

Digital Public-Administration Research Drawing from Bayesian Inspiration: Latent Trait Scaling and Topic Modeling Examination of Budgetary Legislation in Thirteen Countries

Pertti Ahonen

ABSTRACT

This article extends the methodological and empirical scope of public administration research and applies two Bayesian-inspired computational research methods – unsupervised latent trait scaling and topic modeling. The article uses these methods to examine government budgeting in thirteen Western countries, utilizing budgetary legislation as the research material. The empirical research question is: How are legal system traditions present in the words of texts of legislation on government budgeting? According to the results, at one end of the latent trait scale we find overseas inheritors of Britain's common law legal system, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and at the other end two representatives of civil law of the Napoleonic subtype, Italy and Spain. The other countries situate themselves in intermediate positions between the extremes. The topic modeling indicates three reasonably homogeneous groups of countries: the three overseas inheritors of common law and more weakly the United Kingdom, three countries representing the Napoleonic heritage, and, more weakly German-speaking and Nordic countries. In general, the article and its results emphasize the opportunities to extend Bayesian-inspired research in this research field.

Keywords: legal traditions, public administration systems, computational methods, legal informatics, textual analysis, comparative research

Introduction

This article draws from Bayesian inspiration (see Gelman and Shalizi 2013) to examine an element of public administration in its financial aspect, comprised of government budgeting. The empirical research question can be broadly worded as follows: *How are legal system traditions present in the words of texts of legislation on government budgeting?* The research material comprises legal texts passed in thirteen Western countries to regulate institutional structures, procedures and classifications of federal or national government budgeting: Australia, Austria, Canada,

Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (Table 1). Accordingly, this article joins the long but nowadays rather thin line of research that does not shy away from ascribing relevance to legal aspects of public administration (Wright 2011; within public administration research, interestingly, see Painter and Peters 2010). The article strives towards two related methodological objectives of research inspired by Bayesian statistical understanding: first, to apply the research method of “unsupervised latent trait scaling” and, second, to apply the research method of “topic modeling.”

Table 1. Characteristics of Countries and Texts Examined

1 Country	2 Population, million	3 GDP PC PPP USD	4 Government, % GDP	5 Membership	6 Longer-term legal traditions	7 Shorter-term legal traditions	8 Titles of legal texts examined, in English	9 La-test up-grade	10 Words in English
Australia	23.3	43,661	35.3	BC	Common-law	British	Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997	2013	12,503
Austria	8.4	43,322	50.9	EU, euro	German	German	Federal Organic Budget Act 2013	2013	40,151
Canada	35.2	42,303	41.6	BC	Common-law	British	Financial Administration Act 1985	2013	37,994
Estonia	1.2	22,268	43.0	EU, euro	German	German	Law on State Budget	1999	4,659
Finland	5.5	38,395	54.7	EU, euro	Nordic	Nordic	1988 Budget Act, 1992 Budget Decree (single text file)	2007	21,494
France	66.0	35,961	56.1	EU, euro	Roman, German	Napoleonic	The Organic Law on Budget Laws 2001	NA	8,946
Iceland	0.3	40,523	43.7	None	Nordic	Nordic	The Government Financial Reporting Act 1997	NA	4,690
Italy	59.7	30,170	50.6	EU, euro	Roman	Napoleonic	Law of Accounting and Public Finance 2010	2013	23,306
Netherlands	16.8	42,942	49.9	EU, euro	Roman, German	Napoleonic, German	Government Accounts Act 2001	2005	15,332
New Zealand	4.5	30,695	32.8	BC	Common-law	British	Public Finance Act 1989	2013	47,378
Spain	46.7	30,253	42.1	EU, euro	Roman	Napoleonic	General Budgetary Law 2001	NA	43,711
Sweden	9.6	42,973	49.2	EU	Nordic	Nordic	Budget Act 2011	2011	4,290
United Kingdom	63.2	37,384	44.4	EU, BC	Common-law	British	Exchequer and Audit Departments Act 1866, Charter of Budget Responsibility 2011 (single text file)	2013	3,847

Explanations: Austria, Australia and Canada are federal states, and the other countries are unitary states, but Italy and Spain have regions with strong autonomy, and Scotland has been contemplating independence from the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom and Canada apply, and until recently New Zealand applied, a first-past-the-post electoral system resulting in few effective political parties, whereas the other countries apply various versions of the proportional electoral system. All countries have a multi-party parliamentary government, which France supplements with semi-presidential characteristics.

Column 3 gives the country's gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in purchasing-power parity terms in US dollars, and column 4 the GDP share of the item general government, comprising by and large the entire public sector, including the social-security funds (IMF 2013b). Both figures were estimates for 2013 at the time of their publication. Column 5 indicates if a country is an EU member state and a member of the EU legal system, a member of the EU euro area including the European Central Bank system, or a member of the British Commonwealth (BC). Columns 6 and 7 ignore some of the finer grain, such as the civil-law heritage in the Canadian province of Quebec, the specificity of the legal heritage of Scotland and the unique characteristics of Spanish law. Column 9 gives the year of the latest upgrade of the legislation examined available in this article, and column 10 gives the number of words in the legislation examined before editing carried out for the present analysis.

According to public-domain information, Estonia should have passed a new Law on State Budget that should have come into effect on 1 January 2014. However, this had not happened by that date. According to other public-domain sources, Iceland has also been preparing a new organic budget act, but the older act was also retained in the research material in this case.

Within research with a Bayesian methodological inspiration this article represents machine learning studies, also known as computational studies. According to its first methodological objective, this article searches for latent, polarized traits in text documents of budgetary legislation and in the countries that these texts represent, and it does so with computational algorithms in the “driver’s seat”, that is, in an unsupervised way (Slapin and Proksch 2008). According to its second methodological objective, the article searches for “topics” in text documents of budgetary legislation and in the countries that these documents represent by means of a computational method representing “topic modeling” (Grimmer and Stewart 2013).

It is hardly common knowledge what digital methods in general and computational methods in particular can deliver compared to traditional methods (see Cioffi-Revilla 2014). First, computational methods enable the processing of textual or other “big” data in quite different proportions than traditional quantitative methods. Second, both in studies examining big data and other studies including the present study, computational methods enable the examination of textual data without common tedious and expensive preparatory stages. These stages are comprised, for instance, of the elaboration and application of a framework of themes or other textual elements to examine textual data in conventional quantitative content analysis (see Krippendorff 2012). In this study, computational methods enable to accomplish what has been beyond the economic and other means by such means as conventional quantitative content analysis. Computational methods also help generate empirical results that for no *prima facie* reason should be seen as substandard to those generated by means of conventional methods.

