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Motivation

- Economic voting
- Sources of economic voting:
  - Voters rewarding incumbents
  - Attribution errors
  - Happiness
- Empirical evidence
  - Endogeneity of economic conditions
  - Even in the case of seemingly exogenous events, such as natural disasters or terrorist attacks, the shock may reveal information about the incumbent
Motivation

- Here we exploit the evidence provided by a large scale randomized natural experiment:
- The Spanish Christmas Lottery
  - Syndicate lottery: 75% of Spaniards participate, typically sharing numbers
  - And they play a relatively large quantity: on average, €70 per person
    - In total, €3 billion (0.3% of Spain’s GDP)
  - Many relatively small prizes to several thousand individuals sharing the same ticket number
  - Large economic impact:
    - The main winning province receives an average income shock equivalent to 3% of its GDP
Motivation

Convenient features:

- Several thousand families in the same network receive a positive economic shock
- Not a gamblers’ lottery, but more of a social interaction
- It is public knowledge that the shock is exogenous
- The incumbent is not expected to play any role anticipating or reacting to the shock
Motivation

Results:

- We find that a shock in lottery prizes equivalent to 1% of provincial GDP is associated with a (significant) increase in votes for the incumbent of 0.21 percentage points.
- In terms of votes, we estimate that for every winning fraction, the incumbent receives 0.6 additional votes.
- What is the source of the effect?
  - Winners should be well aware of the random nature of the lottery.
  - Survey information suggests that lottery prizes do not affect voters’ assessment of the incumbent.
- Alternative explanations?
  - Increases in wealth may reinforce voters’ preference for the status quo.
  - Happiness.
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Literature

- Descriptive evidence:
  - Pearson and Myers (1948)
  - Kramer (1971)
  - Fair (1978)
  - Lewis-Beck (1988)
  - Brender and Drazen (2008)

- Exogenous variations in economic conditions:
  - Wolfers (2002)
  - Brunner et al. (2008)

- Other exogenous factors that may affect voting:
  - Natural disasters: Healy and Malhotra (2010)
  - Terrorist attacks: Gardeazabal (2010), Montalvo (2010)
  - Sports outcomes: Healy et al. (2010)
Ohio Lottery:
- Labor supply, earnings, savings and consumption (Imbens et al. 2001)
- Health and mortality (Lindahl 2005)
- Physical and mental health (Apouey and Clark 2009)
- Marriage and divorce (Hankins and Hoekstra 2011)
- Individual bankruptcy (Hankins et al. 2011)
- Neighbors’ consumption (Kuhn et al. 2011)

Our paper:
- Not a gamblers’ lottery
- The impact of an increase in the unearned income of a community, not a single individual
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Political System in Spain

- After Franco’s death, the first democratic election was held in 1977
- Between 1986 and 2008 there have been seven national elections
- Two political parties have been in power: the Socialist Party (14 years) and the People’s Party (8 years)
Spanish Christmas Lottery

- The lottery is always held on December 22
- Origin can be traced back to 1812
- Syndicate play started in 1862
- Biggest lottery event worldwide: approximately €3 billion (0.3% of Spain’s GDP)
Spanish Christmas Lottery

- 85,000 numbers
- 1,950 fractions (“tickets”) per number (€20 each)
- Fractions are often divided into shares, at a cost of between €2 and €5.
- Depending on how many fractions and shares have been sold, for each number there might exist somewhere between 2,000 and 20,000 ticket holders.
Spanish Christmas Lottery

- Strict rules regulate the process
- Three top prizes, and 13,334 smaller prizes
- The amount received for a winning ticket (€20) holder is:
  - First prize: €300,000
  - Second prize: €100,000
  - Third prize: €50,000
Spanish Christmas Lottery

- 75% of the Spanish population plays
- On average, they spend €70 per person
- Roughly similar amounts:
  - Conservative voters spend an average €6 more
  - University (high school) graduates spend €6 (15) more than high school dropouts
  - Men spend €15 more
  - No differences according to age
- 87% of Christmas lottery buyers syndicate play:
  - with relatives: 64%
  - with friends: 33%
  - with co-workers: 28%
- Most fractions are sold in the same outlet
- Most buyers live in the same location (exception: town of Sort)
Spanish town celebrates after winning £600m on lottery - except for one man who FORGOT to buy his ticket | Mail Online

Jackpot joy: The people of Granen celebrate winning the Christmas lottery in Spain by doing the Conga. The winning tickets were all bought in the small town and the surrounding villages including Sodeto which has around 70 houses.
The unluckiest man in the world: Only person in whole of Spanish village who didn't win a share of £600m lottery jackpot (because he didn't buy a ticket)

- Costis Mitsotakis was missed off as residents went round collecting money for the draw
- Every other home in Sodeto, northwest Spain, had at least one winning ticket in the Christmas draw
- A single £4 ticket would have won him £83,000
- Some households bought several tickets and became millionaires

