UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE JUIZ DE FORA FACULDADE DE ECONOMIA PROGRAMA DA PÓS GRADUAÇÃO EM ECONOMIA

Matheus Henrique dos Santos Nascimento

Legislature Size and Council Member Diversity: Evidence from Brazilian Municipalities

> Juiz de Fora 2024

Matheus Henrique dos Santos Nascimento

Legislature Size and Council Member Diversity: Evidence from Brazilian Municipalities

Dissertação apresentada ao Programa da Pós Graduação em Economia da Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora como requisito parcial à obtenção do título de Mestre em Economia Aplicada. Área de concentração: Economia

Orientadora: Prof^a. Dr^a. Laura de Carvalho Schiavon

Ficha catalográfica elaborada através do Modelo Latex do CDC da UFJF com os dados fornecidos pelo(a) autor(a)

Nascimento, Matheus Henrique dos Santos.

Legislature Size and Council Member Diversity : Evidence from Brazilian Municipalities / Matheus Henrique dos Santos Nascimento. – 2024. 39 f. : il.

Orientadora: Laura de Carvalho Schiavon

Dissertação (Mestrado) – Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, Faculdade de Economia. Programa da Pós Graduação em Economia, 2024.

1. Legislative Size. 2. Municipal Policy. 3. Political Representation. 4. Regression Discontinuity Design. I. Schiavon, Laura de Carvalho, orient. II. Título.

Matheus Henrique dos Santos Nascimento

Legislature Size and Council Member Diversity: Evidence from Brazilian Municipalities

Dissertação apresentada Programa de Pósao graduação em Economia da Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora como requisito parcial à obtenção do título de Mestre em Economia Aplicada. Área de concentração: Economia.

Aprovada em 19 de fevereiro de 2024.

BANCA EXAMINADORA

Drª. Laura de Carvalho Schiavon - Orientadora

Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora

Dr. Ricardo da Silva Freguglia

Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora

Drª. Flávia Lúcia Chein Feres

Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora

Dr. Vinícius de Araujo Mendes

Universidade Federal da Bahia

Juiz de Fora, 25/01/2024.



Documento assinado eletronicamente por **Laura de Carvalho Schiavon**, **Professor(a)**, em 19/02/2024, às 15:09, conforme horário oficial de Brasília, com fundamento no § 3º do art. 4º do <u>Decreto nº 10.543, de 13 de novembro de 2020</u>.



Documento assinado eletronicamente por **Flavia Lucia Chein Feres**, **Professor(a)**, em 19/02/2024, às 15:16, conforme horário oficial de Brasília, com fundamento no § 3º do art. 4º do <u>Decreto nº 10.543</u>, <u>de 13 de novembro de 2020</u>.



Documento assinado eletronicamente por **Ricardo da Silva Freguglia**, **Professor(a)**, em 20/02/2024, às 15:53, conforme horário oficial de Brasília, com fundamento no § 3º do art. 4º do <u>Decreto nº</u> <u>10.543, de 13 de novembro de 2020</u>.



Documento assinado eletronicamente por **Vinícius de Araujo Mendes**, **Usuário Externo**, em 20/02/2024, às 20:23, conforme horário oficial de Brasília, com fundamento no § 3º do art. 4º do <u>Decreto nº 10.543, de 13 de novembro de 2020</u>.



A autenticidade deste documento pode ser conferida no Portal do SEI-Ufjf (www2.ufjf.br/SEI) através do ícone Conferência de Documentos, informando o código verificador **1679528** e o código CRC **4B3FD036**.

To my parents, Arildo and Ane.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To God, I am grateful for the opportunity to have completed this work and for guiding me in every moment of my life.

To my parents, Arildo and Ane, and my brothers, Maikon and Marco Antonio, I thank you for being my strength, my inspiration and my refuge. Thank you for believing in me and always encouraging me to follow my dreams. This dissertation is a reflection of the love and support you have given me, and I could never have gotten here without you.

To Laura Schiavon, my advisor, thank you for all of your guidance and support throughout this dissertation. Without you, this thesis would be just another bunch of ideas in my head. In addition to being a great professional, you are an incredible person. Thank you so much!

To Flávia Chein, Ricardo Freguglia, and Vinicius Mendes, thank you for accepting the invitation to serve on the examining committee. Their constructive comments and valuable contributions will be essential for the improvement of this work.

To my friends from my master's program, Filipe, Leonan, Igor, Pedro Moura, and Pedro Soyer, thank you for all your partnership and companionship. In particular, Pedro Leite, Mariana Armelin, and Arthur, you were not only academic colleagues, but truly my second family in this city that was so unfamiliar to me at first. Thank you for everything.

To the people in the study room with whom I have shared my daily life for the last two years. Thank you for the coffees, the laughs, and any conversation that distracted me from the most difficult moments. Especially to Jamaika, Lucas, and Jefferson, thank you for the welcome, for making the days more fun and for becoming good friends with whom I shared great moments.

To Mr. Luís, Mrs. Sonia, and all the friends I shared a home with, thank you for giving me a home away from home. You have been very important to me here in Juiz de Fora.

I would also like to thank the entire Graduate Program in Economics, which has provided me with an environment very conducive to my learning and professional development.

Finally, I would like to say that this study was partially financed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

"The only recourse we have against bad ideas is to be vigilant, resist the seduction of the 'obvious', be skeptical of promise miracles, question the evidence, be patient with complexity and honest about what we know and what we can know."

Abhijit Banerjee and Esther Duflo

ABSTRACT

The Brazilian Constitution of 1988 granted local governments political and fiscal autonomy, empowering them to directly impact the lives of their residents. Municipal councils and their members serve as crucial intermediaries between communities and the government, influencing public services and legislation. This study examines the impact of municipal council size on the diversity of candidates and elected members, focusing on variables such as age, gender, race, and education. A regression discontinuity design was used to assess the effects, analyzing data from the 2017-2020 and 2021-2024 election cycles in municipalities with fewer than 100,000 residents. The results show that an increase in council size leads to the election of approximately one additional non-white candidate. Council size may increase the number of female candidates but does not have a significant impact on the election of women. In terms of age, council size does not affect politicians under 30 or over 60, with a small increase in candidates under 30. In terms of education, there is an increase in the number of elected members with at least a high school education, but no significant change in overall educational representation. This research is in line with the literature on political identity and choice, which emphasizes the influence of personal characteristics on policy preferences. It also contributes to the literature on the impact of legislative size on policy areas.

