0

Table A.3: Policy-oriented Approach: Party Majority And Government Perspective

T	61-65	65-66	66-69	69-72	72-76	76-80	80-82	82-83	83-87	87-90	90-94	94-98
<i>It/Gov</i>	CF	CF/66	CS/67	SF/70	SF/72	SF/77	SF/81	CF/83	CF/84	CF/88	CF/91	CF/95
1	S-R-FC	+	-	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
2	C-F-R-S	-	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	0
3	F-C-S-R	0	+	0	0	0	-	+	+	+	+	+
10	RC-S-F	0	-	+	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
22	C-R-F-S	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	-
23	R-CF-S	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0
25	CR-F-S	-	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	-	0	-
27	F-R-C-S	-	0	-	0	0	+	-	0	0	-	0
30	R-F-C-S	-	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
52	CF-S-R	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
53	CFRS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	CFR-S	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-
70	C-S-F-R	-	0	0	0	+	+	-	0	0	+	0
80	R-S-F-C	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
90	S-F-R-C	0	0	-	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0

Table A.4: Gridlock Approach: Government Perspective

T	61-65	65-66	66-69	69-72	72-76	76-80	80-82	82-83	83-87	87-90	90-94	94-98
<i>It/Gov</i>	CF	CF/66	CS/67	SF/70	SF/72	SF/77	SF/81	CF/83	CF/84	CF/88	CF/91	CF/95
1	S-R-FC	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	-	0
2	C-F-R-S	-	+	+	0	-	-	+	+	0	0	-
3	F-C-S-R	0	-	+	0	0	-	+	0	-	+	-
10	RC-S-F	0	0	+	-	-	0	0	+	0	-	0
22	C-R-F-S	0	-	+	0	-	0	0	+	0	+	0
23	R-CF-S	0	0	+	-	+	-	0	+	-	+	-
25	CR-F-S	+	0	+	0	0	-	-	-	+	-	0
27	F-R-C-S	+	0	-	+	+	0	-	0	-	0	+
30	R-F-C-S	+	-	+	-	0	0	-	+	0	-	-
52	CF-S-R	0	-	+	0	-	-	0	+	-	0	-
53	RCFS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	CFR-S	0	0	-	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	+
70	C-S-F-R	-	-	+	0	0	-	0	+	-	+	-
80	R-S-F-C	+	+	-	-	0	+	0	-	-	+	+
90	S-F-R-C	-	0	0	+	+	-	0	-	+	-	+

Table A.5: *Gridlock Approach: Party Majority Perspective*

T	61-65	65-66	66-69	69-72	72-76	76-80	80-82	82-83	83-87	87-90	90-94	94-98
It/Gov	CF	CF/66	CS/67	SF/70	SF/72	SF/77	SF/81	CF/83	CF/84	CF/88	CF/91	CF/95
1	S-R-FC	0	-	0	0	0/+	0	0	0/+	0/-	+	0
2	C-F-R-S	0	0	0/+	-	+	0	0	0/+	0	+	0
3	F-C-S-R	0	0	0/+	-	+	-	+	+	0	0	+
10	RC-S-F	0	0/-	+	0	0/+	0	-	0	+	+	0
22	C-R-F-S	0	+	0	0	0/+	0	-	0	0	+	-
23	R-CF-S	0	+	0	0	0/-	0	0/-	0	0	0	0/-
25	CR-F-S	0	+	0	0	0/-	+	-	0	0	0	0/-
27	F-R-C-S	0	0	0/-	0	0/-	+	-	0	0	0/-	+
30	R-F-C-S	0	0	0/-	0	0/+	0	0	0	0/-	0	0/-
52	CF-S-R	0	0	0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0/+	0	0/+	0
53	RCFS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	CFR-S	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0/-	0
70	C-S-F-R	0/-	0	0/-	0	0/+	0	-	+	0	+	0
80	R-S-F-C	0	0	0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0
90	S-F-R-C	0	0/+	-	+	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0/-

Table A.6: *Gridlock Approach: Party Majority And Government Perspective*

T	61-65	65-66	66-69	69-72	72-76	76-80	80-82	82-83	83-87	87-90	90-94	94-98
It/Gov	CF	CF/66	CS/67	SF/70	SF/72	SF/77	SF/81	CF/83	CF/84	CF/88	CF/91	CF/95
1	S-R-FC	0	-	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0
2	C-F-R-S	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	-
3	F-C-S-R	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
10	RC-S-F	0	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	C-R-F-S	0	0	+	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
23	R-CF-S	0	0	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	CR-F-S	0	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
27	F-R-C-S	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	-	0	+
30	R-F-C-S	0	0	0	+	0	0	-	+	+	-	0
52	CF-S-R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	-	0	0
53	RCFS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	CFR-S	0	0	0	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
70	C-S-F-R	0	0	0	0	+	0	-	+	-	+	0
80	R-S-F-C	0	0	-	0	0	0	+	-	0	+	0
90	S-F-R-C	-	0	0	0	+	0	-	0	+	-	+