The next section elaborates the further legitimization for this article and proposes the research hypotheses. The two subsequent sections introduce the research methods and the research material. The following two sections report the empirical examination carried out first, by means of unsupervised latent trait scaling and next, by means of topic modeling. The last section consists of a summary and a discussion.

Legitimation of this study and the research hypotheses

Legitimation

From the point of view of epistemology – dealing with what can be known in principle – this article joins research that sees problems in “frequentist” interpretations of probability, understood in terms of relative frequencies of the events examined on the assumption that these events are drawn from a large number of trials or other relevant cases. Some authors have tried to improve the “frequentism” from within by means of an improved specification of statistical models and extended applications of principles of experimental research (see several of the articles in Brady and Collier 2010). Some other authors find in set theory the basis for empirical research that avoids the pitfalls of frequentism (Goertz and Mahoney 2012). Further alternatives comprise approaches informed by Bayesian thinking, metaphorically (Beach and Pedersen 2013), or without shying away from formalization and quantification (Gill and Witko 2013). Whether metaphorical or literal, Bayesian-inspired approaches build upon what is known as Bayes’s theorem:

$$P(A|B) \propto P(A) \times P(B|A) \quad (1)$$

Let us assume that we are collecting evidence, B , about whether an event, A , occurs. The probability of A , $P(A)$, before B becomes available, comprises the Bayesian *prior*. Formula (1) expresses the probability of A after B has become available, $P(A|B)$, the Bayesian *posterior*. The formula expresses $P(A|B)$ to be proportional (expressed by the sign $\propto$) to the prior $P(A)$ times the Bayesian likelihood, $P(B|A)$, which comprises the probability of acquiring the evidence B on the condition that the event A occurs. Briefly, the posterior is proportional to the prior times the *likelihood*, and the examination advances from what is known, the prior, via estimation by means of the likelihood to the latent, the posterior.

There are other than epistemological reasons for this article. One of these comprises the challenge to cultivate high and up-to-date standards in public-administration research without subjection to demands to propose quick solutions to acute problems by means of routine methods. Bayesian-inspired latent trait analysis first appeared in political-science research in the shape of supervised latent scaling (Laver et al. 2002) and next as unsupervised scaling (Proksch and Slapin 2008), and in some respects these two types of scaling have been joining forces more lately (e.g. Lowe and Benoit 2013). The Bayesian-inspired methods of topic modeling found their way into political science at about the same time as unsupervised scaling (Grimmer and Stewart 2013). More than latent trait scaling (Charbonneau 2009), topic modeling has also been applied reasonably close to public-administration research thus far (Clark and Lauderdale 2010; Fienberg 2011; DiMaggio et al. 2013; Levy and Franklin 2013).

Another non-epistemological reason to mention for this article concerns the specificity of government budgeting. Its characteristics give it institutional, cognitive and intellectual autonomy in comparison with some other domains of government and public administration, such as general and personnel management, organization development or information-systems research. Moreover, a harmonization of government budgetary institutions, procedures and techniques has been pursued for a long time by such organizations as the OECD or IMF (see, for instance, OECD 2005; Wanna et al. 2010; Pal 2012; IMF 2013a), and the European Union actively promotes similar developments in the member states and the EU partner countries.

Hypotheses

Bayesian-inspired research does not test if null hypotheses can be rejected in favor of the hypotheses that the researcher has proposed. However, Bayesian-inspired research may propose hypotheses, provided that these articulate the researcher's expectations about probabilities that posterior evidence may ultimately indicate.

The author of this article has lately worked with neo-institutional and related theories and research on the diffusion of institutional elements including such elements built into public policies. Therefore some neo-institutional and related research sources have been deemed suitable despite that in these sources typically other themes than government budgeting have been examined.

As mentioned above, long-term harmonization has been advancing in government budgeting and budgetary legislation, but despite progressing formal compliance, actual institutional convergence may not have been achieved (Lienert 2013). This is in line with neo-institutional arguments that high degrees of formal compliance with substantial diffusion of institutional elements to a country may fail to lead to convergence of this country with the source countries of the diffusion (Ashworth, Boyne, and Delbridge, 2009; Goldfinch and Wallis 2010). To draw the extreme hypothetical conclusion that despite *tendencies* towards harmonization these tendencies may fail to accomplish homogeneity and therefore polarization continues to prevail, a first hypothesis can be proposed:

H1: We will find characteristics of polarization if we compare budgetary legislation passed in different established Western democracies.

The prior expectation that important differences exist between developed Western democracies in their budgetary legislation calls for the examination of possible reasons for these differences. Although interesting and important research is available on what has been called “budgetary governance”, such research comprises empirical generalizations (Hallerberg et al. 2007) or informative, well-executed country studies (Raudla 2010), rather than approaches to systemic and structural differences between institutions with keen acknowledgment of historical institutional traditions. This article builds upon the prior expectation that legal-system traditions (Zweigert and Kötz 1998; Pargendler 2012; Table 1, columns 6 and 7), and according to Painter and Peters (2010) traditions of public administration systems, continue to comprise important contextual influences upon national differences in government budgeting as represented in budgetary legislation. Detailing and elaborating the first hypothesis, four further hypotheses with a *substantive* emphasis are proposed:

H2: We will find differences between established Western democracies in their budgetary legislation along dividing lines between legal-system traditions.

H3: We will find a dividing line among established Western democracies in their budgetary legislation between countries with common-law traditions and those with civil-law traditions.

H4: We will find further dividing lines between established Western democracies in their budgetary legislation depending on their subscription to civil-law traditions of the German, Napoleonic or Nordic subtypes.

H5: We will find that countries representing the Napoleonic subtype of civil-law traditions differ more in their budgetary legislation from countries with common-law traditions than do countries with civil-law traditions representing the German or Nordic subtypes.