Keywords: Legislative Size. Municipal Policy. Political Representation. Regression Discontinuity Design.

RESUMO

A Constituição Brasileira de 1988 concedeu aos governos locais autonomia política e fiscal, dando-lhes poder para influenciar diretamente a vida dos seus residentes. As câmaras municipais e seus membros servem como intermediários cruciais entre as comunidades e o governo, influenciando os serviços públicos e a legislação. Este estudo examina o impacto da dimensão da câmara municipal na diversidade dos candidatos e dos vereadores eleitos, centrando-se em variáveis como a idade, o género, a raça e a educação. Uma regressão descontínua foi utilizada para avaliar os efeitos, analisando dados dos ciclos eleitorais de 2017-2020 e 2021-2024 em municípios com menos de 100.000 habitantes. Os resultados mostram que uma câmara municipal maior leva à eleição de aproximadamente um candidato não branco adicional. A dimensão do legislativo pode aumentar o número de candidaturas femininas, mas não tem um impacto significativo na eleição de mulheres. Em termos de idade, a magnitude da câmara municipal não afeta os políticos com menos de 30 ou mais de 60 anos, com um pequeno aumento dos candidatos com menos de 30 anos. Em termos de educação, verifica-se um aumento do número de membros eleitos com pelo menos o ensino médio, mas nenhuma alteração significativa na representação educativa em geral. Esta pesquisa está em linha com a literatura sobre identidade e escolha política, que enfatiza a influência das características pessoais nas preferências políticas. Ela também contribui para a literatura sobre o impacto do tamanho do legislativo nas áreas políticas.

Keywords: Tamanho do Legislativo. Política municipal. Representação política. Regressão Descontínua.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 –	Distribution of council seats by population in 2008 and 2012 14
Figure 2 –	Distribution of council seats between the 2008 and 2012 rules $\ .$ 15
Figure 3 –	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Electoral Outcomes: RD Plots $\ . \ . \ 22$
Figure 4 –	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Racial Representation in Local Elections:
	RD Plots
Figure 5 –	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Gender Representation in Local Elections:
	RD Plots
Figure 6 –	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Age Representation in Local Elections:
	RD Plots
Figure 7 $-$	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Educational Attainment Representation
	in Local Elections: RD Plots
Figure 8 –	Histogram and Estimated Density of the Score
Figure 9 –	Population density distribution

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 –	Summary Statistics
Table 2 $-$	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Electoral Outcomes
Table 3 $-$	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Racial Representation in Local Electi-
	ons
Table 4 –	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Gender Representation in Local Electi-
	ons 24
Table 5 $-$	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Age Representation in Local Elections 26
Table 6 $-$	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Educational Attainment Representation
	in Local Elections
Table 7 $-$	Effects of Municipal Council Size on Placebo Outcomes
Table 8 –	Municipal Thresholds according to Constitutional Amendment nº 58/2009 $$ 34
Table 9 $-$	Robustness check: Year and state fixed effects estimates
Table 10 –	Robustness check: Estimates with triangular kernel
Table 11 –	RD estimates using bandwidth of 5,000
Table 12 –	RD estimates using bandwidth of 7,500

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	10
INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT	13
DATA AND SUMMARY STATISTICS	17
EMPIRICAL STRATEGY	19
RESULTS	21
Main results	21
Validity and Robustness	28
CONCLUSION	30
REFERENCES	31
APPENDIX A – Tables	34
APPENDIX B – Figures	39
	INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

1 INTRODUCTION

The Brazilian Constitution of 1988 strengthened local governments by granting them political and fiscal autonomy, allowing them to pursue their agenda and have a direct impact on the lives of the population, whether in the provision of public services or through the influence of specific municipal laws (Abrucio, 1994; Souza, 1997; Boulding; Brown, 2014; Rocha; Kerbauy, 2014). In this context, municipal councils and their councilors act as crucial channels between the real demands of the community and the government, shaping public services, finances, and laws that affect the daily lives of residents (Mignozzetti; Cepaluni, 2019).

The personal characteristics of elected officials can influence their policy preferences and decisions. For example, black legislators are more likely to support policies that align with the interests of their communities, while female legislators are more likely to support policies that benefit women (Bratton, 2002). In Brazil, the demographic composition of Brazilian legislators is predominantly male, white, and highly educated (Silva, 2014; Silva; Dantas, 2016).

The size of the municipal council is an important determinant of political representation at the local level. Municipalities with larger councils have more seats available, which can increase the opportunities for candidates from different social groups to be elected. This research examines the impact of municipal council size on the diversity of candidates and elected council members, including variables for age, gender, race, and educational attainment. The results of the research have important implications for public policy, as they can help promote more inclusive political representation.

The definition of the size of municipal councils in Brazil has undergone significant changes. Initially, the 1988 Constitution established a proportional relationship between population and the number of councilors. However, the flexible interpretation of this rule led to distortions, such as municipalities of similar size having significantly different numbers of representatives. In 2004, a new rule directly linked the councils' size to the population. Then, in 2009, a new model introduced limits on the number of councilors based on population tiers. This gave municipalities more autonomy to determine the number of councilors within these limits but also increased the total number of councilors in the country.

