

REM WORKING PAPER SERIES

Sovereign Ratings and Finance Ministers' Characteristics

António Afonso, João Tovar Jalles

REM Working Paper 072-2019

February 2019

REM – Research in Economics and Mathematics

Rua Miguel Lúpi 20,
1249-078 Lisboa,
Portugal

ISSN 2184-108X

Any opinions expressed are those of the authors and not those of REM. Short, up to two paragraphs can be cited provided that full credit is given to the authors.



Sovereign Ratings and Finance Ministers' Characteristics*

António Afonso[§], João Tovar Jalles[#]

February 2019

Abstract

This paper empirically assesses the effect of a newly-compiled set of finance ministers' characteristics on the setting by rating agencies of the long-term sovereign rating notations. Using a sample of 26 EU countries between 1980-2012, we find that the existence of more focused delegation-oriented fiscal framework, the Minister of Finance being a woman, and the Minister of Finance having a degree in the areas of finance or "hard sciences" seems to contribute to a better sovereign rating notation, and the opposite in the case of a Law background.

JEL Codes: C23, C25, E44, F30, G10, G12, H30

Keywords: sovereign ratings; ordered probit; sovereign debt; panel data; principal components

* The usual disclaimer applies and all remaining errors are the authors' sole responsibility. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and not of their employers.

[§] ISEG – School of Economics and Management, Universidade de Lisboa; REM – Research in Economics and Mathematics, UECE. UECE – Research Unit on Complexity and Economics is supported by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia. email: aafonso@iseg.ulisboa.pt

[#] Centre for Globalization and Governance, Nova School of Business and Economics, Campus Campolide, Lisbon, 1099-032 Portugal. UECE – Research Unit on Complexity and Economics. email: joaojalles@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Economic, institutional, government, and individual characteristics are usually perceived as relevant determinants of capital markets developments, notably regarding sovereign ratings. Indeed, governments are responsible for the implementation of economic policy, especially at the macro and fiscal level, and therefore the behaviour of governments also plays a role as a potential determinant of financial and capital markets outcomes.

For instance, Ministers of Finance are major key players in implementing fiscal and macroeconomic policies and in shaping expectations about their future behavior, since they have the resources notably to produce economic and fiscal forecasts (von Hagen, 2010). Since capital markets and rating agencies take into account fiscal policy developments in an expectational view when setting both long-term yields and sovereign ratings, the personal characteristics of those policy makers are quite relevant, namely in terms academic and professional background, for purposes related to credibility.

There are broadly two approaches concerning fiscal governance via the Ministry of Finance: delegation and contracts. In the first one the Finance Minister is responsible for the overall budget. In addition, under the contracts approach, Finance Ministers are in charge of managing the budget process.

Moreover, finance Ministers play an important role in determining public deficits (Jochimsen and Thomasius, 2014) and influencing public debt dynamics (Moessinger, 2014). Ganapolsky & Schmukler (1998) show that after a period of high volatility and political turmoil, a change of the Finance Minister reduces the variance of both stock and bond market returns. Hence, possible (positive) spillovers can also occur for sovereign ratings.

On the other hand, several authors addressed the issue of the determinants of sovereign ratings, notably Cantor and Packer (1996), who identified per capita income, GDP growth, inflation, external debt, level of economic development and default history as important

determinants for Moody's and S&P. Afonso (2003), who also included a logistic and an exponential transformation of the ratings, in addition to the linear transformation already used in the literature. Mulder and Monfort (2000) generalized the OLS approach to panel data, using a linear transformation of the ratings.

In this context, and to overcome the limitation of OLS regressions with a linear transformation of the ratings, Bissoondoyal-Bheenick (2005) used an ordered probit model for a period of five years and 95 countries.¹ Moreover, Afonso et al. (2008) analysed the determinants of sovereign ratings from the three main agencies by using a linear regression framework (random effects estimation, pooled OLS estimation and fixed effects estimation) versus an ordered probit response framework.²

Nevertheless, Afonso et al. (2011) confirm that logistic and exponential transformations to ratings provide little improvement over the linear transformation, not finding evidence of the so-called "cliff effects" (when investors adjust their portfolio composition to select only investment grade securities). They also highlight the difference between short- and long-term determinants, concluding that GDP per capita, GDP growth, government debt and budget balance have a short-term impact, whereas government effectiveness, external debt, foreign reserves and default history influence ratings in the long-run.

