arXiv:2012.01331v7 [econ.GN] 7 Nov 2022

Accountability and Motivation

Liqun Liu*

November 8, 2022

Abstract

We build a formal model that examines how different policymaking environments shape career-concerned officials' reform decisions and implementation. When career concerns are strong, officials will inefficiently initiate reforms to signal to the central government that they are congruent. To improve the quality of reform policymaking, the central government must hold officials accountable to policy outcomes. We demonstrate that the central government can exercise this accountability by requiring officials to publicize policy outcomes while maintain secrecy on implementation details. In this situation, officials can signal their congruence only through a desirable policy outcome, so they are highly motivated to carry out a reform well. We also demonstrate that the accountability on policy outcomes is infeasible under alternative policymaking environments. We apply the results to China's recent practice in decentralized reform policymaking.

Keywords: Accountability; Motivation; Pandering; Transparency

*Email: liuliqunallen@gmail.com.

1 Introduction

There is a widespread perception that decentralized policymaking, especially those regarding reform decisions, is a cause of China's splendid economic growth since the Opening-up era. Under a hierarchical political system, decentralized policymaking confers at least two benefits compared with command and control. First, it allows the central government to diversify the risk embedded in reform decisions (e.g., Heilmann (2008b); Heilmann et al. (2013)). Second, it motivates policy innovation as well as discipline local officials to act in the public interest (e.g., Qian and Weingast (1997)). Indeed, China's indigenous and successful policymaking methodology "proceeding from point to surface"– successful local initiatives can diffuse into the entire country – seems to corroborate with these scholarly wisdom. Should we therefore conclude that decentralization is the last word on China's reform policymaking?

Before answering this question, we note several stylized facts that overshadow the optimism of decentralization. One is the ambiguous cadre promotion rule faced by local officials during reform policymaking. According to Wang and Yang (2021), it is the reform outcome rather than the reform decision that matters in local officials' promotion. However, even if we do not account for the patronage network effects (e.g., Jiang (2018)), a desirable reform outcome seems unlikely to be local officials' only ladder for success. Thanks to the short tenure (typically less than 3 years), local officials often move elsewhere before the outcomes of their policy initiatives are realized (Teets and Hasmath, 2020; Zhu and Zhang, 2016). This creates incentives for local officials to engage in the wasteful "face innovation"; that is, reform merely for the appearance of reform (Teets, 2015).[1]

Another fact is the heterogeneous motives underlying local officials' reform decisions. Local officials typically have different policy or ideological preferences in carrying out a reform, despite they are subject to the same promotion system (Teets et al., 2017). For example, China's market-oriented reforms often encountered resistance by conservative local policymakers (Cai and Treisman,

[1] In fact, if local officials differ in competence, or if rival factions at the center have divided opinions about reform decisions (Cai and Treisman, 2006), then a "face innovation" has substantial signaling value for local officials' future careers.

2006; Heilmann, 2008b). For example, local actors may functionally deviate from central commands (Heilmann et al., 2013; Tsai, 2006; Van Aken and Lewis, 2015). This alludes to the possibility that even a good reform may fail when it is left at the wrong hands.

The other fact concerns China's nonnegligible institutional constraints in monitoring the implementation of policies. For example, Wong (2012) notices that China's auditing staffs are inadequately trained and low in numbers. Such a constraint can embolden local officials to engage in face innovation. To tackle deviations and ensure implementation loyalty, the central government recently requires local officials to report upward for approval before acting. But this measure can be costly, as it overloads local officials with extra administrative burdens (Teets et al., 2017; Chen, 2017). More importantly, local officials are discouraged from experimenting new ideas. Chen and Göbel (2016) show that the number of reported policy experiments has declined from 100 in 2008 to around 50 in 2013, before plummeting to less than 10.

So, a salient challenge to China's reform policymaking is how to hold local officials accountable for their reform decisions, implementation, and policy outcomes. By accountability, we mean the ability for the central government to credibly reward or punish local officials if their policymaking meets or fails a set of explicit and implicit standards. The award can be monetary, such as an enlarged financial budget; or it can be political, such as a cadre promotion to higher offices. This brings us several research questions: which accountability is desirable for the sake of policymaking? How can the central government implement the desirable kind of accountability? Under what conditions should the central government recentralize its policymaking?

To answer these questions, we build a formal model of policymaking with career concerns. The model includes a local official and the central government. Prior to the game starts, the central government chooses to what extent it oversees the policymaking. Then, the local official decides between maintaining the status quo policy and initiating a reform; in the event of a reform, he also chooses the amount of costly implementation effort. Compared with the status quo, the reform is "risky": it may fail either because it is a bad decision by nature, or because it is poorly implemented by the local official. Put differently, "choosing well" and "implementing well" are complementary to a successful reform. The local official observes the nature of a reform,

whereas the central government does not. Moreover, the local official does not necessarily share the same policy preference with the central government: with a positive probability, the official is a "congruent type," who prefers a successful reform to the status quo to a failed reform just as the principal; with the complementary probability, the official is a "noncongruent type" who prefers the status quo to any reform outcome. At the end of the policymaking, the central government decides whether to promote the official or not conditional on available information.

Through equilibrium analysis, we identify instances in which local official's career concerns can hurt reform policymaking. Generally speaking, when career concerns are strong, the local official will use a reform decision to signal his congruence with the central government, regardless of whether the reform is actually good or bad. Since the "appearance" of reform matters, policymaking is distorted in two ways: many bad reforms are wrongly initiated, and many good reforms are badly implemented. Thus, to achieve high-quality policymaking, it seems necessary to hold the local official accountable for policy outcomes. That is, the central government should credibly commit to promoting (punishing) local officials who can successfully (unsuccessfully) implement a reform. However, committing to such an incentive scheme can be extremely difficult.[2] We show that if the central government merely observes the reform decision, or if it observes the reform decision, implementation details, and policy outcomes, then whether a reform succeeds or not does not affect the local official's promotion. In other words, the accountability for policy outcomes fails in these circumstances. The idea is that in evaluating the local official, the central government places far more weights on observed actions than policy outcomes, which are nothing but the mechanical output induced by these actions. Accordingly, the local official's attention is directed to appearing congruent rather than pursuing successful policymaking. This result explains why we observe many demotivated local officials and unsustainable face innovations.