References

- Alesina, Alberto and Allan Drazen (1991). "Why Are Stabilizations Delayed?", *American Economic Review* 81(5): 1170-1188.
- Alt, James, David Lassen and David Skilling (2002). "Fiscal Transparency, Gubernatorial Approval, and the Scale of Government: Evidence from the States", *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 2(3): 230-249.
- Bawn, Kathleen (1999). "Money and Majorities in the Federal Republic of Germany: Evidence for a Veto Players Model of Government Spending", *American Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 707-736.
- Black, Duncan (1958). *The Theory of Committees and Elections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bräuning, Thomas (2004). "Fiscal Constitutionalism in Economic and Monetary Union", *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behaviour* 7(4).
- Bundesministerium für Finanzen, *Finanzberichte* diverse Jahre. Bonn, Berlin: Bundesministerium für Finanzen.
- Castles, Francis and Peter Mair (1984). "Left-Right Political Scales: Some 'Expert' Judgements", *European Journal of Political Research* 12(1): 73-88.
- Castles, Francis G. (1982). "The Impact of Parties on Public Expenditure", in Francis G. Castles (ed.). *The Impact of Parties, Politics and Policies in Democratic Capitalist States*. London: Sage, pp. 21-96.
- Cusack, Thomas (1995). *Politics and Macroeconomic Performance in the OECD Countries during the Period 1950 through 1990*. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- Cusack, Thomas (1997). "Partisan Politics and Public Finance: Changes in Public Spending in the Industrialized Democracies 1955-1989", *Public Choice* 91(3/4): 375-395.
- De Swaan, Abram (1973). *Coalition Theories and Cabinet Formation: A Study of Formal Theories of Coalition Formation as Applied to Nine European Parliaments after 1918*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Downs, Anthony (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper.
- Franzese, Robert (2002). *Macroeconomic Policies of Developed Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garrett, Geoffrey and Peter Lange (1986). "Performance in a Hostile World: Economic Growth in Capitalist Democracies, 1974-1980", *World Politics* 38(4): 517-545.
- Garrett, Geoffrey and Peter Lange (1991). "Political Responses to Economic Decline: What's 'left' for the left?", *International Organization* 45(4): 539-564.
- Hagen, Jürgen von and Ian Harden (1994). "Budget Processes and Commitment to Fiscal Discipline", *European Economic Review* 39(3-4): 771-79.

- Hahn, Sung Deuk, Mark S. Kamlet and David C. Mowery (1996). "The Political Economy of Deficit Spending in Nine Industrialized Parliamentary Democracies: the Role of Fiscal Institutions", *Comparative Political Studies* 29(1): 52-77.
- Hallerberg, Mark, Rolf Strauch and Jürgen von Hagen (2001). *The Use of Effectiveness of Budgetary Rules and Norms in EU Member States*. Report prepared for the Dutch Ministry of Finance.
- Hansen, John (1998). "Individuals, Institutions, and Public Preferences over Public Finance", *American Political Science Review* 92(3): 513-33.
- Hibbs, Douglas A. (1977). "Political Parties and Macroeconomic Policy", *American Political Science Review* 77(4): 1467-1187.
- Hibbs, Douglas A. (1987). *The Political Economy of Industrial Democracies*. Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press.
- Hibbs, Douglas A. (1992). "Partisan Theory after Fifteen Years", *European Journal of Political Economy* 8(3): 361-373.
- Hinich, Melvin and Michael Munger (1994). *Ideology and the Theory of Political Choice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hofferbert, Richard I. and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (1990). "The Policy Impact of Party Programmes and Government Declarations in the Federal Republic of Germany", *European Journal of Political Research* 18(3): 277-304.
- Horst, Patrick (1995). *Haushaltspolitik und Regierungspraxis in den USA und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Hotelling, Harold (1929). "Stability in Competition", *Economic Journal* 39(1): 41-57.
- Kahneman, Daniel and Amos Tversky (1979). "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decisions under Risk", *Econometrica* 47(2): 263-292.
- Kirchheimer, Otto (1966). "The Transformation of Western European Party Systems", in Joseph Palombara (ed.). *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (1987). „Election Programs in West Germany: Explorations in the Nature of Political Controversy“, in Ian Budge, David Robertson and Derek Hearl (eds.). *Ideology, Strategy and Party Change: Spatial Analysis of Post-War Election Programmes in Nineteen Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- König, Thomas and Thomas Bräuninger (2000). "Politikwechsel und Föderalismus“, in Everhard Holtmann and Helmut Voelzkow (Hrsg.). *Zwischen Wettbewerbs- und Verhandlungsdemokratie*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 129-147.
- König, Thomas and Thomas Bräuninger (1997). "Wie wichtig sind die Länder für die Politik der Bundesregierung bei Einspruchs- und Zustimmungsgesetzen?", *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 28(4): 605-628.
- König, Thomas and Mirja Pöter (2001). "Examining the EU Legislative Process. The Relative Importance of Agenda- and Vetopower“, *European Union Politics* 3(2): 329-351.