Finally, Amstad and Packer (2015) used several explanatory variables as proxies for fiscal, economic and institutional strength, monetary regime, external position and default history and concludes that a small set of factors can largely explain the rating scale.

In this paper, we contribute to literature by assessing to what extent the characteristics of a major policy maker, the Minister of Finance, play a role in the setting by the rating agencies of

¹ An OLS regression with a linear transformation of the ratings assumes a constant distance between adjacent rating notches. However, ratings represent a qualitative ordinal assessment of a sovereign credit risk, thus the distance between two adjacent ratings may not be the same

² Instead of assuming a rigid shape of the ratings scale, this model estimates the threshold values between rating notches, defining the shape of the ratings curve.

the long-term sovereign rating notations. Our main results point to the fact that the existence of more focused delegation oriented fiscal framework, the Minister of Finance being a woman, and the Minister of Finance having a degree in the areas of finance or “hard sciences”, seems to contribute to a better sovereign rating notation, and the opposite in the case of a Law background.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the methodology and the data set. Section 3 reports and discusses the empirical results. Section 4 concludes.

2. Methodology and Data

To estimate the impact on credit ratings, $R_{i,t}$, of our set of finance ministers’ characteristics, we run the following reduced-form regression:

$$R_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta FMC_{i,t} + \gamma \mathbf{X}'_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

where α_i are country-fixed effects capturing unobserved heterogeneity across countries, and time-unvarying factors; δ_t are time effects to control for global shocks; $FMC_{i,t}$ are the time-varying set of finance ministers’ characteristics (see below for details); \mathbf{X}_{it} is a vector of macroeconomic variables, lagged to reduce reverse causality.³ Following the literature (Cantor and Packer’s (1996) seminal paper and Monfort and Mulder (2000) and Bissoondoyal-Bheenick (2005)), this vector includes the following key determinants of sovereign credit ratings (expected sign in parenthesis): real GDP per capita (+), real GDP growth (+), inflation rate (+/-), debt-to-GDP ratio (-), foreign reserves (+), terms-of-trade (+/-), unemployment rate (-).

In addition to using each rating agency’s assessment separately as dependent variables we also take two aggregate measures: the first, results from taking the simple average across the

³ Similar results obtained using contemporaneous regressors (not shown).

three agencies (Ratings_Avg); the second uses a Principal Component Analysis to extract the common factor (Ratings_PCA).⁴

There are two econometric approaches typically employed in the literature looking at credit ratings determinants. One uses linear regression methods to a linear numerical representation of the ratings (e.g. Cantor and Packer, 1996; Afonso, 2003) since the OLS application is simple and allows for simple generalizations to panel data settings (Mora, 2006). The second uses ordered response models given the fact that ratings are a qualitative ordinal measure and traditional linear estimation techniques are not adequate (for instance, they are biased even in large samples – see Hu et al., 2002; Depken et al., 2007).

Therefore, in the context of an ordered response model, an unobserved latent variable R_{it}^* has a linear form and depends on the same variables as before:

$$R_{it}^* = \alpha_i + \delta_t + \beta FMC_{i,t} + \gamma \mathbf{X}'_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

with several cut-off points to draw up the boundaries of each rating category, and the final rating notation is given by:

$$R_{it} = \begin{cases} AAA (Aaa) & \text{if } R_{it}^* > c_{20} \\ AA+ (Aa1) & \text{if } c_{16} > R_{it}^* > c_{19} \\ AA (Aa2) & \text{if } c_{15} > R_{it}^* > c_{18} . \\ \vdots & \\ < C & \text{if } c_1 > R_{it}^* \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The difference between the cut off points determines a non-linearity is the effect of variables (i.e. it might be easier to move from AA to AA+, then the subsequent move to AAA).

For our empirical analysis, we rely on two main estimators: OLS with robust standard errors clustered at the country level and for robustness purposes two ordered models (probit and logit)

⁴ A likelihood ratio test was used to examine the “sphericity” case. This test comfortably rejects sphericity at the 1 percent level.

estimated using maximum likelihood using a robust variance-covariance matrix to account for serial correlation (see Afonso et al., 2011 for details).