We can acknowledge the long-term efforts towards harmonization of government budgeting and budgetary legislation since the 1940s – despite the doubts whether this harmonization has advanced far – with explicit hypotheses. The deeper back-

ground includes underresearched relations of dominance in the global scale according to which countries with English as the dominant idiom – and with a common law legal heritage – stand as the common model countries and other countries as common followers (see, for instance, Anessi-Pessina et al. 2016). In neo-institutional terms, the other countries have commonly voluntarily tried to accomplish institutional isomorphisms of their national budgeting with models of English-speaking countries, or these other countries have been forced towards such isomorphisms with the mediation of such actors as international financial institutions (see, for instance, Alasuutari and Rasimus 2009). Assuming also accelerated trends of harmonization (see Wanna, Jensen, and de Vries 2010; IMF 2013a), the following hypotheses can be proposed:

H6: National budgetary legislation ages rapidly, during time spans as short as twenty years, and insofar as such legislation has aged, the probability of its reform increases.

H7: English-speaking countries and therefore countries with common law traditions have comprised the foremost global models in budgetary reforms (Wanna, Jensen and De Vries 2010). Therefore we will find that civil law countries with older government budgetary legislation differ more from the common law countries than civil law countries that have more recently reformed their budgetary legislation.

H8: At one extreme end of the characteristics of government budgetary legislation, we will find common law countries with newer or constantly updated budgetary legislation rather than countries representing the same traditions but retaining older elements in its budgetary legislation.

The search for items called “topics” (see below on topic modeling) in this article derives from no other theoretical background than the search for polarization in budgetary legislation according to hypotheses H1-H8. Therefore the neo-institutional, related and other theoretical impulses stay the same. Many published topic-modeling studies have been exploratory, and exploration comprises what many dedicated computational scholars want to do first and foremost, but confirmatory topic modeling can also be envisaged. This justifies hypotheses about what topics will be discerned, which topics the documents examined and the respective countries will represent and which interpretations the examinations suggest as concerns the contents of the topics. Should more than two topics be estimated, their interpretation would have to be exploratory. However, concerning a two-topic solution two hypotheses can be proposed:

H9: We will find a topic representing the heritage of the common-law system in budgetary legislation.

H10: We will find a topic representing the heritage of the Napoleonic subtype of the civil-law system in budgetary legislation.

Research methods

The corpus of the thirteen texts of budgetary legislation was pruned by means of programs included in a computer library of text-mining called “tm” (Feinerer 2013). The tm library was used to turn all capital letters into small type, abolish numbers, punctuation marks and stopwords (e.g. articles, particles, conjunctives, pronouns and forms of such words as “to be” and “to have”) and, in this very examination, to eliminate all words that were present in only one or two of the thirteen texts of the corpus. The eliminations left 2,992 of the original 5,351 words.

Unsupervised Latent Trait Scaling

The genealogy of the computational methods applied in this article starts with the 18th-century work of Rev. *Thomas Bayes*, those who later made his work public and *Pierre-Simon, Marquise de Laplace*, who independently invented aspects of Bayesian statistics and extended them. The genealogy also comprises work on statistical distributions by *Siméon Denis Poisson* in the early 19th century, as well as by others, and early practical applications which examined the Poissonian “law of small numbers” by such authors as the Polish-German scholar *Ladislaus v. Bortkiewicz*, who at the end of the 19th century (in a seminal study on casualties in German cavalry) effectively demonstrated that events with low frequency among a mass of events indeed follow the Poisson distribution. Within political-science research, both supervised and unsupervised latent trait-scaling (Laver et al. 2002; Proksch and Slapin 2008) continue earlier political science work that utilizes data coded manually by single or several coders in preparation for studies on latent polarized traits, such as studies on political attitudes that defy analysis by means of more straightforward approaches. The more recent research was preceded by decades of political studies examining the revelation of preferences in such contexts as those of roll-call voting (Lindstädt et al. 2011). However, to date, computerized data acquisition has not crowded out manual procedures in political science (Lowe and Benoit 2013) or elsewhere (for studies on themes close to this article, see Hyndman et al. 2014; Ahonen 2015).

In this article, unsupervised latent trait scaling was carried out by means of the R-Wordfish program (Proksch and Slapin 2009). This program supports the examination of word frequencies in texts and assumes the Bayesian prior that a Poisson process generates these frequencies. This makes Wordfish one of the approaches of “strong” Bayesian analysis, alternatively called naïve Bayesianism, building on assumptions that the presence or absence of a particular characteristic is unrelated to the presence or absence of any other relevant characteristic. Wordfish has not generally performed worse than alternative techniques of scaling, such as the supervised latent trait-scaling algorithm called Wordscores (Lowe and Benoit 2013). The Wordfish assumption on the Poisson distribution for the word frequencies promotes simplicity, as this distribution has only one parameter, λ , which comprises both the mean and the variance. In brief, Wordfish builds upon the assumption that the number of times that a word, j , is present in a document derives from a Poisson distribution. The general form of the Wordfish model is:

$$y_{ij} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{ij}) \quad (2)$$

$$\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\alpha_i + \psi_j + \beta_j \times \omega_i) \quad (3)$$

In (1), y_{ij} is the count of word j in document i , and in (2), α is the set of fixed effects related to a document, ψ is the set of fixed effects related to words, β is the set of estimates of word-specific weights to capture the importance of each individual word in discriminating between positions that the texts represent and ω is the set of estimates for the position that each document represents. Both types of fixed effects, α and ψ_j , are of lesser interest, as they only control for the possibility that all documents include some words rather than others and that some documents include more text and therefore more words than other documents. In unsupervised scaling the interest lies primarily in estimating the ω 's, indicating the positions taken in the documents, and the β 's, indicating the words that differentiate between these positions. In this article, Wordfish was acquired from the particular source of the R-Austin library in which the “bugs” of the original Wordfish program have been fixed (Lowe 2011).

The technicalities of the Wordfish estimation are explained in the Wordfish manual (Proksch and Slapin 2009). The right-hand side of the equation (3) is estimated by means of an expectation-maximization algorithm, which defines an iterative procedure to compute the maximum likelihood estimates for the latent variables, from α to ω . The estimation consists of five steps. First, starting values for α , ψ , β and ω are obtained. Second, the document parameters ω and α are estimated, conditional on the expectation for the word parameters ψ and β , by maximizing a log-likelihood function related to each of the documents. Third, the word parameters ψ and β are estimated conditional on the expectation of the document parameters ω and α , obtained in step 2. For each word, a log-likelihood function is maximized. Fourth, the log-likelihood of the overall model is calculated as the sum of the individual word log-likelihoods obtained in step 3. Fifth, steps 2-4 are repeated until, hopefully, convergence is obtained. The Wordfish program enables the calculation of credibility intervals for the scaling estimates using a parametric bootstrap. The standard number of 500 iterations characteristically requires some computer calculation time with better-performing personal computers, such as twelve hours, as in this study.