- Korff, Hans C. (1975). *Haushaltspolitik. Instrument öffentlicher Macht*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Krehbiel, Keith (1996). "Institutional and Partisan Sources of Gridlock. A Theory of Divided and Unified Government", *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 8(1): 7-40.
- Laver, Michael and John Garry (2000). "Estimating policy positions from political texts", *American Journal of Political Science* 44(3): 619-34.
- Laver, Michael and William B. Hunt (1992). *Policy and Party Competition*. New York: Routledge.
- Mair, Peter (1990). *The West European Party System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moeser, Ekkehard (1978). *Die Beteiligung des Bundestages an der staatlichen Haushaltsgewalt. Eine Untersuchung zur rechtlichen und tatsächlichen Stellung des Bundestages in haushaltswirtschaftlichen Entscheidungsprozessen*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Persson, Torsten and Guido Tabellini (2003). *Economic Effects of Constitutions*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Romer, Thomas and Howard Rosenthal (1978). "Political Resource Allocation, Controlled Agendas, and the Status Quo", *Public Choice* 33: 27-43.
- Rose, Klaus and Kurt Faltlhauser (eds.) (1990). *Die Haushälter*. Köln: Kölner Universitäts-Verlag.
- Schmidt, Manfred G. (1982). „The Role of Parties in Shaping Macroeconomic Policy“, in Francis G. Castles (ed.). *The Impact of Parties. Politics and Policies in Democratic Capitalist States*. London: Sage, pp. 97-176.
- Schmidt, Manfred G. (1996). "When parties matter: A review of the possibilities and limits of partisan influence on public policy", *European Journal of Political Research* 30(2): 155-183.
- Shepsle, Kenneth and Barry Weingast (1981). "Structure-induced Equilibrium and Legislative Choice", *Public Choice* 37: 503-519.
- Sturm, Roland (1988). *Der Haushaltsausschuss des Deutschen Bundestages. Struktur und Entscheidungsprozess*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Troeger, Vera E. (2001). *Akteure und Präferenzen in der Haushaltspolitik: eine quantitative Analyse der Determinanten der deutschen Ausgabenpolitik seit 1962*. Magisterarbeit, Universität Konstanz.
- Tschetschner, Axel (2002). *The Basic Law (Grundgesetz) The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany*. (May 23rd, 1949) Würzburg 2002.
- Tsebelis, George (1995). "Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto players in Presidentialism, Parliamentaryism, Multicameralism, and Multipartyism", *British Journal of Political Science* 25(3): 289-326.
- Tsebelis, George (1999). "Veto Players and Law Production in Parliamentary Democracies. An Empirical Analysis", *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 591-608.
- Tsebelis, George (2002). *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Tsebelis, George and Eric Chang (2001): *Veto Players and the Structure of Budgets in Advanced Industrialized Countries*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van Deemen, Adrian M.A. (1991). "Coalition Formation in Centralized Policy Games", *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3: 139-161.
- Volkens, Andrea (1998). *Handbuch zur Inhaltsanalyse programmatischer Dokumente von Parteien und Regierungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- Wagner, Adolph (1883). *Finanzwissenschaft, 1. Band: Ordnung der Finanzwirtschaft, Finanzbedarf, Privaterwerb*. 3. Aufl., Leipzig.
- Wagner, Adolph (1890). *Finanzwissenschaft, 2. Band: Theorie der Besteuerung, Gebührenlehre und allgemeine Steuerlehre*. Leipzig
- Wildavsky, Aaron (1975). *Budgeting: A Comparative Theory of Budgetary Processes*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
-