Next, we demonstrate that career concerns can also benefit reform policymaking, provided that the central government chooses the right institution design. Notably, we show that the central government can hold local officials accountable for policy outcomes with "semi-transparency": officials are required to publicize policy outcomes while maintain secrecy on implementation details (prior to a promotion decision is made). To see this, policy outcomes will convey useful information about

[2]See Mei and Pearson (2014) for an empirical study.

local officials' policy motives when some parts of their actions are concealed from the central government. Since a congruent type is more motivated than a noncongruent type to carry out good policies, the central government will update positively (negatively) from a desirable (undesirable) policy outcome. This means that in equilibrium, the central government can credibly reward a successful reform as well as punish an unsuccessful one. Anticipating this, the local official becomes very diligent to implement a reform whenever possible, as a successful reform confers both political and policy payoffs. We show that under a wide range of circumstances, semi-transparency best serves the central government's policy interest. Substantively, the central government may want to extend the policy autonomy granted to local officials, and evaluate them on the basis of performance. Stricter controls, such as requiring real time disclosure of policy progress and dispatching teams of monitors, can be counterproductive.

By studying the formal model and its extensions, we revisit two classic debates in policymaking. Regarding whether the central government should delegate reform decisions to local policymakers, our results resonate with the insights of delegation theory (e.g., Holmstrom (1977) and Bendor et al. (2001)): if the benefit from informed policymaking outweighs the loss from being unable to implement its favorable policies, the central government should delegate policymaking. Importantly, we find that if the central government lacks the capacity to enforce implementation loyatlty, then centralization is strictly dominated. Regarding whether technical decisions should be left to accountable or nonacountable officials, our results complement Maskin and Tirole (2004). They show that nonaccountable officials are more motivated than nonaccountable officials to acquire costly information about the right decision. We show that under the right incentive schemes, accountable officials may be more motivated than nonaccountable officials to exert costly implementation efforts.

This paper builds on the pandering models of policymaking, where careerist agents herd on their priors to signal smartness (Canes-Wrone et al., 2001; Levy, 2005; Prat, 2005; Fox and Van Weelden, 2012) or loyalty (Maskin and Tirole, 2004; Fox, 2007; Fox and Shotts, 2009; Fox and Jordan, 2011). Along this line, Prat (2005) and Fox and Van Weelden (2012) are closest to our study. They note that transparency on actions can incentivize decision-makers to discard useful signals to appear

smart, so more transparency is not always a blessing in policymaking. Our model devotes to finding the right kind of transparency that can link decision-makers' policymaking and political incentives, which can be valuable to motivate implementation.

Holmström (1979) has shown that under mild assumptions, a principal in a contractual relationship with an agent almost always benefits from observing more. Since then, scholars demonstrate that more information can be welfare reducing. Holmström (1999) shows that more precise information about the agent may demotivate the agent to work hard. Crémer (1995) shows that more information may hurt policymaking if the possibility of renegotiation is concerned. Dewatripont et al. (1999) show that agents may work harder if the principal receives a noisier signal about performance. Ashworth and Bueno de Mesquita (2014) show that voters' welfare may decline if they know too much about incumbent politicians' policymaking. This study shows that semi-transparency can elicit the maximum implementation effort from local officials.

2 Model

Setup. A privately informed agent (he) chooses and implements a policy on behalf of a principal (she). We think of this agent as a local official, and the principal as the central government. The agent's policy choice x can either be the status quo policy ($x = q$) or a reform ($x = r$). The status quo brings a sure policy outcome. The reform outcome can be "successful" or "unsuccessful," which depends on its state of nature ω and the agent's implementation effort e. ω could be good ($\omega = G$) or bad ($\omega = B$) with equal probability. As a policy expert, the agent observes ω; the principal does not. We suppose that "choosing well" and "implementing well" are complementary to a successful reform: a bad reform never succeeds; a good reform succeeds with a probability exactly equal to the implementation effort e chosen from $\{\underline{e}, \overline{e}, 1\}$, with $0 < \underline{e} < \overline{e} < 1$.[3] $\underline{e}$ is the "default" success probability of a good reform that an agent can achieve for free. This level of effort corresponds to the notion of "face innovation" (Teets, 2015), in which a policymaker chooses a posturing reform

[3]This specification is without loss of generality so long as a good reform's probability of success, which we denote by $p(e)$, is strictly increasing in the agent's implementation effort e. Essentially, the agent strategically chooses e as if contemplating "should I pay a cost $c(p(e))$ to ensure that a good reform succeeds with probability $p(e)$". Then, we can work directly with $p(e)$ as the agent's choice variable (simply by relabeling $p(e)$ as e in the model). See Hirsch (2016) for a similar setup.

without exerting serious effort.[4] $\underline{e} > 0$ indicates that even a good face innovation may succeed. For example, an incumbent governor may free ride on the reformist policy initiatives from her predecessor (Zhu and Zhang, 2016). The full effort $e = 1$ corresponds to the "perfect implementer" setup commonly assumed in the literature, where only "choosing well" matters (Canes-Wrone et al., 2001; Maskin and Tirole, 2004; Fox, 2007). $\overline{e} \in (\underline{e}, 1)$ reflects the possibility that an agent is often a somewhat hardworking yet imperfect implementer. The agent privately bears the implementation cost $c(e)$, which explains why perfect implementers are rare. Since $\underline{e}$ costs nothing, we set $c(\underline{e}) = 0$, $c(\overline{e}) = c > 0$, and $c(1) = \bar{c} > c$.

The agent can be one of two types. With probability $\pi \in (0, 1)$ the agent is a "congruent" or "good" type ($t = g$) whose preference is congruent with the principal. Just as the principal, the congruent agent derives a payoff of $v > 0$ from a successful reform, 0 from the status quo, and $-v$ from an unsuccessful reform.[5] With probability $1 - \pi$ the agent is a "noncongruent" or "bad" type ($t = b$). Such an agent receives a payoff of 0 from the status quo, and $-v$ from any reform outcome.[6] Regardless of his true type, the agent wants the principal to believe that he is congruent at the end of the policymaking process, when the principal makes a promotion decision. If this agent is not promoted, the principal will promote a competing agent randomly from the same pool of candidates, whose probability of being congruent is also π.

Strategies. The agent's strategy maps his type and the state of the world into his action, which can be formally written as $(\sigma(t, \omega), e(t, \omega)) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, the probability with which an agent initiates a reform and the associated implementation effort for each type $t \in \{g, b\}$ and the state $\omega \in \{G, B\}$. Notate $e(t, \omega) = \emptyset$ if $\sigma(t, \omega) = 0$ (i.e., a type-t agent who never reforms exerts null implementation effort). The principal forms beliefs about the agent's private type t based on the information available to her, and makes the promotion decision accordingly.

[4] "Face innovation is also an adaptive response to learning about promotion strategies, and manifests itself where subnational officials determine that the appearance of being innovative matters more than the outcome of the innovation." (Teets, 2015, 102).

[5] The possible payoffs from a reform are symmetrized around 0 for the sake of technical convenience; what really matters here is that a reform is risky – the principal does not wish to initiate a reform unless she believes that the reform is sufficiently likely to succeed.