Topic Modeling

Known since classical Antiquity and characterized as early as in Aristotle (2006), topics comprise elements that language users invent or innovatively transfer from other uses to those of their own in order to influence the cognitions, emotions and perceptions about these language users' ethos held by their audience, including their opponents. Bayesian-inspired “topic modeling,” hardly bearing more than an indirect relationship with the historical antecedents indicated and therefore representing “vulgar” rather than true humanism, supports the interpretation of latent meaning structures in corpuses comprised of texts. The probabilistic topical model called the latent Dirichlet allocation (abbreviated as LDA, see Blei et al. 2003), paying tribute to the German 19th-century mathematician *Johann Peter Gustav Lejeune Dirichlet*,

has also found applications in fields reasonably close to public-administration research (Clark and Lauderdale 2010; DiMaggio, Nag, and Blei 2013; Levy and Franklin 2013).

LDA is used to analyze unobservable latent factors in order to clarify interesting similarities that obtain the material examined. LDA not only enables the examination of separate words but also the investigation of co-occurrences of words. In LDA, documents are understood to comprise mixtures of a certain number of topics that regulate the probability of words finding their way into these documents. LDA assumes that the distribution of the topics examined has a Dirichlet prior. While applying LDA, the topics and their probability distribution in the documents examined are understood to comprise hidden random variables, which are built into a hierarchical probabilistic model and estimated by means of approximating the conditional distribution of these variables in the corpus of documents examined. This is done by means of sampling-based algorithms, such as Gibbs sampling constructing a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm (abbreviated as MCMC, see Blei 2012). Topic modeling has often been used in exploratory ways. Inferential procedures with manual labeling of the topics are common, although computer-assisted labeling has also been elaborated (Grimmer 2010). However, as indicated above, confirmatory topic modeling testing theoretically grounded hypotheses explicitly proposed is not ruled out, either.

In this article, the same corpus topic of text documents, first pruned by means of text mining, is examined not only with latent trait scaling but also with topic modeling. The topic modeling was carried out by means of the R-topicmodel library (Grün and Hornik 2013a, 2013b). First, the probability distribution of words, β , has to be determined for each topic, assuming a Dirichlet prior, δ :

$$\beta \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\delta) \quad (4)$$

Second, the proportions of the topic distribution, θ , for each w , document, have to be determined, also assuming a Dirichlet prior, α :

$$\theta \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha) \quad (5)$$

Third, for w_i , each of the N words, there shall be the choice of a topic, z_i , on the assumption of the multinomial prior distribution of this topic:

$$z_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(\theta) \quad (6.1)$$

Fourth, w_i , each of the N words, shall be chosen on the assumption of a multinomial prior distribution of each word, conditioned on the topic:

$$z_i: p(w_i | z_i, \beta) \quad (6.2)$$

After these four steps, the log-likelihood of the entire research material, calculated as the sum over the log-likelihoods of all documents in the corpus examined, is maximized with respect to the model parameters α and β . The R-topicmodel library

presupposes that k , the number of topics, is fixed a priori. The model is first fitted using the LDA library function “LDA,” including possible further specifications – all made in the analysis reported in this article – such as giving an initial value to the Dirichlet prior α , defining the number of iterations to reach stable posterior estimates, and introducing a “seed word” to start the estimation in order to enable the reproducibility of the results (Grün and Hornik 2013a, 2013b). Next, an LDA function named “posterior” is used to obtain the distribution of words on each topic and the distribution of topics in each document. LDA also allows for first dividing the text corpus examined into a “training data set” and a “text data set” and next making the program learn to estimate the model, though this option was not used in this analysis. The Bayesian testing resources offered by the R-topicmodel library are rather limited, the indicator called “perplexity” that this library offers is not particularly informative, and to estimate, for instance, the more useful test criterion DIC (deviance information criterion), some other topic modeling library such as R-lda should be used (Mimno and Blei 2011).

Research material

The research material was comprised of federal or national government budgetary legislation in thirteen countries: Australia, Austria, Canada, Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom (Table 1). The data are from the year 2013 or the latest available year, which means that newer reforms of budgetary legislation cannot have been taken into account. For instance, the new Estonian Budget Act is being put into force in steps since 2014, and since 2015 Iceland has a new Organic Budget Act (Estonia 2016; IMF 2016).

Some countries had to be excluded from the analysis because of their unique characteristics, such as the United States with its very elaborate legislative budgetary process and the other structurally complex federal countries of Germany, Switzerland, and Belgium. Some countries could not be included because of the absence of legal norms on government budgeting, such as Denmark and Norway, which had only passed administrative regulations on this issue in the year 2013 (OECD 2005; Ernst & Young 2012).

It is an asset in the present analysis that the thirteen countries examined comprise a group that is in many, but not too many, aspects reasonably homogeneous, such as highly developed Western democracies in Europe or with European origins (Table 1). The research material mostly derives from a website delivering original English legal texts on government budgeting or translations into English (World Bank 2013). The Austrian legal text derives from a governmental website (Austria 2013), and the Italian legal text originates from an official law database (Italy 2013). All texts used were available either in the original English or in English translation, except for the Italian text. After a first rough automatic translation (Babylon 2013), with good reading comprehension of the Italian language, I translated the Italian text into English myself. All texts available in the World Bank website were replaced with newer text versions if available in other sources. Applying common practices of automatic text analysis for two countries, the UK and Finland, two separate legal texts were merged into a single text to attain better representativeness of the documentation on these countries.

Unsupervised latent trait analysis of budgetary legislation in thirteen countries

The unsupervised latent trait analysis of budgetary legislation in the thirteen countries examined gives posterior support to the prior expectations formulated in the hypotheses proposed. As indicated above, the α (alpha) fixed effects, related to documents and the countries behind these documents, are of little interest for the model interpretation and therefore give no more than visual support for the display of the positions taken in the documents, ω (omega) (Figure 1).




Figure 1. **Position Estimates of Budgetary Legislation in Thirteen Countries**
Explanations: The x-axis indicates the Wordfish latent trait scaling estimates for each document's (and country's) position, ω (omega), and the y-axis indicates the fixed effects related to each document (and country), α (alpha).