Haushaltspolitik und Veto-Spieler

In diesem Beitrag untersuchen wir die Veränderung einzelner Posten des deutschen Bundeshaushalts im Zeitraum von 1961 bis 1998. In Anlehnung an die Vetospielertheorie formulieren wir Erwartungen über die Veränderung der Haushaltsposten und vergleichen, ob der policy-orientierte Koalitions- oder der Handlungsintervallansatz besser das Ausgabeverhalten der haushaltspolitischen Vetospieler erklärt. Bei der empirischen Überprüfung unterscheiden wir zusätzlich verschiedene Konzeptionen von haushaltspolitischen Vetospielern, zum einen die Regierung und zum anderen die Mehrheitsparteien des Bundestags. Unsere Ergebnisse zeigen, dass erstens der Handlungsintervallansatz die haushaltspolitischen Veränderungen am besten erklärt, und zweitens die Regierung einen ausgabenkürzenden, die Mehrheitsparteien dagegen einen ausgabenerhöhenden Einfluss auf die Haushaltspolitik ausüben. Unsere Resultate machen vor allem deutlich, dass die Regierung als eigenständiger Akteur in der Haushaltspolitik auftritt und der Status quo ein wichtiger Bezugspunkt für das haushaltspolitische Verhalten der Akteure ist.

Politique budgétaire et 'veto-players'

Dans cet article, nous examinons les changements dans l'allocation du budget fédéral allemand entre 1961 et 1994. Une première approche ('policy-oriented coalition-building approach') suggère que seuls les acteurs budgétaires directement impliqués peuvent modifier la composition du budget, tandis qu'une seconde approche ('gridlock model of legislative choice') avance que

les modifications sont tributaires du positionnement du statu quo. Il importe également d'identifier l'ensemble des principaux 'veto-players' en matière budgétaire, ainsi que leurs préférences, en distinguant entre le gouvernement et les partis représentés au Parlement. Nous comparons la capacité prédictive des deux approches, tout en contrôlant l'impact d'autres facteurs politiques et économiques. Nos résultats montrent que le modèle 'gridlock' explique mieux les changements budgétaires ; cependant, les coupes budgétaires sont imputables au gouvernement, tandis que les allongements sont imputables aux partis de la majorité parlementaire. En conclusion, l'identification des veto-players et les approches théoriques utilisées contribuent à éclaircir les fondements politiques des variations du budget allemand.

Thomas König arbeit als Politikwissenschaftler an der Deutschen Hochschule für Verwaltungswissenschaften Speyer und beschäftigt sich mit der empirischen Überprüfung von Verhandlungs- und Entscheidungstheorien. Neuere Forschungen umfassen den Europäischen Verfassungsgebungsprozess (DOSEI), die Europäische Gesetzgebung (DEU) und die deutsche Innenpolitik.

Vera E. Troeger ist Lecturer für Internationale Politische Ökonomie und Quantitative Methoden am Departement für Politische Wissenschaft der Universität Exeter. Ihre derzeitigen Forschungsaktivitäten verbinden die Felder Vergleichende und Internationale Politische Ökonomie, Formale Politische Theorie und Entwicklung sowie Anwendung quantitativer statistischer Methoden. Vera E. Troeger studierte Politische Wissenschaft, Volkswirtschaftslehre und Statistik an der Universität Konstanz. Zwischen 2002 und 2004 leitete sie die ökonometrische Abteilung des Projektes FAST der Schweizerischen Friedensstiftung in Bern. FAST ist ein Frühwarnsystem für politische Krisen in Entwicklungsländern und basiert auf der Analyse von täglichen Ereignisdaten. Im selben Zeitraum arbeitete Vera E. Troeger am Weatherhead Center for International Affairs (WCFIA) an der Harvard Universität in Cambridge. Im Mai 2004 nahm sie eine Forschungsstelle am Max Planck Institut für Ökonomik in Jena an, wo der größte Teil der Doktorarbeit entstand.

Address for correspondence: Professor Dr. Thomas König, German University of Administrative Sciences Speyer, 67324 Speyer, Tel: +49(0) 6232654-355; Fax: +49(0) 6232654-127; E-Mail: tkoenig@dhw-speyer.de

Address for correspondence: Vera E. Troeger, University of Exeter, Department of Politics, Amory Building, Rennes Drive, Exeter, EX4 4QJ, UK, Tel: +44(0)1392264632, Fax: +44(0)1392263305; E-Mail: v.e.troeger@exeter.ac.uk