By Rob Cooper

UPDATED: 18:59 GMT, 3 February 2012
Spanish town celebrates after winning £600m on lottery – except for one man who FORGOT to buy his ticket | Mail Online

World’s unluckiest man: Costis Mitsotakis is the only person in Sodeto who did not win a share of the El Gordo Christmas lottery jackpot after he didn’t buy a ticket
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Data

- At the Individual Level:
  1. Survey data on Christmas Lottery (6 surveys; 12,000 observations)
  2. Survey data on Voting (100 surveys; 300,000 observations)
- At the Provincial Level:
  1. Electoral (national elections)
  2. Macroeconomic
  3. Christmas Lottery prizes and expenditure
Table: Descriptive Statistics - Information at the Provincial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Electoral data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral roll (in thousands)</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4459</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter turnout (%)</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>49.97</td>
<td>84.15</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent votes (%)</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>65.31</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party votes (%)</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Party votes (%)</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>65.31</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Macroeconomic variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (in thousands)</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>14,267</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>27,238</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposable income per capita</td>
<td>10,395</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>6,105</td>
<td>16,985</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transfers per capita</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank deposits per capita</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>28,929</td>
<td>1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank loans per capita</td>
<td>11,855</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>40,983</td>
<td>1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle registrations (per 1,000 pop.)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing price/m²</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate (%)</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>61.69</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force participation (%)</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>38.05</td>
<td>67.25</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (%)</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: Descriptive Statistics - Information at the Provincial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Christmas Lottery: All provinces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure (% GDP)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top prizes (% GDP)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per capita</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top prizes per capita</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of winning fractions</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning fractions per capita (%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Christmas Lottery: Winning province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure (% GDP)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top prizes (% GDP)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per capita</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top prizes per capita</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of winning fractions</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning fractions per capita (%)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christmas Lottery top prize at the provincial level (% of GDP)
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Christmas Lottery and Economic conditions

- Size of the unexpected temporary income shock: €75k-300k
- Spanish survey of household finances (2005)
  - Income: €32k
  - (Net) Assets: €257k (80% real estate, 9% own business, 5% bank accounts, 6% other)
  - Debts: €30k
  - Permanent income (back of the envelope calculation): Approximately €1 million
- On average the Fatty represents a 7.5%-30% increase in permanent income
The (short term) effect of lottery prizes on lottery winners

- Consumption
- Durable goods: housing, car.
- Saving
  - Bank accounts
  - Cancel debts (*tapar agujeros*)
- Labour market supply
  - Intensive margin (as in Imbens et al. 2002)
  - Extensive margin (population aged 55-64)

The impact on non winners living in the same province

- Demand shock (market for goods and services, labour market)
  - Spanish provinces are small very open economies (openness=175%)
- Social effects
  - Effect on neighbours’ consumption (as in Kuhn et al. 2011)
Overall

- Increase in income
- Increase in bank deposits
- Increase in consumption of durable goods
- Ambiguous effect on total loans
- Ambiguous effect on economic activity
- Ambiguous effect on labour supply
Is the Christmas Lottery really random?

● We estimate the following set of equations:

\[ \Delta_{t,t-1} y_s = \alpha + \beta Prizes_{s,t+1} + \gamma Expenditure_{s,t+1} + \varepsilon_{s,t} \]  

(1)

where \( \Delta_{t,t-1} y_s \) denotes the variation in a certain macroeconomic variable for province \( s \) between year \( t \) and year \( t - 1 \), \( Prizes_{s,t+1} \) denotes the Christmas Lottery prizes collected in year \( t + 1 \), and \( Expenditure_{s,t+1} \) refers to the value of Christmas Lottery tickets sold. All variables are measured in per capita terms.

● We use population weights and we cluster standard errors at the province level.
Table: The ‘Effect’ of Christmas Lottery Prizes on Past Economic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep. var.:</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Other transfers</th>
<th>Income (excl. Other transfers)</th>
<th>Bank deposits</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>Housing prices</th>
<th>Employment rate</th>
<th>Labor force participation</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
<th>GDP</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Consumer price index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_{t-1,t}$</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The macroeconomic effects of the Christmas Lottery

- We estimate the following set of equations:

\[
\Delta_{t+k,t} y_s = \alpha + \beta Prizes_{s,t+1} + \gamma Expenditure_{s,t+1} + \varepsilon_{s,t}, \text{ for } k = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad (2)
\]

where \(y\) denotes a certain macroeconomic variable.
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**Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income (excl. other transfers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deposits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1.5</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1.5</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-20</th>
<th>-15</th>
<th>-10</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Prices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Labor Force Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unemployment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GDP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-0.5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Politicians’ Luck of the Draw: Evidence from the Spanish Christmas Lottery**
Economic conditions and electoral outcomes