[6] The noncongruent type has a variety of interpretations. For example, it may stand for the kind of policymakers captured by special interest groups and thus veto socially-beneficial policy changes (see also Fox (2007) and Fox and Shotts (2009)). Yet there can be policymakers who enact policies for moral, ideological, or political reasons, as we have mentioned in Cai and Treisman (2006) and Heilmann (2008b).

Payoffs. The principal cares about policymaking and political selection. Let $u(x, e, \omega)$ be the principal's policy payoff and Q be the probability that the promoted official is congruent. Then the principal's payoff can be written as

$$U(x, e, \omega) = u(x, e, \omega) + z \cdot Q.$$

$z > 0$ is the principal's net benefit from being able to promote a congruent agent vis-à-vis a noncongruent type. The interpretation of z can vary. For example, a congruent agent can be a more loyal ally or a better implementer for a reform project in the future. When the current agent is promoted under environment J (to be specified shortly), Q equals the principal's posterior probability μ^J that the current agent is congruent. If a competitor is promoted, Q equals π.

The agent cares about policymaking and promotion. Specifically, an office perk $R > 0$ goes to whoever is promoted. Let $u_t(x, e, \omega)$ be a type-t agent's policy payoff. Then his total payoff can be written as

$$U_t(x, e, \omega) = \begin{cases} u_t(x, e, \omega) - c(e) + R, & \text{if reelected} \\ u_t(x, e, \omega) - c(e), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Parameter restrictions. Now, we impose parameter restrictions to highlight the agent's motivation problem. A noncongruent type averts reform policies due to antagonistic policy dispositions or ideological preferences. Nonetheless, such a type is willing to engage in face innovation for career purposes. We suppose $v \leq R\underline{e}$ to ensure that career incentives justify face innovation: a noncongruent agent is willing to gamble for resurrection if he anticipates that a successful reform leads to promotion. However, since a noncongruent type lacks an intrinsic motivation to reform, the maximal amount of effort he may exert is limited. We suppose $R - \bar{c} \leq v$ to guarantee that the noncongruent type never exerts full effort, even if doing so secures promotion.

Next, we turn to the congruent type. Because the effort cost is privately borne, such a type tends to undersupply the implementation effort compared with the principal's desired level. To make the problem interesting, we assume that the congruent agent *can* be motivated into a perfect

implementer if the right incentive scheme is provided. We suppose (1) $\max\{v-\bar{c}, v(2\underline{e}-1)\} < v(2\overline{e}-1)-c$, which ensures that a congruent type without career concerns will reform with effort $\bar{e}$ when the state is good; (2) $v+R-\bar{c} \geq v(2\overline{e}-1)+R\overline{e}-c$, which ensures that a congruent type who expects a promotion conditional on a successful reform will reform with full effort when the state is good.

We collect the parameter restrictions below.

Assumption 1 (Motivatable agent)**.** *The parameters* $(v, R, \underline{e}, \bar{e}, c, \bar{c})$ *satisfy*

1. $R-\bar{c} \leq v \leq R\underline{e}$
2. $2v+R \geq \frac{\bar{c}-c}{1-\bar{e}} > 2v > \frac{c}{\bar{e}-\underline{e}}$

In Appendix A, we show that parameter restrictions are quite benign. For example, if $\underline{e}, \bar{e}$ satisfy $\bar{e}+2\underline{e}\bar{e} \leq 3\underline{e}$, then Assumption 1 holds for a rich set of cost structures $(c, \bar{c})$ and incentives (R, v).

Information structure. At least within the context of China's reform policymaking, the central government almost always observes whether a reform decision has been carried out locally. This renders three policymaking environments salient.

We begin by describing the situation in which the principal observes nothing but the reform decision before evaluating the agent. We refer to this environment as *Non-Transparency* (NT). With (NT), the principal's promotion decision must be made before the implementation details and consequences of policymaking become available. For example, a politician may be up for election or cadre promotion shortly. The principal evaluates agent's congruence by

$$\mu^{NT}(x) := P(t=g|x), \qquad x \in \{r, q\}.$$

Next, we consider situations in which the principal observes the policy consequences in addition to the reform decision. Such an information structure mirrors the "feedback" case of Canes-Wrone et al. (2001) and Maskin and Tirole (2004), as well as the policy advocacy "link promotion to longer-term results even once the official is transferred" (Teets, 2015, 103). Depend-

ing on whether the agent's effort is observable, the policymaking environments can be further classified into *Full-Transparency* (FT) and *Semi-Transparency* (ST).

With (FT), the principal observes every element of policymaking, including the policy decision x, implementation effort e, and the consequences y. This setting gives the principal the maximal control over the agent. For example, the central government may dispatch supervisors to monitor the implementation of reforms in local areas. For example, to minimize policy deviations, China recently adopts the new guideline "System of Requesting Instructions and Submitting Reports", which requires local officials to report upward before acting (Chen, 2017). The principal evaluates agent's congruence by

$$\mu^{FT}(x,y,e) := \begin{cases} P(t=g|r,y,e), x=r, y\in\{S,F\}, e\in\{\underline{e},\overline{e},1\} \\ P(t=b|q), x=q \end{cases}$$

where S means "successful reform" and F means "unsuccessful reform."

With (ST), the agent's private implementation effort is unobserved. Such an information structure occurs either because of secrecy concerns,[7] or because the central government's control over is moderate. In this setting, the principal evaluates the agent's congruence by

$$\mu^{ST}(x,y) := P(t=g|x,y), \qquad x\in\{r,q\}, y\in\{q,S,F\}.$$

Timing of the game.

1. Nature picks the random variables (ω, t) according to the prior distributions.

2. The agent observes ω, t, and chooses $x\in\{r,q\}$. Conditional on $x=r$, he chooses implementation effort $e\in\{\underline{e},\bar{e},1\}$.

3. The policy consequence y is realized.

4. The principal decides whether to reelect the agent conditional on her available information.

[7] According to Frankel (2001), more than 30 countries allow for some short-term form of secrecy (quoted from Prat (2005)).

5. All players' payoffs are realized.

Solution concept. The solution concept is Perfect Bayesian Equilibrium (PBE). It requires the principal to form beliefs about agent's type t by the Bayes rule whenever possible, and act in a way that respects sequential rationality. We apply the universal divinity criterion from Banks and Sobel (1987) to strike out PBEs with "unreasonable" off-path beliefs.[8] Loosely speaking, the divinity criterion requires that whenever an unexpected action occurs, it comes from the type of agent who is most likely to benefit from it.

3 Analysis

In this section, we first compare the agent's equilibrium behaviors in policymaking under three information structures. After that, we analyze the principal-optimal information structure. We conclude with discussing a few extensions.