To assess the impact of municipal council size on the diversity of candidates and elected councilors, we used the population thresholds established by Constitutional Amendment 58/2009, which dictates the maximum number of councilors per municipality. We used a regression discontinuity design (RDD), which relies on abrupt changes in treatment assignment (council size) near a population threshold. We examined assumptions and potential biases, including the RDD hypothesis that municipalities cannot manipulate the official population count near the cutoff. Because treatment assignment was not a deterministic function of population, we obtained an intention-to-treat (ITT) estimate. We considered diversity in age, gender, race, and educational attainment. Our analysis covered the 2017-2020 and 2021-2024 electoral cycles in Brazilian municipalities with less than 100,000 inhabitants. We used population data from the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) and information on elected councilors and candidates from the Superior Electoral Tribunal (TSE).

Our results indicate that a larger council size leads to an increase of about 1 nonwhite candidate elected to the city council. For gender representation, we find evidence that council size may increase the number of female candidates, but no statistically significant effect on the election of women, suggesting that council size may not be a determinant of gender representation in local politics. Results for age representation show no significant effect of council size on politicians under 30 or over 60, with a minimal increase in the number of candidates under 30. Finally, in terms of educational representation, there is an increase in the number of elected council members with at least a high school education, but no significant change in overall educational representation.

This study relates to two different strands of literature. First, it relates to the literature on political identity and political choice. Black legislators appear to have a significantly higher intrinsic motivation to defend black interests (Bratton, 2002; Minta, 2009; Broockman, 2013). Younger politicians behave more strategically in response to electoral incentives, likely because they expect longer political careers (Alesina; Cassidy; Troiano, 2019). The personal characteristics of politicians may also affect socioeconomic outcomes. Countries with higher proportions of women in parliament have faster growing economies (Jayasuriya; Burke, 2013) and invest more in infrastructure directly related to the needs of their gender (Chattopadhyay; Duflo, 2004). Municipalities governed by mayors who are farmers have higher rates of deforestation and CO2 emissions, allocate more resources to agriculture, and have more land-related conflicts (Bragança; Dahis, 2022), while younger politicians reduce deforestation and greenhouse gas emissions without significantly affecting local incomes (Dahis; Heras; Saavedra, 2023).

Second, this research is also related to the literature that examines the impact of legislative size on various policy areas. However, the results are often divergent. Weingast, Shepsle and Johnsen (1981) argue that there is a positive relationship between legislative size and public spending inefficiency, but Freire et al. (2023) points out that there is no robust evidence to suggest that legislative size has a positive or negative effect on government budgets. In fact, some studies suggest a negative effect of legislative size on public spending (Pettersson-Lidbom, 2012; Höhmann, 2017; Benedetto, 2018; Lewis, 2019), while others suggest a positive effect (Egger; Koethenbuerger, 2010; Halse, 2016; Kresch et al., 2021). In addition, the size of the legislature is an important factor that may influence other contexts. Lewis (2019) shows that an increase in legislative size negatively affects

citizens' access to public services in Indonesia, while in Brazil the addition of one legislator improves education and health care (Mignozzetti; Cepaluni, 2019). A larger legislature can also benefit women's representation in politics (Correa; Madeira, 2014; Meireles; Andrade, 2017), lead to an increase in corruption (Chang; Golden, 2007; Britto; Fiorin, 2020), and has the potential to reduce the electoral power of incumbent parties in the executive (Frey, 2021). Finally, the results on the impact of legislative size on party fragmentation are mixed (Taba, 2021) but may have a positive effect on spatial vote concentration (Silva, 2017).

The remainder of the dissertation is structured as follows. Section 2 provides the institutional context. Section 3 presents the data and summary statistics. Section 4 explains the empirical strategy. Section 5 contains our results. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Brazil is comprised of more than 5,500 municipalities, which form the basic political and administrative structure of the country. These municipalities are responsible for organizing and providing locally relevant public services such as health care, early childhood education, primary education, and public transportation, among others. To accomplish these tasks, the structure of local government is divided into an executive branch, headed by the mayor, and a legislative branch, represented by the municipal council, both of which are elected by direct vote every four years (Brasil, 1988).

In this context, to serve the interests of the municipality, the Constitution assigns several responsibilities to the Municipal Council. These include deliberating on matters related to municipal taxation, creating, modifying, and abolishing public positions, authorizing credit operations, granting public services, and approving municipal development plans and urban regulations. In addition, councilors are charged with formulating the budget for municipal revenues and expenditures, as well as supervising the financial management of the municipality (Brasil, 1977).

To be elected as a city councilor in Brazil, candidates must meet certain requirements, including being a Brazilian citizen by birth or naturalization, being at least 18 years old, being registered to vote, and being affiliated with a political party (Brasil, 1988). Parties may register up to 150% of the number of seats to be contested, with 30% of these candidates being women (Brasil, 1997)¹.

Regarding the composition of municipal councils, the 1988 Constitution stipulated that the number of councilors should be proportional to the population of the municipality, within certain limits. However, these limits were not specific enough and allowed municipal councils undue discretion in determining the number of seats, which encouraged distortions². Faced with this flexibility, the Federal Supreme Court adopted a new interpretation in 2003, stipulating that the relationship between population and the number of seats should be more precise.

This reinterpretation led to Resolution No. 21.702/2004 of the Superior Electoral Tribunal (TSE), which established a strict ratio between the number of councilors and the population of municipalities. Figure 1A illustrates the number of seats in Brazilian councils for the 2008 elections in municipalities with a population of up to 100,000 inhabitants. According to this new framework, municipalities with up to 47,619 inhabitants would be entitled to 9 councilors, those with a population between 47,620 and 95,238 would have

¹ For example, if a city council has 9 seats up for election, each party may register up to 14 candidates. If a party registers 14 candidates, 4 of them must be women.

² To illustrate the lack of proportionality, consider the following examples: Sumaré (SP), with a population of 168,058, had 13 councilors. São Manuel (SP), with 38,271 inhabitants, had 21 councilors. Guarulhos (SP), with 972,197 inhabitants, had the same number of councilors.

10 councilors, and so on 3 . This proportional relationship was used in the 2004 and 2008 elections.