As proposed in the hypotheses, differences exist between the countries examined (H1), legal-system traditions play a role in these differences (H2), and countries with common-law traditions differ from countries with civil-law traditions (H3). Spain, Italy and France, each representing Napoleonic civil-law traditions, along with Estonia representing the German subtype of the civil-law tradition rather than any other subtype, are situated at one extreme end of the ω values, and at the other extreme end we find three overseas representatives of the common-law tradition, Australia,

Canada and New Zealand (H4, H5). The three Nordic countries included in the analysis, Finland, Iceland and Sweden, receive similar ω values each, although they do not form a clear-cut group, as Austria in the German subtype of the civil-law tradition receives a comparable ω value (H4). Both Estonia and, less extremely, Iceland represent outdated government budgeting (H6, H7), which is revealed by the fact that both countries have been engaged since the early 2010s in comprehensive reforms of their budgetary legislation (see the explanations section in Table 1). The Netherlands, with hybrid Napoleonic-German characteristics in its civil law system, comprises a somewhat anomalous case according to the estimation results. Last, we find Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United Kingdom about where hypothesis H8 proposes.

According to the posterior probabilities of the estimated model of unsupervised latent trait scaling, certain countries are similar enough to receive credibility intervals of their ω values – indicating the positions of the documents that represent these countries – that overlap between the credibility intervals of the values received by certain other countries (Table 2). In this respect Australia and New Zealand hardly differ from each other, nor do Austria, Finland and Iceland or Estonia and Spain. The other countries are more unique, from Canada at the extreme positive end of the ω values to and Italy at the extreme negative end, and, between these extreme ends, France closer to the negative end and the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom in the middle ranges of the ω values.

Table 2. Test Results by Countries on the Documents Examined

Countries	Indicator of position taken in documents from the country, ω	95% lower credibility interval of ω	95% upper credibility interval of ω
Australia	1.4401	1.4002	1.4600
Austria	-0.4418	-0.4493	-0.4043
Canada	1.8086	1.7689	1.8227
Estonia	-0.9689	-1.0135	-0.9469
Finland	-0.4544	-0.4684	-0.4097
France	-0.7192	-0.7476	-0.6848
Iceland	-0.5077	-0.5420	-0.4436
Italy	-1.0599	-1.1131	-1.0666
Netherlands	0.0644	0.0412	0.1218
New Zealand	1.4748	1.4423	1.4895
Spain	-0.9953	-1.0317	-0.9922
Sweden	-0.1680	-0.0422	-0.1220
United Kingdom	0.4814	0.4300	0.5579

Explanations: We may put a note on Italy's ω value situating itself outside the confidence intervals calculated for this country by means of parametric bootstrapping. Possibly, with the number of iterations substantially exceeding the standard number of 500 iterations carried out, Italy's credibility intervals would have adjusted themselves to include Italy's ω between their two extreme values.

The expectation in unsupervised latent trait scaling is that frequent words do not discriminate between the documents examined, as these words do not distinguish important properties from each other (Proksch and Slapin 2008, 2009). Such words should have large fixed effects (θ) associated with word weights (β) close to zero, whereas words with discriminating capacity should be infrequent and have small fixed effects. The characteristic scatterplot “pyramid” of unsupervised latent trait scaling (Figure 2) illustrates that the examination delivers what it should. Such words as the verb form “shall” and the nouns “government” and “budget,” all of which we expect to be frequent in any budgetary legislation, have next to zero word (β) weights (Table 2).




Figure 2. **Word Weights and Word Fixed Effects in Budgetary Legislation of Thirteen Countries**

Explanations: The x-axis indicates the word weight values β (beta) (despite the letter b that the program default inserts and does not allow to correct), and the y-axis indicates the word fixed effects ψ (psi).

Words that best discriminate between the documents examined are situated at both ends of extreme β values. Somewhat more such words and with more extreme absolute values are situated in the lower left part of Figure 2 on the one hand, but on the other the mass of words is concentrated more on the positive side. For further illustration, let us examine the ten words with the highest positive β values and the ten

words with the highest negative β values. Note that only some of these words are visible in Figure 2. From among the words with the highest positive β values we find the word “subsidiary” both in the plural and the singular and the words “governor”, “corporations” and “majesty”. Among the words with the highest negative β values, we detect such words as “administrations”, “chambers”, “programming”, “competence” and “quantification”. The differences between these two sets of words suggest inherited differences between the institutionalized legal systems within which each of these sets are embedded.

Certain words from among those with the highest positive β values emphasize the overseas heritage of the common law system, found among the countries examined in Canada, Australia and New Zealand, each literally (see Table 2 and the above text) indicating Britain’s “majesty” as the head of state, who is represented by a resident “governor”. Moreover, we may argue that the vocabulary of budgetary legislation in these countries represents governance by means of what is known by the term “whole-of-government” (Christensen and Lægveid. 2007), indicated by reference to “subsidiary” organizations of government and public-sector organizations instituted as “corporations”. Notably, in recent decades these three countries have turned to common global models for budgetary reforms carried out in other countries (Wanna et al. 2010).

To single out what the words with the highest negative β values represent, we can utilize contrasts between this word set and the set with the highest positive β values. While in the former set, governance with such institutional supports as the “majesty” and the “governor” receives accents, in the latter set the challenges of pushing the proposed government budget through both “chambers” of the legislature are emphasized. Other words with the highest negative β values take up different aspects of the institutionalization of governance than certain words in the set with the highest positive β values. Words in the former set express concerns with the distribution of “competence,” the roles of various “administrations” in the budgetary process and procedures of “planning” and “quantification,” whereas structural and institutional concerns of governance come up in the word set with the highest positive β values, including the words “subsidiaries” and “corporations”.

Credibility intervals were not calculated only for the posterior document estimates by means of parametric bootstrap, but also for each word included in the analysis. However, the reporting conventions of unsupervised latent trait analysis certainly do not require the inclusion of these results for the 2,992 words left in the examination after the initial pruning.

Topic modeling of budgetary legislation in thirteen countries

The restricted number of documents and countries, thirteen, effectively precluded the estimation of more than three topics. A “seed word” was selected at random at the start of the estimation, 0.1 was used as the prior for the parameter α , and 1,000 iterations were run to estimate the model. Following common topic-modeling practice, the $\alpha = 0.1$ struck a balance between the concentration of the posterior probabilities of the topics within the documents examined either upon only one topic (with high α values) or many or all topics (with low α values). The same model with

the same seed word was run three times to ensure that the results were stable enough. At most, what changed from estimation to estimation comprised the order of the topics, not their contents. The reason why the results of each estimation are not exactly the same comprises the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm built into the latent Dirichlet allocation topic modeling applied in the analysis. As indicated in the methods section, because of the limited resources offered by the R-topicmodel library, comprehensive testing of the final model was not carried out. This omission has commonly been accepted in previous refereed research utilizing topic modeling.