3.1 Equilibria

Proposition 1 (Policymaking under different information structures)**.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Then,*

1. *Non-Transparency (NT) begets demotivation: everyone chooses face innovation excepts that the congruent type may reform with $e = \overline{e}$ when $\omega = G$.*

2. *Full-Transparency (FT) begets separation or pooling: if $R < v + c$, the noncongruent type always chooses the status quo; the congruent type reforms with $e = \overline{e}$ if $\omega = G$, and chooses the status quo if $\omega = B$. If $R > v + c$, both types reform with $e = \overline{e}$ regardless of ω.*

3. *Semi-Transparency (ST) begets motivation: when $\omega = B$, both types choose the status quo; when $\omega = G$, the congruent type reforms with $e = 1$ whereas the noncongruent type reforms with $e \geq \underline{e}$.*

[8] For example, if the principal does not observe the reform details and consequences, an equilibrium exists in which the agent maintains the status quo, supported by the off-path belief that whoever reforms is noncongruent. This equilibrium is nonetheless unsatisfying, because a congruent agent always benefits more from a reform than a noncongruent type. The divinity refinement rules out such a possibility.

Proof. In Appendix B.1 □

With (NT), strong office-holding motives encourage the agent to pander to the ex ante popular decision "reform" without utilizing his information expertise. In equilibrium, the principal promotes the agent if and only if a reform is observed; the principal learns nothing about the agent's type through policymaking. Such an equilibrium corresponds to the "full pandering" equilibrium in Maskin and Tirole (2004). Notably, since the agent's career is tied to the policy decision rather than its consequences, the principal cannot motivate policy implementation by committing to a performance-based promotion rule. This distorts reform decisions (due to wrongly reform when the state is bad) and demotivates reform implementation. The principal's equilibrium payoff is

$$\begin{aligned} W^{NT} &= \frac{1}{2}(\pi(2\overline{e}-1)+(1-\pi)(2\underline{e}-1))v+\frac{1}{2}(-v)+z\pi \\ &= (\pi\overline{e}+(1-\pi)\underline{e}-1)v+z\pi. \end{aligned}$$

Switching from (NT) to (FT), the noncongruent type becomes less willing to mimic the congruent type, because extra costly actions are to be taken. In equilibrium, the congruent type (partially) separates from the noncongruent type if the office motive is weak ($R < v + c$), and pools with the noncongruent type if the office motive is strong ($R > v + c$). In both situations, the agent's future career is attached to the actions rather than policy consequences. This suggests that the agent tends to supply less implementation effort than the principal's desired level to save on cost. The principal's equilibrium payoff is

$$W^{FT} = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{2}(2\overline{e}-1)v+z(\pi+(1-\pi)\pi), R<v+c \\ (\bar{e}-1)v+z\pi, R>v+c \end{cases}$$

With (ST), since parts of the agent's actions are concealed, the principal relies on the policy outcome as a noisy signal to learn about the agent. Knowing that a reform in the hand of a congruent agent is more likely to succeed than in the hand of a noncongruent type, the principal will update positively (negatively) about the agent's congruence conditional on a successful (unsuccessful) reform. Consequently, whenever both types reform on path, the principal's promotion

decision must vary with the reform outcome. With such an incentive scheme, a successful reform confers the agent both policy and political payoffs, thus creating higher-powered incentives for reform implementation. In equilibrium, both types reform when the state is good, whereas both types maintain the status quo when the state is bad. The principal promotes whoever successfully reforms; she does not reward the status quo to deter the noncongruent type from deviating. The principal's equilibrium payoff is

$$W^{ST} \geq \frac{1}{2}(\pi + (1-\pi)(2\underline{e} - 1))v + z[\pi + (1-\pi)\pi(1 - \frac{\underline{e}}{2})]$$

where the inequality reflects the possibility that the noncongruent agent may exert effort more than $\underline{e}$ when $\omega = G$.

Now, we compare the strategic interactions under different information structures. Generally, career concerns give rise to pandering incentives. More transparency deters the noncongruent type from signaling congruence via costly means, which makes it easier for the principal to sort types. However, if career concerns are overwhelmingly strong ($R > c + v$), then more transparency may not improve sorting.

Importantly, we do not observe a monotone pattern between transparency and the quality of policymaking. In fact, if motivating implementation plays a central role in policymaking, the principal should back away from full or no transparency. To provide an intuition for this result, note that the (distribution of) policy outcome is fully determined by the agent's set of actions. When these actions are observed, the induced policy outcomes do not convey any additional information about the agent's private type. Thus, under *Full-Transparency* and *Non-Transparency*, the principal is unlikely to condition her promotion decision on the policy outcomes. This means that only under *Semi-Transparency* can the agent's policy and political payoffs be linked.

3.2 Welfare analysis

Now, we are in a good position to compare the principal's welfare under different information structures. If the selection motive dominates (e.g., z is sufficiently large), then the principal generally should increase transparency to screen the agent. This result is uninteresting, because

it essentially replicates the well-known results that more transparency improves sorting.[9] So, the analysis below focuses on the case where the principal places negligible weights on political selection ($z \approx 0$). This is a realistic and useful benchmark for institution design. For example, a lame duck principal wants to leave a policy legacy for today rather than tomorrow. If we have established the benchmark results about a policy-driven principal, once political selection becomes more heavily weighted, the principal-optimal institution design should generally gear toward more transparency.

Proposition 2 (Institution design)**.** *For a policy-driven principal ($z \approx 0$),*

1. *Non-Transparency always induces the lowest welfare.*

2. *Suppose the noncongruent type implements a reform with an effort $\underline{e}$ when $\omega = G$. When $R < v + c$, Semi-Transparency is optimal if and only if $\frac{\pi}{1-\pi} \geq \frac{1-2\underline{e}}{2(1-\overline{e})}$; When $R > v + c$ Semi-Transparency is optimal if and only if $\pi \geq \frac{2(\overline{e}-\underline{e})-1}{2(1-\underline{e})}$.*

Proof. This follows from a direct comparison of W^{NT}, W^{FT}, and W^{ST}. □

Part I of this proposition says a policy-driven principal should never consider *Non-Transparency*, as both types of the agent will choose face innovation in this setting. Part II characterizes the conditions under which *Semi-Transparency* (ST) and *Full-Transparency* (FT) may prevail as the principal's optimal institution. To provide an intuition, we compare the policy distortion corresponding to each environment. Under (ST), the only policy distortion comes from the noncongruent type who undersupplies the implementation effort of a reform when the state is good. Under (FT), two kinds of distortion may arise: the congruent type undersupplies the implementation effort to save on the cost, and the noncongruent type inefficiently chooses the reform decision. So, if face innovation is not a terrible problem compared with the status quo ($\underline{e}$ is large), or if the agent is sufficiently likely to be congruent (π large), then (ST) is likely to be the principal's best practice. Conversely, if face innovation is doomed to fail ($\underline{e}$ is small) and the reform decision-making suffers from a shortage of reformers (π small), then (FT) may prevail, because it guarantees the quality of implementation to be at least $\overline{e}$.