However, in 2009, an institutional change occurred with the approval of Constitutional Amendment No. 58/2009. This amendment changed the relationship between the number of councilors and the population, moving away from the principle of proportionality. Instead, the amendment introduced a new model by establishing a maximum number of seats for each municipality, determined by 24 different population ranges. Figure 1B illustrates the number of seats in Brazilian councils for the 2012 municipal elections in municipalities with a population of up to 100,000.



Figure 1 – Distribution of council seats by population in 2008 and 2012

Note: This figure shows the distribution of the council size based on population in municipalities at two different points in time: the 2008 elections (Panel A) and the 2012 elections (Panel B).

³ The number 47,619 is obtained by dividing 1,000,000 by 21. The original Constitution defined the first range as "a minimum of nine and a maximum of twenty-one councilors in municipalities of up to one million inhabitants". Therefore, the number 47,619 now represents the lower limit of this range, and for each additional 47,619 inhabitants, the number of councilors increases by one.

This change marked a return to the original decentralization model provided for in the 1988 Constitution. Municipalities with comparable population sizes could now have different numbers of representatives in municipal councils. Consequently, by replacing strict proportionality with a more flexible system, Constitutional Amendment No. 58/2009 resulted in a significant increase in the number of councilors across the country.

Figure 2 shows the distribution of the number of council seats at an intersection of population ranges, including both the rule in place for the 2004 and 2008 elections and the rule in place since 2012.



Figure 2 – Distribution of council seats between the 2008 and 2012 rules

Note: Population data provided by IBGE and the number of council seats provided by TSE were used for this analysis. The dashed vertical line in the graph represents the population ranges of 2008. The x-axis corresponds to the intersections of the population ranges between the 2004/2008 and 2012 electoral rules. The resulting intersections (0-15000, 15001-30000, 30001-47619, 47620-50000, 50001-80000, 80001-95238, and 95239-120000) were used to directly compare the number of councilors in 2012 (y-axis), accounting for population variation within each range.

The number of elected councilors increased from 51,999 in 2008 to 57,434 in 2012. Approximately 30% municipal chambers, representing 1,694 municipalities, opted to increase the number of legislative seats. In addition, 4,801 municipalities, or about

86% of the total, adhered to the maximum number of seats allowed by the new electoral legislation.

3 DATA AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

Our empirical study examines the impact of municipal council size on the representation of different social groups within the council. To do so, we combine electoral records with population estimates. We provide a full description of the sources of this information.

Our main data comes from the open data portal of the Superior Electoral Tribunal (TSE) in Brazil. We obtained detailed records from the 2016 and 2020 municipal elections using this platform. This data allowed us to analyze the number of municipal council seats in each election, as well as the characteristics of the candidates who participated and the councilors who were elected. Using the TSE data, we assessed the number and proportion of candidates and councilors based on age, gender, race, and educational background.

To evaluate the application of the councilor allocation rules in each municipality and to determine our running variable, we obtained population estimates from the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE). It is noteworthy that the determination of the number of seats in the 2016 and 2020 elections was based on municipal population data from 2015 and 2019, respectively, according to IBGE data.

In our study, we limit our focus to the 2017-2020 and 2021-2024 electoral cycles¹, focusing on Brazilian municipalities with a population of less than 100,000. This selection is based on the fact that approximately 95% of the country's municipalities fall within this population range (see appendix figure 9). Consequently, our analysis strategically targets areas where observations are most concentrated.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for variables related to municipal characteristics, race, education, gender, and age of candidates and elected councilors. The statistics include the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum for each variable.

The average number of seats in municipal chambers is 9.94, highlighting the significant impact of municipalities within the initial population threshold. The average population of the municipalities is 17,000 inhabitants, and there are on average about 7 candidates per seat.

Women represent about 35% of the candidates and only 15% of the elected councilors, showing a significant gap in gender representation. It is important to note that this proportion of female candidates is close to the legal minimum of 30%.

In terms of racial representation, non-white candidates make up almost half of all candidates and are slightly less represented among those elected (about 48%). Age statistics show relatively similar average proportions of candidates under 30 (about 10%) and over 60 (about 9%).

¹ The exclusion of the 2013-2016 election cycle is due to a lack of available data on candidate racial identification during this period.

Variables	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max	N
Municipal Characteristics					
Number of Seats	9.94	1.64	7.00	17.00	10479
Population (in thousand)	17.06	17.73	0.78	99.99	10512
Total Candidates	69.94	49.74	9.00	396.00	10510
Candidates per Seat	6.73	3.85	1.00	30.89	10479
Gender					
Women Candidates	24.03	16.66	3.00	129.00	10510
Men Candidates	45.90	33.22	6.00	266.00	10510
Women Elected	1.52	1.16	0.00	8.00	10316
Share of Women Candidates (%)	34.68	2.71	25.93	50.00	10510
Share of Women Elected (%)	15.45	11.68	0.00	77.78	10286
Race					
Non-White Candidates	36.33	35.93	1.00	333.00	10192
Non-White Elected	4.86	3.31	0.00	17.00	9466
Share of Non-White Candidates $(\%)$	49.47	28.76	1.25	100.00	10192
Share of Non-White Elected $(\%)$	48.07	30.92	0.00	100.00	9436
\mathbf{Age}					
Candidates Under 30	7.14	5.25	1.00	49.00	10262
Candidates Over 60	6.77	6.12	1.00	62.00	10068
Share of Candidates Under 30 $(\%)$	10.64	5.07	0.93	38.46	10262
Share of Candidates Over 60 $(\%)$	9.44	4.85	0.83	53.33	10068
Elected Under 30	0.77	0.84	0.00	6.00	9682
Elected Over 60	0.83	0.87	0.00	5.00	8456
Share of Elected Under 30 $(\%)$	7.90	8.71	0.00	66.67	9653
Share of Elected Over 60 $(\%)$	8.35	8.63	0.00	55.56	8433
Education					
High School Graduates Candidates	42.13	34.14	2.00	290.00	10510
College Graduates Candidates	12.78	12.11	1.00	112.00	10424
Share of High School Graduates Candidates $(\%)$	58.66	12.30	9.52	100.00	10510
Share of College Graduates Candidates $(\%)$	17.54	8.10	1.25	58.82	10424
High School Graduates Elected	6.73	2.42	0.00	17.00	10510
College Graduates Elected	2.64	1.90	0.00	13.00	10358
Share of High School Graduates Elected (%)	67.14	18.60	0.00	100.00	10479
Share of College Graduates Elected (%)	25.88	16.91	0.00	100.00	10328

Table 1 – Summary Statistics

Notes: The table presents descriptive statistics on the characteristics of candidates and councilors who were elected. The data cover the 2017-2020 and 2021-2024 electoral cycles for municipalities with a population of up to 100,000, using population figures from IBGE and details on candidates and council members from TSE.

