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# How a Race to the Bottom Can make You Fat 

## Motivation

33\% of adults and $17 \%$ of children in the United State are considered obese.
Public health expenditures and school based nutrition programs lead to an Public health expenditures and school based nutrita
improvement in self-reported health and obesity.
levels exis
A strong negative correlation between public education and health spending per capita and obesity rates.

## Objectives

Measure the effect of fiscal competition across states on obesity rates in the United States.

- Test the existence of fiscal competition across states

Measure the impact of changes in business friendliness of fiscal policies on education and health spending.
Measure the effect of education and health spending on obesity.

## Conceptual Framework



Food and exercise

Obesity

## Empirical Mode

Equation 1: Measuring fiscal competition with spatial autoregressive model

$$
g_{i y}=\rho \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{i j} g_{j y}+\alpha_{0}+\sum_{k=1}^{K} x_{i y k} \alpha_{k}+\mu_{i}+\mu_{y}+\epsilon_{i y}
$$

Equation 2: The determinants of education and health spending using a twoway fixed effects model

$$
e_{i y}=\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} g_{i y}+\sum_{k=2}^{K} x_{i y k} \beta_{k}+\sigma_{i}+\sigma_{y}+\vartheta_{i y}
$$

Equation 3: Dynamic panel model to estimate the determinants of obesity

$$
o_{i y}=\varphi o_{i, y-1}+\gamma_{0}+\gamma_{1} e_{i y}+\sum_{k=2}^{K} x_{i y k} \gamma_{k}+\theta_{i}+\theta_{y}+\omega_{i y}
$$

$g_{i y}$ - the level of the fiscal policy measure in own state
$e_{i y}$ - the measure of education and health spending
$o_{i y}$ - the obesity rate in own state
$w_{i j}$ - the spatial weight assigned to states $j$ and $i$
$x_{i y k}$ - the $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ state characteristic
$\mu, \sigma$, and $\theta$ - state and year fixed effects
$\epsilon_{i y}, \vartheta_{i y}$, and $\omega_{i y}$ - the regression error term

## Estimation Strategies

Spatial weighting matrix: border, distance, border-distance, and truncated distance

Estimate a dynamic panel model by system GMM

- Use neighbor's median age and income as instruments

Data
Unbalanced panel dataset for the 48 contiguous states from 1992 to 2010

- Obesity rates - the percentage of adults in state who are obese (CDC)
- Education and health spending per capita - spending on elementary and secondary education plus heal expenditure divided by population (US Census)
- Measure of business friendliness: (1) business revenues per capita (2) business revenues per unit of public infrastructure spending (US Census)
Other demographic variables


## Results

A $1 \%$ increase in neighbor's fiscal measure raises own fiscal measure by $0.60 \%$ to $1.35 \%$.
A $1 \%$ increase in own fiscal measure raises own education and health spending per capita by $0.23 \%$ to $0.72 \%$.
by increase in education and health spending per capita reduces obesity rates by $0.31 \%$ to $0.50 \%$.
Education and health spending have a persistent effect on obesity rates.

Table: Results for our three equations

| Equation | Fiscal competition |  | Determinants of Education and health spending |  | Determinants of obesity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dependent variable | Business revenues per capita | Business revenues per unit of public infrastructure spending | Education and health spending per capita | Education and health spending per capita |  | besity |
| Parameter of interest | Neighbor' s Business per capita percapta | Neighbor's Business revenues per unit of public infrastructure spending | Business revenues per capita | Business revenues per unit of public infrastructure spending | Lagged obesity | Education and health spending per capita |
| Border | $\begin{aligned} & .803 * * * * \\ & (.204) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .747 * * * \\ & (.206) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .230 * * * \\ & (.078) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .254 * * * \\ & (.097) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .333^{* * *} \\ & (.125) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -.324^{* *} \\ & (.191) \end{aligned}$ |
| Distance | $\begin{aligned} & 1.352 * * * \\ & (.671) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.113 * * * \\ & (.527) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .626 * * * \\ & (.283) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .720 * * * \\ & (.350) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .393 * * * * \\ & (.1355) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -.504 * * * \\ & (.240) \end{aligned}$ |
| Borderdistance | $\begin{aligned} & .688_{* * * * *}^{(.190)} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .690 *=* \\ & (.193) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .282 * * * \\ & (.097) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .287 * *= \\ & (.108) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .337 * * * \\ & (.121) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -.311 * * \\ & (.171) \end{aligned}$ |
| Truncated distance | $\begin{aligned} & .759 * * * \\ & (.326) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .600 * * * \\ & (.276) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .573^{* * *} \\ & (.227) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .689 * * * \\ & (.322) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .402^{* * *} \\ & (.125) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -.421 * * \\ & (.232) \end{aligned}$ |
| Fixed effect dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |
| Observations | 816 | 816 | 816 | 816 |  | 816 |
| Note: * P value <0.15; ** P value <0.1; *** P value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Fiscal comp <br> - Fiscal comp <br> - Fiscal comp run. | etition does etition crow etition affect | exist. <br> ds out educatio <br> cts obesity rate | on and healt s in the sho | th spending. rt run, medium | run and | long |
| Harmonizing fiscal policies could, not only improve the provision of public goods, but also reduce obesity rates. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