Regarding the dataset of the characteristics of Ministers of Finance, we draw on Afonso and Guedes (2014). Some stylised facts of the Ministers's of Finance academic background, in terms of share in the overall data sample, are: Economics (39.8 percent); Law (21.3 percent); Management (7.0 percent); Finance/Accounting (10.4 percent); other Social Sciences (7.9 percent); “Hard Sciences” (4.6 percent) no formal education (8.9 percent). The average age of Finance Ministers was around 51 years old, the average tenure was about 2 years, and 4 percent of Finance Ministers were women. For the purpose of the empirical analysis, we code the academic background characteristics as follows: Economics, degree1; Law, degree2; Management, degree3; Finance/Accounting, degree4; Other social sciences, degree5; “Hard sciences”, degree6.

Our sample consists of a total of 26 advanced countries between 1980-2012. Data on our dependent variable, $R_{i,t}$, includes data from the three main rating agencies, S&P, Moody's and Fitch Ratings attributed at 31st December. Similarly to Afonso et al. (2011), we group the qualitative sovereign rating notations in 21 categories by putting together the few observations below C, which are given the value one, while AAA observations receive the value 21 (see Table A1 in the appendix).

All macroeconomic and fiscal variables are retrieved from the IMF's World Economic Outlook Database.

3. Empirical Results

Table 1 reports the baseline results for the estimation of specification (1), using the average ratings from the three main rating agencies. The core determinants turn out to have the expected effect as identified in previous literature, notably increases in per capita GDP and in the foreign

reserves, as well as improvements in the terms of trade contribute to the increase in the sovereign rating. On the other hand, higher debt-to-GDP ratio, inflation rate and unemployment imply a worsening of the credit ratings.

[Table 1]

Regarding the specific characteristics of the Ministries of Finance, we find that when they are women there is a positive effect towards sovereign credit ratings, and the same is true for tenure of the Ministries. In addition, the academic background of the Ministry of Finance in the area of Finance (taking into account country fixed effects in the estimation procedure), seems to contribute to attain higher rating levels. Moreover, delegation in the budget procedure also increases the rating notations.

In Table 2, we report the results from the analysis using as dependent variable the separate rating notations from each of the three rating agencies, their simple average value and also the (first) common factor from the Principal Component Analysis. In addition, we also assess the probability of rating changes via an ordered Probit and Logit analysis.

[Table 2]

Results from the individual estimation per rating agency confirm the baseline findings in terms of the core determinants of the ratings, already mentioned above (columns 1, 2, and 3 in Table 2). However, in terms of the characteristics of the Ministers, a degree in Law seems to lower rating notation in the case of Standard & Poor's.

Turning to the estimation results from ordered models, we do not find any statistical significance vis-à-vis sovereign ratings regarding the academic characteristics of Ministers. When we perform an additional sensitivity analysis (see the Appendix), adding finance ministers' characteristics one at a time, we find similar outcomes, notably regarding the detrimental rating assessment from having an academic background in Law.

4. Conclusion

Finance Ministers play an important role in determining public deficits and influencing public debt dynamics. As a result, they shape investors' expectations regarding the pricing of risk over bond issuance as their credibility and policies may affect yields. In this paper, we empirically evaluated to what extent the characteristics of a major policy maker, the Minister of Finance, are relevant in the setting by the rating agencies of the long-term sovereign rating notations.

Looking at a sample of 26 EU countries over more than 30 years, we uncover that the existence of a more focused delegation oriented fiscal framework, the Minister of Finance being a woman, and the Minister of Finance having a degree in the areas of finance or "hard sciences", seems to improve the sovereign rating notation, while the opposite takes place if the Minister has a Law background. Results are robust to alternative estimators and sensitivity analyses.

References

1. Afonso, A. (2003). “Understanding the determinants of sovereign debt ratings: Evidence for the two leading agencies”, *Journal of Economics and Finance*, 27, 56–74.
2. Afonso, A., Furceri, D., Gomes, P. (2012). “Sovereign credit ratings and financial markets linkages: Application to European data”, *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 31, 606-638.
3. Afonso, A., Gomes, P., Rother, P. (2011). “Short and Long-run determinants of sovereign debt credit ratings”, *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 16, 1-15.
4. Afonso, A., Guedes, M. (2014). “EU Finance Ministers, Capital Markets and Fiscal Outcomes”, Working Paper n° 1/2014/DE/UECE/ADVANCE, ISEG.
5. Amstad, M., Packer, F. (2015). “Sovereign ratings of advanced and emerging economies after the crisis”, *BIS Quarterly Review December*.
6. Bissoondoyal-Bheenick, E. (2005), “An analysis of the determinants of sovereign ratings”, *Global Finance Journal*, 15(3), 251-280.
7. Cantor, R., Packer, F. (1996). “Determinants and impact of sovereign credit ratings”, *Economic Policy Review*, 2, 37-53.
8. Cantor, R. (2012). “Sovereign Risk Measurement Methodologies”, Presentation at the 2012 Credit Risk Conference, NYU Stern School of Business.
9. Depken, C., LaFountain, C., Butters, R. (2007). “Corruption and creditworthiness: evidence from sovereign credit ratings”, Working Paper 0601, University of Texas Austin, USA
10. Hu, Y., Kiesel, R., Perraudin, W. (2002). “The estimation of transition matrices for sovereign credit ratings”, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 26(7), 1383-1406.