In terms of education, the majority of candidates (59%) and elected councilors (67%) have a high school education. However, the proportions of candidates and elected councilors with higher education (18% and 26%, respectively) suggest a positive influence of higher education on the probability of being elected.

4 EMPIRICAL STRATEGY

We used a regression discontinuity design to estimate the impact of the size of the municipal council on the diversity of candidates and elected councilors, including variables for age, gender, race, and education level. To do so, we examined the population limits established by Constitutional Amendment 58/2009, which determines the maximum number of councilors in each municipality. We analyzed the 2017-2020 and 2021-2024 electoral cycles.

A sharp RDD becomes appropriate when one considers that, although noncompliance is evident - not all municipalities choose to reach the maximum number of councilors allowed - relatively few municipalities deviate from adopting the limit, as shown in table 8. Our basic model is defined as follows:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta D_{it} + g(X_m) + \mu_{it} \tag{4.1}$$

where Y_{it} represents the outcome of interest for municipality *i* in year *t*; D_{it} is the treatment dummy variable indicating whether the observation is to the right of the threshold; $g(X_m)$ is a polynomial function of the running variable. We normalize and pool the pre-election populations around the first four thresholds to form a single cutoff, following Brollo et al. (2013). Our main specifications are estimated without controls. The coefficient of interest is β , which estimates the effect of having more contested seats on outcomes.

We estimate bias-corrected regression discontinuity coefficients and robust standard errors, using non-parametric functions within narrow windows on either side of the cutoff (Calonico; Cattaneo; Titiunik, 2014). This approach is more robust to bandwidth choices and valid under weaker conditions than conventional methods. We use a uniform kernel and compute the optimal mean squared error (MSE) bandwidth as in Calonico, Cattaneo and Farrell (2020). The procedure for selecting the optimal bandwidth was implemented using the R package provided by Calonico, Cattaneo and Titiunik (2015)¹. Following Gelman and Imbens (2019), we use a first-degree polynomial in the estimation procedures.

In cases where treatment is not a deterministic function of the running variable, the reduced-form coefficient of interest, as described in equation 4.1, serves as an intention-to-treat (ITT) estimator. To ensure reliable estimates, we rely on bias-corrected coefficients and robust cluster confidence intervals calculated according to Calonico, Cattaneo and Farrell (2018).

A basic assumption of the RD design is that municipalities cannot manipulate the official population count near the cutoff. In addition, other policies associated with the

¹ Available on January 2024 at https://rdpackages.github.io/rdrobust

cutoff, or imbalances in outcome determinants between cutoffs, could bias our estimates. We test and discuss these potential threats in Section 5.2.

5 RESULTS

We first test for an increase in the probability of treatment at the threshold. Then, we estimate the reduced-form effect of the council size on the participation in municipal elections of non-whites, women, those under 30 and over 60, and those with a high school diploma or higher education. Finally, the identification assumptions are discussed. The main reduced-form results are accompanied by graphs of the local linear regression of the outcome on the running variable, without controls.

5.1 Main results

The results presented in Table 2 and Figure 3 show the increased probability of being treated at the specified threshold. On average, municipalities with larger councils show an increase of 0.7 members compared to those with smaller councils, with this result being statistically significant at the 1% level. This finding remains consistent across different bandwidths and kernel choices, reinforcing the robustness of the observed relationship.

In addition, the analysis reveals a relationship between council size and the total number of candidates participating in the elections. While this effect is only statistically significant at the 10% level, it still suggests a positive influence on the size of the candidate pool.

Table 3 examines the relationship between racial representation and council size. The results of the regression discontinuity analysis indicate a statistically significant positive effect of council size on the number of non-white candidates elected. Specifically, we found an increase of 1.136 in the number of non-white candidates elected (column 2) in larger councils. This finding suggests that municipalities with larger legislative bodies are more likely to elect non-white candidates. We also estimate an increase of 5.7 percentage

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Seats	Total	Candidates
	Seats	Candidates	per Seat
β bias-corrected s.e.	0.726***	11.494^{*}	0.582
	(0.145)	(5.046)	(0.467)
Bandwidth	1736	1469	1109
Observations	2075	1823	1464

Table 2 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Electoral Outcomes

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.



Figure 3 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Electoral Outcomes: RD Plots

Note: The regression discontinuity plots visually represent the results of the regression discontinuity analysis for the normalized population threshold. Each plot corresponds to specific variables and illustrates changes around the cutoff point of the population threshold.

Table 3 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Racial Representation in Local Elections

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Non-White Candidates	Non-White Elected	At Least 1 Non-White	Share of Non-White	Share of Non-White
	_		Elected	Candidates	Elected
β bias-correcteds.e.	7.268	1.136^{**}	0.035	5.715^{*}	5.503
	(3.849)	(0.357)	(0.022)	(2.735)	(3.051)
Bandwidth	1336	1405	2222	1717	1781
Observations	1728	1926	2609	2103	2276

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

points in the proportion of non-white candidates (column 4), although this effect is only statistically significant at the 90% confidence level. However, the probability of electing at least one non-white candidate is not significantly affected by council size (column 3), and council size has no significant effect on the proportion of non-white candidates elected (column 5). These results suggest that council size may have a limited effect on racial representation in local politics, even if it leads to an increase in the number of non-white council members elected. Figure 4 complements the results in the table by providing RD plots for each outcome variable.