[9] In contract theory, more observables tend to improve sorting but hurt discipline (e.g., Crémer (1995); Dewatripont et al. (1999); Holmström (1999)).

Before proceeding, we relate our results to prior works. Existing theories debate about whether "transparency on action" or "transparency on consequence" will improve the quality of policymaking. Prat (2005) shows that transparency on consequence almost always improves policymaking, because it encourages career-concerned political agent to choose the best course of actions. Fox and Van Weelden (2012) show that the result is sensitive to the cost structure of policy mistakes. Under certain conditions, it is never optimal to have transparency on both action and consequences. One key assumption driving the theoretical results is that one cannot perfectly deduce the agent's action from the policy outcomes. Thus, making actions unobservable can reduce the agent's incentive to signal smartness by pandering to the ex ante popular action.

However, their results do not fully carry through to reform policymaking, particularly in the China context. One obvious reason is that the central government can almost always observe the reform decisions. More importantly, from reform policymaking, one can always deduce whether a reform has taken place from any one of the three potential outcomes "successful reform," "unsuccessful reform," and "status quo." Since transparency on outcome is almost always a part of the optimal institution design, the discussion about "transparency on the reform decision" is redundant. So, in the context of reform policymaking, the real focus seems to be whether the central government should allow for transparency on implementation. In fact, the "System of Requesting Instructions and Submitting Reports" is designed for this purpose.

3.3 Discussions

In this section, we revisit several key assumptions of the baseline model.

a. Alternative information structure

In the baseline model, we omit a plausible information structure where the principal observes the policy decision and implementation efforts, but not the consequences. As we have explicated in Section 3.1, the observed actions rather than their induced policy outcomes contain all relevant information for the principal's promotion decision. In this situation, the agent faces exactly the same policy and career incentives as under *Full-Transparency*. Thus, studying this information

structure would be repetitive. For policy outcomes to be relevant for the promotion decision, a necessary condition is that the principal cannot observe the agent's entire set of actions.

b. Generality

We keep the baseline model parsimonious to deliver the core insights. In the Supplementary Appendix, we study a more general version of the model, featuring an imbalanced prior for the state ω, a continuum of effort e with a convex cost, and the agent is imperfectly informed about the state. We show that, under benign conditions, motivation is made plausible only under *Semi-Transparency*, for reasons we have explicated in the baseline model. Moreover, in terms of welfare, the principal favors *Semi-Transparency* if motivating implementation is overwhelmingly important. This extension indicates that our results are indeed robust.

4 Policy Implications

In this section, we discuss the policy implications of the model.

4.1 Delegation vs centralization

Since 2017, China has started to limit the policy discretion of local governments. While this practice is meant to ensure implementation loyalty, scholars are concerned about the possibility that the ongoing recentralization process may eventually reverse to command and control. Historically, China's policy experimentation had taken a top-down approach. For example, *Hongqi*, a political theory journal published by the Chinese Communist Party, wrote "All local efforts were to be unified in executing every new policy or ideological clue that came from the Party Center" in 1959 (quoted in Heilmann (2008a, pp15)). To examine how such a command and control practice may affect the quantity and quality of policy innovation in China, we add "centralization" as a possible institution design to the baseline model. Under centralization, the (less informed) central government mandates the policy choice between a reform and the status quo, whereas local officials implement the policy. To make the results more general, we suppose that the reform is good by

nature with probability p (i.e., $P(\omega = G) = p$).

Since the central government does not observe the state of a reform ω, it enacts policies depending on whether the prior on ω favors a reform or the status quo. So, even if policies can be perfectly implemented by local officials, centralization prevents the central government from adapting the policy to the state ω. Thus, the central government should delegate reform decisions whenever informed policymaking really matters. Such an observation resonates with numerous scholarly works in the theory of delegation (e.g., Holmstrom (1980); Bendor et al. (2001)).

More importantly, in the event of a reform, centralization may prevent the central government from eliciting sufficient implementation efforts from local officials. Such demotivation happens because local officials cannot signal their loyalty or competence by executing mandated actions from higher offices. When asked to implement a reform in a situation where the efforts are unverifiable, local officials are high likely to engage in face innovation, which is clearly suboptimal for policymaking. Indeed, within a hierarchical political system, the central government can resolve the shirking problem by strictly monitoring and auditing policy implementation. However, to put such a draconian measure into practice, the central government has to assemble a team of monitors with necessarily policy expertise to identify the deviants, which can be quite costly (Wong, 2012).

By contrast, delegation with a moderate control can hold local officials accountable to policy outcomes. Notably, the local official behaves as an almost-perfect agent under *Semi-Transparency*: he chooses policies responsively to the state of a reform, and implements a reform diligently whenever necessary. The only downside is that sometimes the central government may lose control over a bad type who undersupplies effort in a reform. If this issue is minor, either because most of local officials embrace reforms, or because the loss of control over the bad types is not serious, then the central government will benefit from delegating reform decisions.

4.2 Accountability and motivation

Another policy debate has to do with whether policymaking should be left to accountable or nonaccountable officials. According to Maskin and Tirole (2004, p.1043), nonaccountable officials are more motivated than accountable officials to acquire costly information about the optimal deci-

sion. It so happens because accountable officials can lose jobs if they choose the informed decision rather than the popular decision, whereas nonaccountable officials are immune from this career concern. Thus, allocating decision-making powers to nonaccountable officials can be preferable if motivating information acquisition matters in policymaking.

Our analysis complements the findings of Maskin and Tirole (2004) about motivation. Specifically, we demonstrate that accountability makes motivating implementation possible. Unaccountable officials are unlikely to implement a reform at the social-optimal level, as they often privately bear the cost of implementation efforts. By contrast, accountable officials who are up for election or promotion are more willing to exert implementation efforts. In the baseline model, we show how the central government can encourage implementation by committing to a performance-based cadre promotion rule that links local officials' policy and political payoffs. Substantively, if local officials already know how to choose well, accountability provides an incentive to motivate their implementation of policies.

We summarize the findings in the next Proposition:

Proposition 3. *1. If informed policymaking matters, or if monitoring is costly, then centralization hurts policymaking.*

2. If the central government prioritizes on motivating reform implementation, then reform decisions should be allocated to accountable officials.