11. Monfort, B., Mulder, C. (2000). "Using credit ratings for capital requirements on lending to emerging market economies – possible impact of a new Basel accord", IMF Working Paper 00/69.
12. Ganapolsky E. Schmukler S. (1998). "The impact of policy announcements and news on capital markets: crisis management in Argentina during the tequila effect". World Bank Development Research Group Macroeconomics and Growth. Working Paper.
13. Jochimsen B. Thomasius S. (2014). "The Perfect Finance Minister: Whom to appoint as Finance Minister to balance the budget". *European Journal of Political Economy*, 34: 390-408.
14. Moessinger M.-D. (2014). "Do Personal Characteristics of Finance Ministers affect the development of Public Debt?", *Public Choice* 161 (1): 183-207.
15. von Hagen J. (2010). "Sticking to fiscal plans: the role of institutions", *Public Choice* 144(3-4): 487-503.

Table 1 – Baseline Regressions

<i>Specification</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Regressors									
Real GDP per capita (t-1)	-0.459 (0.493)	-0.065 (0.160)	-0.037 (0.150)	1.705 (1.618)	1.756** (0.738)	2.005*** (0.694)	4.152 (3.148)	4.395*** (1.348)	4.652*** (1.330)
Real GDP growth (t-1)	0.051 (0.068)	0.073 (0.061)	0.098 (0.064)	0.118** (0.052)	0.119*** (0.036)	0.102*** (0.035)	0.249** (0.096)	0.249*** (0.065)	0.234*** (0.067)
Inflation rate (t-1)	-0.010*** (0.003)	-0.009*** (0.002)	-0.008*** (0.002)	-0.000 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
Terms-of-trade (t-1)	0.056 (0.079)	0.094*** (0.032)	0.092*** (0.035)	0.068*** (0.024)	0.073*** (0.017)	0.080*** (0.018)	0.043* (0.023)	0.045** (0.017)	0.051*** (0.018)
Debt-to-GDP ratio (t-1)	-0.008 (0.017)	-0.020*** (0.007)	-0.021*** (0.007)	-0.052*** (0.017)	-0.052*** (0.010)	-0.052*** (0.010)	-0.042** (0.015)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.043*** (0.009)
Foreign reserves (t-1)	1.076*** (0.291)	0.665*** (0.167)	0.568*** (0.175)	0.224 (0.174)	0.224* (0.128)	0.204 (0.133)	0.217 (0.161)	0.214* (0.132)	0.211 (0.136)
Unemployment rate (t-1)	-0.356*** (0.121)	-0.318*** (0.045)	-0.287*** (0.044)	-0.069 (0.067)	-0.069* (0.039)	-0.075* (0.039)	-0.026 (0.074)	-0.024 (0.039)	-0.029 (0.039)
female_it		1.509*** (0.447)	1.453*** (0.382)		0.467** (0.188)	0.601*** (0.215)		0.565*** (0.218)	0.685*** (0.248)
age		0.008 (0.016)	0.007 (0.016)		-0.013 (0.009)	-0.019** (0.010)		-0.006 (0.009)	-0.011 (0.010)
tenure		0.191*** (0.055)	0.199*** (0.054)		0.001 (0.026)	-0.000 (0.027)		-0.014 (0.024)	-0.016 (0.025)
delegation		2.029*** (0.361)	1.777*** (0.376)		6.996*** (0.523)	7.401*** (0.579)		8.047*** (0.576)	8.338*** (0.620)
degree1			-1.759*** (0.482)			0.274 (0.205)			0.158 (0.187)
degree2			-0.640 (0.439)			-0.237 (0.193)			-0.266 (0.212)
degree3			-1.319* (0.738)			-0.147 (0.339)			0.110 (0.378)
degree4			-2.768*** (0.813)			0.853** (0.335)			0.325 (0.380)
degree5			-0.136 (0.532)			-0.187 (0.267)			-0.110 (0.299)
degree6			-0.791 (0.672)			0.744** (0.366)			0.597 (0.384)
Country Effects	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time Effects	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	352	352	352	352	352	352	352	352	352
R-squared	0.322	0.388	0.437	0.881	0.882	0.888	0.901	0.902	0.905