Table 4 presents the results of the regression discontinuity (RD) analysis that examines the impact of the size of the municipal council on women's participation and representation in local elections. The estimates show that an increase in the number of council seats is associated with a positive, but only marginally significant effect on



Figure 4 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Racial Representation in Local Elections: RD Plots

Note: The regression discontinuity plots visually represent the results of the regression discontinuity analysis for the normalized population threshold. Each plot corresponds to specific variables and illustrates changes around the cutoff point of the population threshold.

the number of female candidates (column 1). However, this increase has no statistically significant effect on the number of women elected (column 2), the probability of at least one woman being elected (column 3), or the proportion of female candidates or elected officials (columns 4 and 5). These results suggest that the size of the municipal council is not a determinant of gender representation in local politics. Figure 5 further supports the analysis by showing the RD plots for each outcome variable.

Table 5 presents the results of the regression discontinuity (RD) analysis that examines the impact of the size of the municipal council on the participation and representation of younger (under 30 years old) and older (over 60 years old) politicians in local elections. Our results suggest that the size of the municipal council does not have a significant effect on age representation in local politics. The increase in the number of candidates under 30 (column 1), which is the only significant effect identified, is minimal and does not translate into a higher proportion of councilors under 30. This suggests that other factors play a more important role in explaining the representation of different age groups in the local legislative body. Figure 6 completes the analysis.

Table 6 presents the results of the regression discontinuity (RD) analysis that

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Women	Women	At Least 1 Woman	Share of Women	Share of Women
	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Elected
β bias-correcteds.e.	3.718^{*}	0.029	0.014	-0.377	-0.473
	(1.745)	(0.097)	(0.036)	(0.241)	(0.754)
Bandwidth	1370	2987	2784	1432	5639
Observations	1725	2918	2795	1788	4552

Table 4 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Gender Representation in Local Elections

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

Figure 5 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Gender Representation in Local Elections: RD Plots



Note: The regression discontinuity plots visually represent the results of the regression discontinuity analysis for the normalized population threshold. Each plot corresponds to specific variables and illustrates changes around the cutoff point of the population threshold.



Figure 6 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Age Representation in Local Elections: RD Plots

Note: The regression discontinuity plots visually represent the results of the regression discontinuity analysis for the normalized population threshold. Each plot corresponds to specific variables and illustrates changes around the cutoff point of the population threshold.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Candidates Under 30	Share of Candidates Under 30	Elected Under 30	Share of Elected Under 30	Candidates Over 60	Share of Candidates Over 60	Elected Over 60	Share of Elected Over 60
β bias-correcteds.e.	1.636^{**}	0.685	0.000	-0.042	0.911	-0.278	-0.046	-0.974
	(0.531)	(0.360)	(0.069)	(0.670)	(0.665)	(0.406)	(0.066)	(0.796)
Bandwidth	1455	3734	3024	3502	1635	2583	4142	2701
Observations	1831	3424	3070	3396	2015	2705	4182	3144

Table 5 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Age Representation in Local Elections

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

Table 6 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Educational Attainment Representation in Local Elections

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	High School Graduates Candidates	Share of High School Graduates Candidates	High School Graduates Elected	Share of High School Graduates Elected	College Graduates Candidates	Share of College Graduates Candidates	College Graduates Elected	Share of College Graduates Elected
β bias-corrected s.e.	7.358^{*}	0.661	0.858^{***}	2.786	2.147	1.566^{*}	0.497^{*}	3.392
	(3.416)	(1.040)	(0.236)	(1.697)	(1.225)	(0.781)	(0.194)	(1.868)
Bandwidth	1444	2006	1368	1885	1378	1586	1637	1366
Observations	1801	2263	1722	2184	1749	1961	2001	1753

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

examines the impact of the size of the municipal council on the educational attainment of candidates and councilors elected in local elections. We find an average increase of 0.858 elected councilors with at least a high school education (column 3). In addition, there is a possible increase in the number of candidates with at least a high school education as the size of the council increases (column 1), but this result is only statistically significant at the 10% level. However, this increase does not change the proportion of candidates or elected officials with at least a high school diploma (columns 2 and 4). This finding suggests that increasing the number of candidates and elected officials with at least a high school diploma does not necessarily lead to a change in educational representation in local politics. The results for candidates and elected officials with a college degree are less clear. Figure 7 presents the RD plots for the number of candidates and elected officials by education level to visualize the RD results.

Our results are consistent with previous research examining the relationship between city council size and participation and representation in Brazilian municipal elections (Correa; Madeira, 2014; Britto; Fiorin, 2020; Frey, 2021). Specifically, our results suggest that a larger municipal council leads to the election of more non-white councilors. Similarly,



Figure 7 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Educational Attainment Representation in Local Elections: RD Plots

Note: The regression discontinuity plots visually represent the results of the regression discontinuity analysis for the normalized population threshold. Each plot corresponds to specific variables and illustrates changes around the cutoff point of the population threshold.

we observe an effect on the election of councilors with at least a high school education. However, it is important to note that this does not translate into a proportional increase in the representation of these groups within the council itself. Finally, our analysis found no significant effect between council size and representation based on gender or age.

5.2 Validity and Robustness

Additional results are presented in the appendix to check the robustness of the results to specification and methodological variations. Table 9 of the appendix presents estimates with year (election cycle) and state fixed effects, while table 10 presents local linear regressions estimated with triangular rather than uniform kernels. These results are consistent with the main results, and these robustness checks provide additional confidence in the validity of our findings.