Proof. In Appendix B.2 □

5 Conclusion

China's decentralized reform policymaking, or "experimentation under hierarchy," is often seen as the driver to China's growth during the past decades. Recently, as China's central government started to tighten the grip over local governments, the number of policy innovations has declined sharply. Motivated by these facts, we build a formal model that examines how different policymaking environments shape career-concerned officials' reform decisions and implementation. We find that under benign conditions, the central government achieves the best policy outcome by

exercising a moderate level of control over local officials. That is, the central government should delegate reform decisions to the more informed local officials, back away from knowing the details of implementation, and evaluate local officials solely based on the policy outcomes. Such a "semi-transparent" policymaking environment enables the central government to commit to a performance-based promotion rule, thereby providing local officials with high-powered incentives to implement a reform policy well. We also show that the motivation effect cannot exist when the central government uses an alternative policymaking environment. Our findings are robust to a number of extensions.

Our results contribute to the theory of policymaking in several ways. First, it sheds new light on the classic debate between delegation versus centralization. We show that if uninformed policymaking is more serious a problem than the loss of control over misaligned local officials, or if the central government cannot monitor the implementation of reform at a low cost, then delegation is preferred. Second, we identify another potential benefit of accountability compared with nonaccountability: it makes motivating implementation possible. By exercising a moderate level of control, the central government can provide local officials with the right incentives to exert substantial implementation efforts. Third, we identify different accountabilities under different institution designs. We show that policymaking is surely distorted if local officials are only accountable to their policy decisions. Depending on whether motivating implementation or minimizing policy risks should be prioritized, the central government may or may not want to back away from full transparency to exercise accountability on policy outcomes.

How should we relate the theoretical results to China's reform policymaking? One straightforward interpretation seems an advocacy for relaxing the control over local officials. As is well known, in the realm of politics, motivating local officials to work hard by committing to an explicit incentive contract can be difficult. In this paper, we demonstrate that the central government can credibly commit to a performance-based cadre promotion rule, provided that it allows for more local autonomy in policymaking. So, our results lend further support to delegation: when motivation is indispensable for policymaking, it is often a good idea for the central government to maintain an arm's length relationship with local officials.

A Compatibility of parameters

In this section, we demonstrate that a large collection of parameters is compatible with Assumption 1. Notice that $e^* = \frac{1}{2}$ is the critical implementation effort that makes a principal exactly indifferent between initiating a good reform and maintaining the status quo. So, we will focus on whether a rich set of parameters can support wherever e^* is located relative to $(\underline{e}, \overline{e})$.

To begin, we decompose Assumption 1 into (1) $R - \bar{c} \leq v \leq R\underline{e}; R + 2v \geq \frac{\bar{c}-c}{(1-\bar{e})}$ and (2) $\frac{c}{(\bar{e}-\underline{e})} < 2v < \frac{\bar{c}-c}{(1-\bar{e})}$. Part (1) describes a triangle area on the (R, v) plane, provided that parameters are compatible. We verify this by looking at whether the intersection of $R - \bar{c} = v$ and $R\underline{e} = v$, which is $(\frac{\bar{c}}{1-\underline{e}}, \frac{\underline{e}}{1-\underline{e}}\bar{c})$ is above $R + 2v = \frac{\bar{c}-c}{(1-\bar{e})}$ on the (R, v) plane. This amounts to $\frac{\bar{c}+2\underline{e}\bar{c}}{1-\underline{e}} > \frac{\bar{c}-c}{(1-\bar{e})}$, which simplifies to $\frac{c}{\bar{c}} > 1 - \frac{1-\bar{e}}{1-\underline{e}}(1 + 2\underline{e})$. Part (2) describes two parallel lines restricting the value of v, which is compatible if $\frac{c}{(\bar{e}-\underline{e})} < \frac{\bar{c}-c}{(1-\bar{e})}$ or $\frac{c}{\bar{c}} < \frac{\bar{e}-\underline{e}}{1-\underline{e}}$after simplification. Together, a necessary condition for parameter compatibility is $\frac{c}{\bar{c}} \in (1 - \frac{1-\bar{e}}{1-\underline{e}}(1 + 2\underline{e}), \frac{\bar{e}-\underline{e}}{1-\underline{e}})$. On the (R, v) plane, if the triangle intersects with the area between two parallel lines, then the entire set of parameters is compatible.

For the intersection to be nonempty, two conditions must simultaneously hold: (a) the lowest point of the triangle, $(\frac{\bar{c}(3-2\bar{e})-c}{3(1-\bar{e})}, \frac{\bar{c}\bar{e}-c}{3(1-\bar{e})})$, is below the higher of the parallel, $v = \frac{\bar{c}-c}{2(1-\bar{e})}$, and (b) the highest point of the triangle, $(\frac{\bar{c}}{1-\underline{e}}, \frac{\underline{e}\bar{c}}{1-\underline{e}})$ is above the lower of the parallel $v = \frac{c}{2(\bar{e}-\underline{e})}$, where "high" and "low" are with respect to the value of v. Condition (a) boils down to $\frac{\bar{c}\bar{e}-c}{3(1-\bar{e})} < \frac{\bar{c}-c}{2(1-\bar{e})}$, which simplifies to $\frac{c}{\bar{c}} < \frac{1}{3-2\bar{e}}$. Condition (b) boils down to $\frac{c}{\bar{c}} < \frac{2\underline{e}}{1-\underline{e}}(\bar{e} - \underline{e})$. So, if $1 - \frac{1-\bar{e}}{1-\underline{e}}(1 + 2\underline{e}) < \min\{\frac{\bar{e}-\underline{e}}{1-\underline{e}}, \frac{1}{3-2\bar{e}}, \frac{2\underline{e}}{1-\underline{e}}(\bar{e} - \underline{e})\}$, there exists a rich set of cost structure $\frac{c}{\bar{c}}$ and incentives (R, v) that ensure compatibility of parameters. Notably, since the RHS of this inequality is positive, a sufficient condition would be $1 - \frac{1-\bar{e}}{1-\underline{e}}(1 + 2\underline{e}) \leq 0$. After rearrangement, this condition simplifies to $\bar{e} + 2\underline{e}\bar{e} \leq 3\underline{e}$. It is straightforward to verify that $(\underline{e}, \bar{e})$ can take the value such as $(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{2}{3}), (\frac{3}{5}, \frac{3}{4})$.

B Proofs

We will focus on the proofs about the existence of equilibrium in the baseline model; the uniqueness part is deferred to Supplementary Appendix, where a general version of the model is studied.

B.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. 1. Under (NT), the principal observe $x = r$ on path, so her posterior belief is $P(t = g|x = r) = \pi$, which justifies a promotion decision.

Claim 1. *The off-path belief pinned down by the divinity refinement is* $P(t = g|x = q) = \frac{\pi}{2-\pi} < \pi$.