Notes: Estimation by OLS. Economics, degree1; Law, degree2; Management, degree3; Finance/Accounting, degree4; Other social sciences, degree5; “Hard sciences”, degree6. Constant term as well as country and time effects (where applicable) omitted for reasons of parsimony. Clustered standard errors in parenthesis. *, **, *** denote statistical significance at the 10, 5 and 1 percent level, respectively.

Table 2 – Robustness Regressions

<i>Specification</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Estimator	OLS	OLS	OLS	OLS	Ordered Probit	Ordered Logit
Dependent variable	S&P	Moodys	Fitch	Ratings_PCA	Ratings_Avg	Ratings_Avg
Regressors						
Real GDP per capita (t-1)	5.377*** (1.061)	4.023*** (1.515)	3.020** (1.181)	0.929*** (0.266)	4.468*** (1.424)	10.071*** (3.372)
Real GDP growth (t-1)	0.176*** (0.050)	0.258*** (0.072)	0.227*** (0.061)	0.047*** (0.013)	0.112*** (0.044)	0.211* (0.111)
Inflation rate (t-1)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	0.001* (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)
Terms-of-trade (t-1)	0.045*** (0.016)	0.043** (0.020)	0.046** (0.018)	0.010*** (0.004)	0.032* (0.018)	0.053* (0.033)
Debt-to-GDP ratio (t-1)	-0.037*** (0.007)	-0.037*** (0.009)	-0.037*** (0.008)	-0.009*** (0.002)	-0.050*** (0.010)	-0.097*** (0.025)
Foreign reserves (t-1)	0.158 (0.132)	0.344** (0.155)	0.212* (0.130)	0.042 (0.027)	0.117 (0.105)	0.063 (0.251)
Unemployment rate (t-1)	-0.015 (0.037)	-0.037 (0.043)	-0.040 (0.035)	-0.006 (0.008)	-0.077** (0.034)	-0.061 (0.073)
female_it	0.761*** (0.229)	0.703*** (0.262)	0.464* (0.260)	0.137*** (0.050)	0.138 (0.276)	-0.047 (0.536)
age	-0.007 (0.010)	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.006 (0.009)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.011 (0.012)	-0.004 (0.027)
tenure	-0.042** (0.021)	-0.012 (0.029)	0.015 (0.027)	-0.003 (0.005)	0.075* (0.039)	0.084 (0.086)
delegation	8.906*** (0.529)	7.738*** (0.691)	8.029*** (0.529)	1.671*** (0.124)	15.333*** (1.185)	35.096*** (2.806)
degree1	0.061 (0.183)	0.075 (0.239)	0.157 (0.205)	0.032 (0.037)	-0.079 (0.303)	0.090 (0.614)
degree2	-0.464** (0.208)	-0.230 (0.254)	-0.266 (0.215)	-0.054 (0.042)	-0.454 (0.338)	-0.367 (0.707)
degree3	0.141 (0.352)	-0.156 (0.419)	0.358 (0.340)	0.023 (0.076)	0.149 (0.522)	0.004 (1.016)
degree4	0.383 (0.350)	0.237 (0.448)	0.608 (0.405)	0.066 (0.076)	0.394 (0.467)	0.880 (1.011)
degree5	-0.135 (0.282)	-0.367 (0.362)	-0.091 (0.285)	-0.022 (0.060)	-0.214 (0.545)	-0.009 (1.224)
degree6	0.357 (0.347)	0.521 (0.362)	0.495 (0.414)	0.119 (0.077)	0.439 (0.593)	0.929 (1.249)
Constant	-7.718** (3.682)	-4.072 (5.323)	-0.249 (3.939)	-3.959*** (0.918)		
Country effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	390	380	362	352	352	352
R-squared	0.909	0.874	0.906	0.906		

Notes: Alternative estimators and dependent variables identified in rows 2 and 3, respectively. Economics, degree1; Law, degree2; Management, degree3; Finance/Accounting, degree4; Other social sciences, degree5; “Hard sciences”, degree6. Constant term as well as country and time effects (where applicable) omitted for reasons of parsimony. Clustered standard errors in parenthesis. *, **, *** denote statistical significance at the 10, 5 and 1 percent level, respectively.