The posterior probability distributions resulting from the topic modeling (Table 3; Table 4) support hypothesis 9, taking up a topic that can be named the “Heritage of the common-law legal system”, and hypothesis 10, taking up a topic that can be called the “Heritage of the Napoleonic subtype of the civil-law legal system”. The third topic can be inferentially labeled the “Heritage of the Nordic and German subtypes of the civil-law legal system”. As is the rule in topic models, many words appear in two or all three topics. Some of the words with the highest probability of inclusion in any of the three topics hardly more than indicate that the corpus examined indeed comprises legal texts (such as the word “law” and the modal verbs “must”, “shall” and “may”) or includes references or cross-references to the specific parts of the legal text in question (such as “section”, “article” and “paragraph”).

Let us look for words of more substance that are characteristic of certain topics rather than others. Words that deal with the *contents* of budgeting are most frequent in the first, “German and Nordic” topic: “budget”, “finance”, “financial”, “expenditure” (both in the singular and the plural), “appropriations”, “cash”, “assets” and “provisions”. In the second, “common law” topic we find a good many words that characterize the *institutionalization* of budgetary governance with special reference to the key actors of this institutionalization: “minister”, “crown”, “treasury”, “board”, “parliament”, “council” and “governor”. Words characterizing *accountability* are more frequently found in the third, “Napoleonic” topic than in the others: “account”, “accounting”, “report”, “auditing” and “information”. It would be interesting to find correspondences between these emphases and those in research on budgetary governance (Hallerberg et al. 2007) and in research on ideologies of government budgeting and accounting (Hyndman et al. 2014). However, it derives from the very different purposes, objectives, research materials and procedures of these two studies and this article that meaningful examination of such correspondences is not possible.

Table 3. A Three-Topic Model of Budgetary Legislation in Thirteen Countries

Descending probability order of words to belong to a topic	Topic 1, Heritage of the Nordic and German subtypes of the civil-law legal system	Topic 2, Heritage of the common-law legal system	Topic 3, Heritage of the Napoleonic subtype of the civil-law legal system
1	“shall”	“minister”	“article”
2	“budget”	“may”	“state”
3	“government”	“crown”	“shall”
4	“federal”	“act”	“budget”
5	“section”	“corporation”	“public”
6	“finance”	“section”	“law”
7	“management”	“financial”	“general”
8	“act”	“public”	“finance”
9	“minister”	“must”	“year”
10	“year”	“money”	“accounts”
11	“accounting”	“person”	“expenditure”
12	“may”	“treasury”	“may”
13	“financial”	“report”	“financial”
14	“statement”	“shall”	“paragraph”
15	“accounts”	“department”	“entities”
16	“ministry”	“appropriation”	“referred”
17	“expenditures”	“year”	“accounting”
18	“expenditure”	“board”	“ministry”
19	“fiscal”	“parliament”	“following”
20	“state”	“subsection”	“treasury”
21	“audit”	“council”	“provisions”
22	“central”	“fiscal”	“revenue”
23	“referred”	“information”	“said”
24	“cash”	“respect”	“provided”
25	“information”	“regulations”	“credits”
26	“account”	“amount”	“auditing”
27	“assets”	“governor”	“account”
28	“line”	“means”	“report”
29	“report”	“made”	“sector”
30	“provisions”	“general”	“social”

Explanations: The table indicates words in a descending order of the probability that the words indicated belong to a given topic. Only thirty words receiving the highest posterior probabilities in each topic are included. The estimation gave the value 576.826 for “perplexity”, measuring the predictive ability of the estimated model. However, it is not possible to assess if this is a high or low figure.

Table 4. Distribution of Topics by Countries

Countries	Topic 1, Heritage of the Nordic and German subtypes of the civil-law legal system	Topic 2, Heritage of the common-law legal system	Topic 3, Heritage of the Napoleonic subtype of the civil-law legal system
Australia	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
Austria	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Canada	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
Estonia	0.3078	0.0000	0.6921
Finland	0.9426	0.0000	0.0573
France	0.2109	0.0000	0.7890
Iceland	0.6364	0.0358	0.3278
Italy	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Netherlands	0.8176	0.1258	0.0566
New Zealand	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
Spain	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Sweden	0.9450	0.0000	0.0550
United Kingdom	0.2815	0.5522	0.1663

Explanations: The figures in the table indicate the distribution of topics in the document or documents representing each country according to the posterior probabilities in the LDA (latent Dirichlet allocation) model estimated.

As proposed in hypothesis 9, the countries in which only the second topic is present, according to the posterior probabilities estimated, comprise Canada, New Zealand and Australia. The probability of the second topic in the two combined documents representing the United Kingdom is not low, either, but exceeds one-half of the total. As proposed in hypothesis 10, the countries in which the third topic has the highest posterior probability include two inheritors of Napoleonic civil law, Spain and Italy. In the documents from these countries only the third topic is present according to the estimation results. The estimation presents the host country of the Napoleonic tradition, France, as a hybrid between this topic and the German-Nordic topic, which is in accordance with the commonly acknowledged Germanic traits in parts of the French legal heritage. Estonia stands out as something of an anomaly; despite the predominantly German heritage of its legal system, over two-thirds of the vocabulary examined represent the third or “Napoleonic” topic in the Estonian document. It should be separately examined if the Estonian uniqueness might derive from possible French influences upon this country’s budgetary legislation of 1938, and again once the act examined was passed after the restoration of Estonian independence, although soon heavily amended (Raudla 2010). In the Austrian document only the first topic is present. This topic also has a high posterior probability in the Swedish and Finnish documents and a fairly high posterior probability, or almost two-thirds, in the Icelandic document.

In the documents from the thirteen countries, the posterior probability of finding only one topic is one hundred percent in six countries (Australia, Austria, Canada,

Italy, New Zealand and Spain) and almost 95 percent in two other countries (Finland and Sweden). The posterior probabilities for three countries are divided between a dominant and a minor topic (Estonia, France and Iceland), and in two countries between a dominant topic and two minor topics (the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, the Netherlands).

Conclusions and discussion

The empirical research question of this article worded as follows: *How are legal system traditions present in the words of texts of legislation on government budgeting?* Confirmation has been received to the continuing relevance of legal system traditions in the public administration domain of regulating government budgeting by means of legislation. Arguably, additional usefulness of the article derives from its Bayesian-inspired methodological approach of applying research methods of machine learning a.k.a. computational methods.