Proof. let $\tilde{p}_t(\omega)$ be the probability of promotion that makes a type-t agent who observes indifferent between deviating to $x = q$ and sticking to the equilibrium strategy. Then, $R\tilde{q}_g(G) = R + v(2\bar{e} - 1) - c$ whereas $R\tilde{q}_t(\omega) = R - v - c$ for all $(t, \omega) \neq (g, G)$. So, $\tilde{q}_g(G) > \tilde{q}_t(\omega)$ for all $(t, \omega) \neq (g, G)$. This means that a congruent agent who observes $\omega = G$ is least likely to gain from such a deviation. So, the divinity refinement will strike such a type conditional on this deviation, and stop afterwards. This means that $P(t = g|x = q) = \frac{\pi/2}{\pi/2+1-\pi} = \frac{\pi}{2-\pi} < \pi$. □

So the principal will not promote whoever chooses the status quo. Given this promotion rule, both types of agent will choose the reform $(x = r)$ for promotion. The congruent type who observes $\omega = G$ will rationally choose the implementation effort $\bar{e}$. If either the congruent type observes $\omega = B$, or if the agent is noncongruent, the lowest effort $\underline{e}$ will be chosen to minimize the cost.

2. Under (FT). For expository convenience, we do not explicitly write the policy outcome y in the calculation of posterior belief. Case I: $R < c + v$. The principal observes $(r, \bar{e})$ and $(q, 0)$ on path. Her posterior belief is $P(t = g|(r, \bar{e})) = 1$ and $P(t = g|(q, 0)) = \frac{\pi}{2-\pi} < \pi$, so she will promote if $(r, \bar{e})$ is observed and not promote if $(q, 0)$ is observed. Repeating the steps in the proof of Claim 1, her off-path belief pinned down by the divinity refinement is $P(t = g|(r, \underline{e})) = \frac{\pi}{2-\pi} < \pi$ and $P(t = g|(r, 1)) = 1$, so she will promote if $(r, 1)$ is observed and not promote if $(r, \underline{e})$ is observed. Given this rule, a congruent agent who observes $\omega = B$ and the noncongruent type receive a payoff of 0 on path, whereas the best deviation to $(r, \bar{e})$ confers a payoff of $R - c - v$. By Assumption 1, this deviation is unprofitable. A congruent

agent who observes $\omega = G$ who implements a reform with effort $\bar{e}$ receives an equilibrium payoff of $R + v(2\bar{e} - 1) - c$. By deviating to reform with effort $\underline{e}$ her payoff is $v(2\underline{e} - 1)$; by deviating to reform with effort $e = 1$ her payoff is $R + v - \bar{c}$. Both are unprofitable by Assumption 1. Case II: $R > c + v$. For the congruent type who observes $\omega = B$ and the noncongruent type, their reform decision with the implementation effort $\bar{e}$ is justified by the promotion incentives. So, by repeating the arguments in the case of (NT), we conclude that every agent will reform the implementation effort $\bar{e}$; the principal promotes if and only if $(r, \bar{e})$ and $(r, 1)$ are observed.

3. Under (ST), the principal observes (r, S), (r, F), and $x = q$ on path. Her posterior belief is $P(t = g|(r, S) = \frac{\pi}{\pi + (1-\pi)e} > \pi$ and $P(t = g|(r, F)) = 0$, where e can take the value of $\underline{e}$ or $\bar{e}$ depending on the parameter. So, she will promote whoever successfully reforms, and not promote whoever unsuccessfully reforms. Also note that $P(t = g|q) = \pi$. For the noncongruent to reform when $\omega = G$, it must be that he cannot be promoted by maintaining the status quo. So, the principal can choose not to promote conditional on $x = q$ to deter such a deviation. Now, since $R\underline{e} - v > 0$ by Assumption 1, the noncongruent type does not want to deviate to the status quo. The congruent type does not want to deviate to implementing a reform with effort different from $e = 1$ by Assumption 1. Finally, an agent who observes $\omega = B$ will not reform, because such a reform cannot succeed.

□

B.2 Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. 1. Under centralization, if the prior ω favors the status quo (e.g., $P(\omega = G) = p \approx 0$), then the central government will mandate the status quo to be implemented, which confers a policy payoff of 0. The central government may mandate a policy reform to be implemented if p is sufficiently large. Two cases may arise: 1) the central government lacks the capacity to verify the implementation effort. In this situation, the central government observes $x = r$ on path, which means that the agent's implementation does not affect his career. This means that the agent behaves exactly the same as under (NT). 2) the central

government can verify and enforce implementation loyalty at $e = 1$. In this situation, the agent becomes a perfect implementer. The central government's equilibrium payoff under centralization is $pv + (1 - p)(-v) = v(2p - 1)$. Under (ST), the central government's equilibrium payoff is at least $p(\pi + (1 - \pi)(2\underline{e} - 1))v$. So, centralization may dominate (ST) only if $p(2 - \pi - (1 - \pi)(2\underline{e} - 1)) > 1$ and the central government has the necessary capacity to verify and enforce implementation loyalty. In other situations, delegation prevails.

2. A nonaccountable official is one who does not face promotion incentives. If a nonaccountable official is congruent, he will choose the status quo if $\omega = B$ and choose to reform with effort $\bar{e}$ if $\omega = G$. If a nonaccountable official is noncongruent, he will choose the status quo. Note that an accountable official who faces weak career concerns $(R < c + v)$ under (FT) will bring the principal exactly the same policy payoff with a nonaccountable official. Thus, the results in Proposition 2 apply: the principal should delegate reform decisions to accountable officials if motivation matters.

□

Reference

Scott Ashworth and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. Is Voter Competence Good for Voters?: Information, Rationality, and Democratic Performance. *American Political Science Review*, 108(3): 565–587, 2014.

Jeffrey S Banks and Joel Sobel. Equilibrium Selection in Signaling Games. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 647–661, 1987.

Jonathan Bendor, Amihai Glazer, and Thomas Hammond. Theories of Delegation. *Annual review of political science*, 4(1):235–269, 2001.

Hongbin Cai and Daniel Treisman. Did Government Decentralization Cause China's Economic Miracle? *World politics*, 58(4):505–535, 2006.

Brandice Canes-Wrone, Michael C Herron, and Kenneth W Shotts. Leadership and Pandering: A Theory of Executive Policymaking. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 532–550, 2001.

Xuelian Chen. A U-turn or Just Pendulum Swing? Tides of Bottom-up and Top-down Reforms in Contemporary China. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 22(4):651–673, 2017.

Xuelian Chen and Christian Göbel. Regulations against Revolution: Mapping Policy Innovations in China. *Journal of Chinese Governance*, 1(1):78–98, 2016.

Jacques Crémer. Arm's Length Relationships. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(2):275–295, 1995.

Mathias Dewatripont, Ian Jewitt, and Jean Tirole. The Economics of Career Concerns, part I: Comparing Information Structures. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 66(1):183–198, 1999.