We estimate the following equation:

\[ \Delta Votes_{st} = \alpha_t + \beta \Delta Economic\ variables_{st} + \varepsilon_{st} \] (3)

where \( \Delta Votes_{st} \) denotes the variation in the percentage of votes received in province \( s \) by the incumbent party in the national elections between the election in year \( t \) and the previous election.
Table: The Effect of Economic Conditions on Electoral Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>Δ Votes for Incumbent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ GDP per capita</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Unemployment</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ CPI</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Housing prices</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-sq</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election fixed-effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christmas Lottery and electoral outcomes

- We estimate the following equation:

\[
\Delta Votes_{st} = \alpha_t + \beta Prizes_{st} + \gamma Expenditure_{st} + \varepsilon_{st}
\]  

(4)

where \( Prizes_{st} \) denotes the total income in Spanish Christmas Lottery prizes as percentage of GDP received by province \( s \) in the years prior to the election in year \( t \), and \( Expenditure_{st} \) is the expenditure on the Christmas Lottery as percentage of GDP during the same period.

- Our identification strategy makes use of the fact that, conditional on lottery expenditure, the lottery prizes are randomly distributed.
Table: The Effect of Christmas Lottery Prizes on Electoral Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>All incumbents</th>
<th>Ex. Sort</th>
<th>Left-wing</th>
<th>Right-wing</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery prizes</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery expenditure</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning tickets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per capita (%)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic conditions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province fixed-effects</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population weights</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-sq</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table: The Effect of Christmas Lottery Prizes on Voter Turnout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>( \Delta \text{ Voter Turnout} ) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All incumbents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery prizes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery expenditure</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election fixed-effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province fixed-effects</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population weights</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-sq</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Christmas Lottery and Electoral Outcomes

- Effect on voter turnout
  - Negative not significant. It could explain about 1/3 of the effect on votes maximum

- Timing of the effect
  - The effect dies out after one year and a half

- Different prizes
  - Only the top prize, the Fatty, has a significant impact on voting

- Placebo
  - Prizes have no effect on previous elections
Sources of economic voting

- Incumbent tends to receive more votes in provinces awarded with *the Fatty*, particularly in elections held shortly after the prize is received.
- However, we do not know why this happens.
  - Are individuals wrongly attributing lottery prizes to the incumbent?
- Next we turn to survey data:
  - Survey is performed three weeks after Christmas Lottery is held.
  - Individuals are directly asked to assess the incumbent’s performance.
Sources of economic voting

- Survey information
  - If the national elections were to be held tomorrow, which party would you vote for?
  - Overall, how would you describe the job the governing party is doing: very good, good, average, poor, very poor?
  - In general, how would you describe the political action taken by the opposition party: very good, good, average, poor, very poor?
  - Regarding Spain’s overall economic situation, how would you describe it: very good, good, average, poor, very poor?
  - Regarding Spain’s overall political situation, how would you describe it: very good, good, average, poor, very poor?
Sources of economic voting

- The general specification that we use is as follows:

\[ z_{ist} = X_{it} \alpha + \beta Prizes_{st-1} + \gamma Expenditure_{st-1} + \sum_t \delta_t S_t + \sum_{st} \lambda_{st} D_{st} + \varepsilon_{ist} \]  

(5)

where \( z_{ist} \) denotes the survey responses of individual \( i \) in province \( s \) at time \( t \), \( X_{it} \) is a vector of individual characteristics, \( Prizes_{st-1} \) denotes the Christmas Lottery income awarded in the province the month prior to the survey as percentage of GDP, and \( Expenditure_{st-1} \) is the corresponding expenditure on the Christmas Lottery. \( S_t \) is a set of survey dummies and \( D_{st} \) is a set of dummies for period and province, where each period includes three surveys before Christmas (April, July and October) and a survey after Christmas (January). In other words, we are comparing survey responses in the same province before and shortly after Christmas.
**Table: Survey Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep. variable:</th>
<th>Vote for incumbent</th>
<th>Vote for another party</th>
<th>Unknown/Did not vote</th>
<th>Sympathy incumbent</th>
<th>Assessment incumbent</th>
<th>Assessment opposition</th>
<th>Economic situation</th>
<th>Political situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Voted for incumbent</td>
<td>Voted for another party</td>
<td>Unknown/ Did not vote</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery prizes</td>
<td>0.012**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.0019)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery expenditure</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.097)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R-sq</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>287163</td>
<td>91692</td>
<td>78670</td>
<td>92546</td>
<td>269926</td>
<td>235789</td>
<td>182337</td>
<td>219147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusions

- We find that the incumbent party tends to obtain relatively more votes in winning provinces.
- Respondents in winning provinces are more likely to vote for the incumbent, but they do not seem to think that the incumbent is more competent, or that the national economic or political situations have improved.

Explanations?
- Our results do not point towards the hypothesis of attribution errors.
- Our results are more consistent with two possibilities:
  - Increases in wealth may reinforce voters’ preference for the status quo.
  - Or, perhaps when voters are happier, they become more lenient with the incumbent.