Eight of the hypotheses proposed received support once posterior probabilities were estimated by means of the computational method unsupervised latent trait scaling, and two further hypotheses were supported once estimation by means of topic modeling was carried out. According to the estimated posterior probabilities, remarkable differences exist between the countries examined along dividing lines between legal system traditions. The unsupervised latent trait scaling indicated a cleavage in budgetary legislation between overseas inheritor countries representing common-law traditions, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, and countries with civil-law traditions representing the Napoleonic subtype, or especially Spain and Italy. The other countries examined occupy the middle ground between the two extremes. The topic modeling indicated the posterior probability of a topic of the heritage of the British common-law system and a topic of the heritage of the Napoleonic subtype of the civil-law legal system. Moreover, on an exploratory basis a third topic was labeled the “Heritage of the Nordic and German subtypes of the civil-law legal system”.

While the posterior probabilities estimated indicated some countries, represented by the documents examined, as if “ideal types” representing one topic only, other countries rather were hybrids. The legislation that the second, “common-law” topic catches accentuates institutional governance aspects of government budgeting, whereas the third, “Napoleonic” topic emphasizes budgetary accountability, and the first, “German and Nordic,” characteristically takes up the contents of budgeting. By and large these results conform with Lienert’s (2013) conclusions on resilient inter-country differences in budgetary legislation in different countries. However, it has not been possible within the confines of this article to examine reasons for the topical differences.

According to the very purposes of this article, it has examined what Bayesian-inspired research methods may help deliver. Traditional quantitative content analysis, in particular, would have been much beyond the economic and other means in this study. However, the empirical results of the article send a definite message. After all, the utility of assuming the resilience of divisions between legal traditions has been seriously under question, and in some research fields such assumptions have

been seen as downright counterproductive (Pargendler 2012; Lindahl and Schadewitz 2013; however, in public administration research, see Painter and Peters 2010). Despite advancing global harmonization in government budgeting ever since the 1940s (Wanna, Jensen and de Vries 2010), the hypotheses proposed on the continuing relevance of legal system traditions in regulating government budgeting by means of legislation could be sustained.

More generally, this article joins previous neo-institutional, related and other studies that take into account the context of public administration to help explain why the same influences may not bring about the very same results, let alone do so soon all over the world (Ashworth et al. 2009; Goldfinch and Wallis 2010; Pollitt 2013). In the article, the context comprised the historically mediated institutional heritage of different legal systems and their subtypes, and, *mutatis mutandis*, traditions of different public-administration systems.

The empirical study reported in this article has been carried out under certain delimitations introduced by the investigator. For two reasons this study has comprised cross-sectional studies (Levy and Franklin 2013; Gill and Witko 2013) without joining the expanding time-series research that utilizes texts as its research material (Proksch and Slapin 2008; Grimmer 2010; Bertelli and Grose 2011; Clark and Lauderdale 2010; DiMaggio et al. 2013). This cross-sectional character has arisen from a combination of the author's interest in international comparative study of public administration in its financial and budgeting aspects on the one hand, and on the other the difficulties to prepare a corpus comprised of consecutive texts of budgetary legislation passed in numerous countries over a longer time period. The reasonably good availability of the texts examined in this article comprised a fortunate "opportunity window" enabling this study to evolve in the first place.

REFERENCES

- Ahonen, Pertti. 2015. "Diffusion, Modification and Sedimentation of Institutional Elements in Government Accounting Change: Finland in a Comparative Perspective during Three Decades since 1980." *International Journal of Critical Accounting* 7(2), 123-141.
- Alasuutari, Pertti and Ari Rasimus. 2009. "Use of the OECD in Justifying Policy Reforms: The Case of Finland." *Journal of Political Power* 2(1), 89-109.
- Anessi-Pessina, Eugenio, Carmela Barbera, Mariafrancesca Sicilia and Ileana Steccolini. 2016. "Public Sector Budgeting: A European Review of Accounting and Public Management Journals." *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 29(3), 491-519.
- Aristotle. 2006. *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Greek-English ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ashworth, Rachel, George Boyne and Rick Delbridge. 2009. "Escape from the Iron Cage? Organizational Change and Isomorphic Pressures in the Public Sector." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19(1), 165-187.
- Austria. 2013. *Federal Organic Budget Act of 2013*. Available at http://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokumente/Erv/ERV_2009_1_139/ERV_2009_1_139.pdf (last accessed 15 October 2013).
- Babylon. 2013. *Public Domain Version of a Program of Automatic Translation*. Available at <http://www.babylon.com> (last accessed 1 December 2013).
- Beach, Derek and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. 2013. *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Blei, David M. 2012. "Probabilistic Topic Models." *Communications of the ACM* 55(4), 77-84.
- Blei, David M., Andrew Y. Ng and Michael I. Jordan. 2003. "Latent Dirichlet Allocation." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2(4-5), 993-1022.
- Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (ed.). 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd edn. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Charbonneau, Étienne. 2009. "Talking like a Tax Collector or a Social Guardian? The Use of Administrative Discourse by U.S. Lottery Agencies." In Louis M. Imbeau (ed.). *Do they Walk like they Talk? Speech and Action in Policy Processes*. Dordrecht: Springer, 223-240.
- Christensen, Tom and Per Lægreid. 2007. "The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform." *Public Administration Review* 67(6), 1059-1066.
- Cioffi-Revilla, Claudiko. 2014. *Introduction to Computational Social Science: Principles and Applications*. London: Springer.
- Clark, Tom S. and Benjamin E. Lauderdale. 2010. "Locating Supreme Court Opinion in Doctrine Space." *American Journal of Political Science* 20(3), 329-350.
- DiMaggio, Paul, Manish Nag and David Blei. 2013. "Exploiting Affinities between Topic Modeling and the Sociological Perspective on Culture: Application to Newspaper Coverage of U.S. Government Arts Funding." *Poetics* 41(6), 570-606.