Justin Fox. Government Transparency and Policymaking. *Public choice*, 131(1):23–44, 2007.

Justin Fox and Stuart V Jordan. Delegation and Accountability. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(3): 831–844, 2011.

Justin Fox and Kenneth W Shotts. Delegates or Trustees? A Theory of Political Accountability. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(4):1225–1237, 2009.

Justin Fox and Richard Van Weelden. Costly Transparency. *Journal of Public Economics*, 96(1-2): 142–150, 2012.

Maurice Frankel. Freedom of Information: Some International Characteristics. *mimeo*, 2001. URL www.cfoi.org.uk/pdf/amsterdam.pdf.

Sebastian Heilmann. From Local Experiments to National Policy: The Origins of China's Distinctive Policy Process. *The China Journal*, (59):1–30, 2008a.

Sebastian Heilmann. Policy Experimentation in China's Economic Rise. *Studies in comparative international development*, 43(1):1–26, 2008b.

Sebastian Heilmann, Lea Shih, and Andreas Hofem. National Planning and Local Technology Zones: Experimental Governance in China's Torch Programme. *The China Quarterly*, 216: 896–919, 2013.

Alexander V Hirsch. Experimentation and Persuasion in Political Organizations. *American Political Science Review*, 110(1):68–84, 2016.

Bengt Holmstrom. On Incentives and Control in Organizations. *PhD thesis, Stanford Univeristy*, 1977.

Bengt Holmström. Moral Hazard and Observability. *The Bell journal of economics*, pages 74–91, 1979.

Bengt Holmstrom. On the Theory of Delegation. Technical report, Discussion Paper, 1980.

Bengt Holmström. Managerial Incentive Problems: A Dynamic Perspective. *The review of Economic studies*, 66(1):169–182, 1999.

Junyan Jiang. Making Bureaucracy Work: Patronage Networks, Performance Incentives, and Economic Development in China. *American Journal of Political Science*, 62(4):982–999, 2018.

Gilat Levy. Careerist Judges and the Appeals Process. *RAND Journal of Economics*, pages 275–297, 2005.

Eric Maskin and Jean Tirole. The Politician and the Judge: Accountability in Government. *American Economic Review*, 94(4):1034–1054, 2004.

Ciqi Mei and Margaret Pearson. Diffusion of Policy Defiance among Chinese Local Officials. In *Local Governance Innovation in China*, pages 47–63. Routledge, 2014.

Andrea Prat. The Wrong Kind of Transparency. *American Economic Review*, 95(3):862–877, 2005.

Yingyi Qian and Barry R Weingast. Federalism as a Commitment to Reserving Market Incentives. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 11(4):83–92, 1997.

Jessica C Teets. The Politics of Innovation in China: Local Officials as Policy Entrepreneurs. *Issues and Studies*, 51(2):79, 2015.

Jessica C Teets and Reza Hasmath. The Evolution of Policy Experimentation in China. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 13(1):49–59, 2020.

Jessica C Teets, Reza Hasmath, and Orion A Lewis. The Incentive to Innovate? The Behavior of Local Policymakers in China. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 22(4):505–517, 2017.

Kellee S Tsai. Adaptive Informal Institutions and Endogenous Institutional Change in China. *World Politics*, 59(1):116–141, 2006.

Tucker Van Aken and Orion A Lewis. The Political Economy of Noncompliance in China: The Case of Industrial Energy Policy. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 24(95):798–822, 2015.

Shaoda Wang and David Y Yang. Policy Experimentation in China: The Political Economy of Policy Learning. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.

Christine Wong. Performance, Monitoring, and Evaluation in China. *PREM Notes*, 23, 2012.

Xufeng Zhu and Youlang Zhang. Political Mobility and Dynamic Diffusion of Innovation: The Spread of Municipal Pro-business Administrative Reform in China. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 26(3):535–551, 2016.

arXiv:2012.01331v7 [econ.GN] 7 Nov 2022

1 Alternative Setup

In this section we consider an alternative formulation of congruence à la **?**. Now the game consists of two periods. At the end of period 1, the principal decides whether to retain this agent. If not, she makes a random draw from the pool of agents.

The per-period policy-making environment is similar. An agent is delegated the task of choosing a policy x from a binary set $X = \{r, q\}$ where r means reform and q means the status quo. The reform is risky: its outcome y could be either success ($y = 1$) or failure ($y = 0$). Whether the reform may succeed depends on its nature $\omega \in \{G, B\}$ and the agent's implementation effort $e \in \mathbb{R}_+$. A reform could be good ($\omega = G$) or bad ($\omega = B$) with the common prior $P(\omega = G) = \phi \in (0, 1)$; exerting effort e costs the agent $\frac{e^2}{2\lambda}$. The principal does not know the nature of the reform. The agent receives a signal $s \in \{g, b\}$ of accuracy $p \geq \frac{1}{2}$ about ω. The status quo is safe: it confers a constant payoff to players and requires zero implementation effort. Notate $y = \emptyset$ if the agent takes the status quo policy.

To make sense of a Maskin-Tirole notion of congruence, we have to simultaneously modify the agent's preference *and* the mechanisms under which the reform may succeed. As before, the agent has a private type $t \in \{c, n\}$ with the probability of being congruent $P(t = c) = \pi$. The congruent type shares the principal's preference: they both value reform success at 1, the status quo at $d \in (0, 1)$, and reform failure at 0. Following **?**, the noncongruent type wants the policy opposite to the principal's ideal one to be implemented; he triggers a reform whenever the reform timing is bad, and stays with the status quo whenever the timing is good. Formally, a noncongruent prefers a failed reform to the status quo to a successful reform; he obtains $1, d, 0$ from the above policy outcomes.

Unlike the main model, I assume that "choosing well" and implementation effort are *substitutes* in achieving reform success. Specifically, A good reform always succeeds; a bad reform succeeds with a probability equal to the agent's implementation effort $e \in [0, 1]$. This mechanism makes it plausible that a noncongruent agent behaves in the Maskin-Tirole way–absent career concern, he reforms whenever the signal is bad. If we maintain the assumption in the main model, the

noncongruent agent's ideal action with a good signal is reforming with zero effort.

Now we summarize the players' per period payoffs. Write the principal and the congruent agent's policy payoff function as $v(x, y)$, where $v(r, 1) = 1, v(r, 0) = 0$ and $v(q, \emptyset) = d$. A noncongruent agent's payoff is $v_n(x, y)$, where $v_n(r, 1) = 0, v_n(r, 0) = 1$ and $v_n(q, \emptyset) = d$. This formulation suggests that the noncongruent agent is a reform sabotage. All agents receive an office rent $R > 0$ if retained, and all pay a effort cost $\frac{e^2}{2\lambda}$; and, they obtain policy payoffs if and only if they are in office.