APPENDIX

List of countries

United Kingdom, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, Spain, Cyprus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, Lithuania, Slovenia, Poland.

Table A1 – Quantitative ordinal credit rating transformation

	Ordinal scale	S&P	Moody's	Fitch
Highest quality	21	AAA	Aaa	AAA
High quality	20	AA+	Aa1	AA+
	19	AA	Aa2	AA
	18	AA-	Aa3	AA-
Strong payment capacity	17	A+	A1	A+
	16	A	A2	A
	15	A-	A3	A-
Adequate payment capacity	14	BBB+	Baa1	BBB+
	13	BBB	Baa2	BBB
	12	BBB-	Baa3	BBB-
Likely to fulfil obligations, ongoing uncertainty	11	BB+	Ba1	BB+
	10	BB	Ba2	BB
	9	BB-	Ba3	BB-
High credit risk	8	B+	B1	B+
	7	B	B2	B
	6	B-	B3	B-
Very high credit risk	5	CCC+	Caa1	CCC+
	4	CCC	Caa2	CCC
	3	CCC-	Caa4	CCC-
Near default with possibility of recovery	2	CC	Ca	CC
	1	C	C	C
Default	0	SD/D		DDD/DD/D

Table A2 – Sensitivity Analysis: adding finance ministers’ characteristics one at a time

<i>Specification</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
<i>Regressors</i>										
Real GDP per capita (t-1)	4.323*** (1.364)	4.211*** (1.337)	4.165*** (1.363)	4.152*** (1.356)	4.053*** (1.376)	4.120*** (1.347)	4.181*** (1.361)	4.153*** (1.359)	4.145*** (1.348)	4.355*** (1.338)
Real GDP growth (t-1)	0.250*** (0.064)	0.248*** (0.064)	0.251*** (0.064)	0.249*** (0.064)	0.248*** (0.063)	0.245*** (0.061)	0.253*** (0.064)	0.244*** (0.068)	0.249*** (0.064)	0.247*** (0.064)
Inflation rate (t-1)	0.001 (0.001)									
Terms-of-trade (t-1)	0.043** (0.017)	0.045** (0.017)	0.043** (0.017)	0.043** (0.017)	0.047*** (0.018)	0.046*** (0.017)	0.041** (0.017)	0.042** (0.017)	0.043** (0.017)	0.043** (0.017)
Debt-to-GDP ratio (t-1)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.043*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.043*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.043*** (0.009)
Foreign reserves (t-1)	0.215* (0.130)	0.218* (0.130)	0.216* (0.131)	0.217* (0.130)	0.228* (0.132)	0.220* (0.128)	0.221* (0.130)	0.202 (0.136)	0.218* (0.129)	0.220* (0.129)
Unemployment rate (t-1)	-0.022 (0.038)	-0.027 (0.039)	-0.026 (0.038)	-0.026 (0.038)	-0.030 (0.037)	-0.026 (0.038)	-0.026 (0.038)	-0.027 (0.038)	-0.029 (0.038)	-0.024 (0.038)
female_it	0.565*** (0.217)									
age		-0.006 (0.009)								
tenure			-0.020 (0.023)							
delegation				7.918*** (0.567)						
degree1					0.161 (0.161)					
degree2						-0.316* (0.184)				
degree3							0.186 (0.295)			
degree4								0.244 (0.378)		
degree5									-0.229 (0.243)	
degree6										0.442 (0.355)
Country effects	352	352	352	352	352	352	352	352	352	352
Time effects	0.902	0.901	0.901	0.901	0.901	0.902	0.901	0.901	0.901	0.902
Observations	352	352	352	352	380	380	380	380	380	380
R-squared	0.902	0.901	0.901	0.901	0.869	0.869	0.869	0.869	0.870	0.870

Notes: Economics, degree1; Law, degree2; Management, degree3; Finance/Accounting, degree4; Other social sciences, degree5; “Hard sciences”, degree6. Constant term as well as country and time effects (where applicable) omitted for reasons of parsimony. Clustered standard errors in parenthesis. *, **, *** denote statistical significance at the 10, 5 and 1 percent level, respectively.