- Ernst & Young. 2012. *Overview and Comparison of Public Accounting and Auditing Practices in the 27 EU Member States*. Prepared for Eurostat, final report. Brussels: Eurostat.
- Estonia. 2016. *State Budget Act*. Available at https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/compare_original?id=504072014004 (last accessed 10 July 2016).
- Feinerer, Ingo. 2013. *tm – text mining package under the R platform*. Available at <http://tm.r-forge.r-project.org> (last accessed 15 October 2013).
- Fienberg, Stephen E. 2011. “Bayesian Models and Methods in Public Policy and Government Settings.” *Statistical Science* 26(2), 212-226.
- Gelman, Andrew and Cosma Rohilla Shalizi. 2013. “Philosophy and the Practice of Bayesian Statistics.” *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 66(1), 8-38.
- Gill, Jeff and Christopher Witko. 2013. “Bayesian Analytical Methods: A Methodological Prescription for Public Administration.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(2), 457-494.
- Goertz, Gary and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Goldfinch, Shaun and Joe Wallis. 2010. “Two Myths of Convergence in Public Management Reform.” *Public Administration* 88(4), 1099-1115.
- Grimmer, Justin. 2010. “A Bayesian Hierarchical Topic Model for Political Texts: Measuring Expressed Agendas in Senate Press Releases.” *Political Analysis* 18(1), 1-35.
- Grimmer, Justin and Brandon M. Stewart. 2013. “Text as Data: The Promise and Pitfalls of Automatic Content Analysis Methods for Political Texts.” *Political Analysis*, 8 July 2013. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pan/mps028> (last accessed 15 June 2013).
- Grün, Bettina and Kurt Hornik. 2013a. *topicmodel: Topic models*. Available at <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/topicmodels/index.html> (last accessed 15 November 2013).
- Grün, Bettina and Kurt Hornik. 2013b. “topicmodel: An R Package for Fitting Topic Models.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 19(40), 1-20.
- Hallerberg, Mark, Rolf Strauch and Jürgen von Hagen. 2007. “The Design of Fiscal Rules and Forms of Governance in European Union Countries.” *European Journal of Political Economy* 23(2), 338-359.
- Hyndman, Noel, Mariannunziata Liguori, Renate E. Meyer, Tobias Polzer, Silvia Rota and Johann Seiwald. 2014. “The Translation and Sedimentation of Accounting Reforms: A Comparison of the UK, Austrian and Italian Experiences.” *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 25(4-5), 388-408.
- IMF. 2016. *Iceland*. IMF Country Report 16/179, June 2016. Washington, DC: IMF.
- IMF. 2013a. *Public Financial Management and its Emerging Architecture*. Washington, D.C.: IMF.
- IMF. 2013b. *World Economic Outlook Database*. Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/02/weodata/> (last accessed 15 December 2013).
- Italy. 2013. *La legge di contabilità e finanza pubblica* [Law of accounting and public

- finance, in Italian]. Available at <http://www.rgs.mef.gov.it/VERSIONE-I/Servizio-s/Note-brevi/La-legge-d/> (last accessed 20 November 2013).
- Krippendorff, K. 2012. *Content analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Laver, Michael, Kenneth Benoit and John Garry. 2002. "Extracting Policy Positions from Political Texts Using Words as Data." *American Political Science Review* 97(2), 311-332.
- Levy, Karen E.C. and Michael Franklin. 2013. "Driving Regulation: Using Topic Modeling to Examine Political Contention in the U.S. Trucking Industry." *Social Science Computer Review*, 2 December 2013. Available at <http://sscdagepub.com/content/early/2013/11/24/0894439313506847> (last accessed 27 December 2013).
- Lienert, Ian. 2013. "The Legal Framework for Public Finances and Budget Systems." In Richard Allen, Richard Hemming and Barry Potter (eds). *The International Handbook of Public Financial Management*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 63-83.
- Lindahl, Frederick and Hannu Schadewitz. 2013. "Are Legal Families Related to Financial Reporting Quality?" *Abacus* 49(2), 242-267.
- Lindstädt, R., Jonathan B. Slapin and Ryan J. Vander Wielen. 2011. "Balancing Competing Demands: Position Taking and Election Proximity in the European Parliament." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 36(1), 37-70.
- Lowe, Will. 2011. *Austin: Do Things with Words. R Package Version 0.2*. Available at <https://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/austin/> (last accessed 20 November 2013).
- Lowe, Will and Kenneth Benoit. 2013. "Validating Estimates of Latent Traits from Textual Data Using Human Judgment as Benchmark." *Political Analysis* 21(3), 298-313.
- Mimno, David and David Blei. 2011. "Bayesian Checking for Topic Models." Available at <http://www.c.princeton.edu/~blei/papers/MimnoBlei2011.pdf> (last accessed 8 January 2014).
- OECD. 2005. "The Legal Framework for Budget Systems: An International Comparison." *OECD Journal on Budgeting* 4(3), special issue.
- Painter, Martin and B. Guy Peters. 2010. *Tradition and Public Administration*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pal, Leslie A. 2012. *Frontiers of Governance: The OECD and Global Public Management Reform*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pargendler, Mariana. 2012. "The Rise and Decline of Legal Families." *American Journal of Comparative Law* 60(4), 1043-1074.
- Pollitt, Christopher (ed.). 2013. *Context in Public Policy and Management: The Missing Link?* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Proksch, Sven-Oliver and Jonathan B. Slapin. 2008. "A Scaling Model for Estimating Time-Series Party Positions from Texts." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(3), 705-722.
- Proksch, Sven-Oliver and Jonathan B. Slapin. 2009. *Wordfish. 2009. Manual*. Version 1.3. 21 January 2009. Available at <http://www.wordfish.org> (last accessed 10 January 2013).

- Raudla, Ringa. 2010. "The Evolution of Budgetary Institution in Estonia: A Path Full of Puzzles." *Governance* 23(3), 463-484.
- Wanna, John, Lotte Jensen and Jouke de Vries (ed.). 2010. *The Reality of Budgetary Reform in OECD Nations: Trajectories and Consequences*. Basingstoke: Edward Elgar.
- World Bank. 2013. World Bank – IMF Country Budget Law Database. Available at <http://web.worldbank.org> (last accessed 20 October 2013).
- Wright, Bradley E. 2011. "Public Administration as an Interdisciplinary Field: Assessing its Relationship with the Fields of Law, Management, and Political Science." *Public Administration Review* 71(1), 96-101.
- Zweigert, Konrad and Hein Kötz. 1998. *An Introduction to Comparative Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PERTTI AHONEN is Professor of Political Science at the Department of Political and Economics Studies, University of Helsinki. His main research interests include digital politology, neo-institutionalist theory and research, and research on governance, public policy and public policy evaluation. Correspondence: Pertti Ahonen, Department of Political and Economics Studies, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland; E-mail: pertti.ahonen@helsinki.fi