An essential condition for the validity of identification is that the treated units are similar to the control units on observable attributes near the cutoff. To assess the validity of the regression discontinuity design, four placebo outcomes were used: the percentage of non-whites in the municipal population, the percentage of individuals with a high school education, the percentage of females, and the percentage of individuals aged 18 to 29. These outcomes were chosen based on their independence from the treatment (size of the municipal council). The results of the falsification test are shown in Table 7. None of the placebo outcomes showed statistically significant discontinuities at the cutoff point, suggesting that the regression discontinuity design is valid. In other words, the observed effects on council size in the outcome variable are likely due to the treatment and not to other pre-existing differences between municipalities.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Share of	Share of	Share of	Share of
	Non-White	High School	Women	People Aged
	Non-winte	Graduates	women	18-29
β bias-correcteds.e.	3.288	-0.321	0.229	0.310
	(2.460)	(0.501)	(0.133)	(0.208)
Bandwidth	1961	2743	2852	1695
Observations	1601	2732	2912	1332

Table 7 – Effects of Municipal Council Size on Placebo Outcomes

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on placebo outcomes. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1. Data source: IBGE Censo 2010.

We used Cattaneo, Jansson and Ma (2020) manipulation test to check that there



Figure 8 – Histogram and Estimated Density of the Score

are no abrupt changes in the number of observations at the cutoff, indicating a possible manipulation. The test result was a test statistic value of 1.2517 with a p-value of 0.2107, so we do not reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the density of treated and control observations at the cutoff, indicating that there is no evidence of manipulation of the running variable. Figure 8 shows the graphical representation of the test. The histogram shows a continuous distribution of the running variable, and the density estimate shows no abrupt change at the cutoff. The validity of the design is strengthened by the fact that the population estimates used to calculate the running variable were provided by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), an independent national agency, making it unlikely that the population estimates were manipulated.

We conducted sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our RD results to the choice of bandwidth. We estimated our model with alternative bandwidth choices of 5,000 and 7,500. The results obtained with both bandwidths are similar regarding point estimates, but the confidence intervals are wider for the larger bandwidth. These results are consistent with the literature on the robustness of discontinuous regression results. Tables 11 and 12 present the full estimates of the sensitivity analysis.

6 CONCLUSION

Municipal councils are representative bodies of civil society with the power to deliberate on a wide range of local issues of interest. They play a fundamental role in promoting civil society participation in local government, allowing citizens to participate in decisions that affect their communities.

Using a regression discontinuity design, we take advantage of a discontinuous rule that links the size of a municipality's population to the maximum number of council members allowed. This approach allows us to estimate the causal effect of council size on the diversity of candidates and elected council members. Analyzing data from the 2017-2020 and 2021-2024 election cycles, we seek to shed light on how council size shapes the demographic landscape of local legislatures.

In summary, we find an increase in the number of non-white elected councilors. We also estimate an increase in the number of councilors with at least a high school education. However, the size of the council does not affect the proportion of candidates or representatives who are non-white or have at least a high school education.

Regarding gender and age representation, the results are inconsistent. We find that council size it does affect the number of female candidates, but only at the 10% significance level and without a statistically significant effect on the election of women. Similarly, council size does not seem to have a significant effect on the representation of council members under 30 or over 60.

These results may occur because candidates from minority demographic groups still face challenges in getting elected, even in larger councils. This suggests that factors other than council size are more important determinants of the demographic composition of municipal chambers.

These findings have important implications for policymakers seeking to promote diversity in political representation. While increasing the size of city councils may increase the diversity of the candidate pool, it appears insufficient to address the systemic barriers that prevent the election of underrepresented groups. Focusing on addressing these systemic issues, such as implicit bias, discriminatory electoral processes, and unequal access to campaign resources, may be more critical to achieving more diverse representation in local legislatures.

A limitation of our study is the lack of systematic data on municipal legislative production, coupled with the lack of comprehensive datasets that aggregate diverse information about municipalities. This prevents us from assessing, for example, whether larger city councils might exhibit differences in legislative production despite no significant effect on council member representation.

REFERENCES

ABRUCIO, F. L. Os barões da federação. *Lua Nova: revista de cultura e política*, SciELO Brasil, p. 165–183, 1994.

ALESINA, A.; CASSIDY, T.; TROIANO, U. Old and young politicians. *Economica*, Wiley Online Library, v. 86, n. 344, p. 689–727, 2019.

BENEDETTO, M. A. D. The effect of council size on municipal expenditures: Evidence from italian municipalities. *Working Papers in Economics & Finance*, Birkbeck, v. 1802, p. 1–24, 2018.

BOULDING, C.; BROWN, D. S. Political competition and local social spending: evidence from brazil. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Springer, v. 49, p. 197–216, 2014.

BRAGANÇA, A.; DAHIS, R. Cutting special interests by the roots: Evidence from the brazilian amazon. *Journal of Public Economics*, Elsevier, v. 215, p. 104753, 2022.

BRASIL. Lei nº 6.448, de 11 de outubro de 1977. dispõe sobre a organização política e administrativa dos municípios dos territórios federais, e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF, 1977. Available on: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2018/lei/L13709compilado.htm>.

BRASIL. Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988. Brasília, DF: , 1988. Available on: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm.

BRASIL. Lei nº 9.504, de 30 de setembro de 1997. estabelece normas para as eleições. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF, 1997. Available on: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9504compilado.htm>.

BRASIL. Tribunal Superior Eleitoal. Resolução n. 21.702, de 2 de abril de 2004. Instruções sobre o número de vereadores a eleger segundo a população de cada município. 2004.

BRASIL. Constituição (1988). Emenda Constitucional nº 58, de 23 de setembro de 2009. Altera a redação do inciso IV do caput do art. 29 e do art. 29-A da Constituição Federal, tratando das disposições relativas à recomposição das Câmaras Municipais. 2009. Available on: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/emendas/emc/emc58.htm>.

BRATTON, K. A. The effect of legislative diversity on agenda setting: Evidence from six state legislatures. *American Politics Research*, Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, v. 30, n. 2, p. 115–142, 2002.

BRITTO, D. G.; FIORIN, S. Corruption and legislature size: Evidence from brazil. *European Journal of Political Economy*, Elsevier, v. 65, p. 101940, 2020.

BROLLO, F.; NANNICINI, T.; PEROTTI, R.; TABELLINI, G. The political resource curse. *American Economic Review*, American Economic Association, v. 103, n. 5, p. 1759–1796, 2013.

BROOCKMAN, D. E. Black politicians are more intrinsically motivated to advance blacks' interests: A field experiment manipulating political incentives. *American Journal of Political Science*, Wiley Online Library, v. 57, n. 3, p. 521–536, 2013.

CALONICO, S.; CATTANEO, M. D.; FARRELL, M. H. On the effect of bias estimation on coverage accuracy in nonparametric inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Taylor & Francis, v. 113, n. 522, p. 767–779, 2018.

CALONICO, S.; CATTANEO, M. D.; FARRELL, M. H. Optimal bandwidth choice for robust bias-corrected inference in regression discontinuity designs. *The Econometrics Journal*, Oxford University Press, v. 23, n. 2, p. 192–210, 2020.

CALONICO, S.; CATTANEO, M. D.; TITIUNIK, R. Robust nonparametric confidence intervals for regression-discontinuity designs. *Econometrica*, Wiley Online Library, v. 82, n. 6, p. 2295–2326, 2014.

CALONICO, S.; CATTANEO, M. D.; TITIUNIK, R. Rdrobust: an r package for robust nonparametric inference in regression-discontinuity designs. *R J.*, v. 7, n. 1, p. 38, 2015.

CATTANEO, M. D.; JANSSON, M.; MA, X. Simple local polynomial density estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Taylor & Francis, v. 115, n. 531, p. 1449–1455, 2020.

CHANG, E. C.; GOLDEN, M. A. Electoral systems, district magnitude and corruption. *British journal of political science*, Cambridge University Press, v. 37, n. 1, p. 115–137, 2007.

CHATTOPADHYAY, R.; DUFLO, E. Women as policy makers: Evidence from a randomized policy experiment in india. *Econometrica*, Wiley Online Library, v. 72, n. 5, p. 1409–1443, 2004.

CORREA, G.; MADEIRA, R. A. The Size of Local Legislatures and Women's Political Representation: Evidence from Brazil. 2014.

DAHIS, R.; HERAS, I. de las; SAAVEDRA, S. Young Politicians and Long-Term Policy. 2023.

EGGER, P.; KOETHENBUERGER, M. Government Spending and Legislative Organization: Quasi-experimental Evidence from Germany. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, v. 2, n. 4, p. 200–212, out. 2010.

FREIRE, D.; MIGNOZZETTI, U.; ROMAN, C.; ALPTEKIN, H. The effect of legislature size on public spending: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Political Science*, Cambridge University Press, v. 53, n. 2, p. 776–788, 2023.

FREY, A. Larger Legislatures and the Cost of Political Brokerage: Evidence from Brazil. 2021.

GELMAN, A.; IMBENS, G. Why high-order polynomials should not be used in regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, Taylor & Francis, v. 37, n. 3, p. 447–456, 2019.

HALSE, A. H. More for everyone: The effect of local interests on spending on infrastructure. *European Journal of Political Economy*, Elsevier, v. 43, p. 41–56, 2016.

HöHMANN, D. The effect of legislature size on public spending: evidence from a regression discontinuity design. *Public Choice*, v. 173, n. 3, p. 345–367, dez. 2017.

JAYASURIYA, D. S.; BURKE, P. J. Female parliamentarians and economic growth: Evidence from a large panel. *Applied Economics Letters*, Taylor & Francis, v. 20, n. 3, p. 304–307, 2013.

KRESCH, E. P.; SCHNEIDER, R.; VERAS, H.; WALKER, M. Do bigger legislatures lead to bigger government? evidence from a brazilian municipal council reform. In: NTA. *114th Annual Conference on Taxation.* 2021.

LEWIS, B. D. Legislature Size, Local Government Expenditure and Taxation, and Public Service Access in Indonesia. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, v. 54, n. 2, p. 274–298, jun. 2019.

MEIRELES, F.; ANDRADE, L. V. R. Magnitude eleitoral e representação de mulheres nos municípios brasileiros. *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, SciELO Brasil, v. 25, p. 79–101, 2017.

MIGNOZZETTI, U. G.; CEPALUNI, G. Legislature size and welfare: evidence from Brazil. 2019.

MINTA, M. D. Legislative oversight and the substantive representation of black and latino interests in congress. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, Wiley Online Library, v. 34, n. 2, p. 193–218, 2009.

PETTERSSON-LIDBOM, P. Does the size of the legislature affect the size of government? Evidence from two natural experiments. *Journal of Public Economics*, v. 96, n. 3, p. 269–278, abr. 2012.

ROCHA, M. M. d.; KERBAUY, M. T. M. *Eleições, partidos e representação política nos municípios brasileiros.* : Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (UFJF), 2014.

SILVA, B. S.; DANTAS, H. Quem são eles? identificando e caracterizando os vereadores brasileiros (2000-2016). *Perspectivas: Revista de Ciências Sociais*, v. 48, 2016.

SILVA, G. P. d. Mesmas instituições, mesmos resultados? comparando o efeito da competição eleitoral sobre os níveis de concentração de votos1. *Opinião Pública*, SciELO Brasil, v. 23, p. 682–713, 2017.

SILVA, P. C. O Poder Legislativo municipal: estrutura, composição e produção. Tese (Doutorado) — Universidade de São Paulo, 2014.

SOUZA, C. Constitutional Engineering in Brazil. Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 1997.

TABA, Y. L. Magnitude do distrito e fragmentação partidária em eleições municipais no Brasil. Tese (Doutorado) — Universidade de São Paulo, 2021.

WEINGAST, B. R.; SHEPSLE, K. A.; JOHNSEN, C. The political economy of benefits and costs: A neoclassical approach to distributive politics. *Journal of political Economy*, The University of Chicago Press, v. 89, n. 4, p. 642–664, 1981.

APPENDIX A – Tables

Municipal Population	Number of Seats (Maximum Limit)	Municipal Count	Municipalities Adopting Maximum
Up to 15,000	9 (nine)	3262	3224
From 15,001 to 30,000	11 (eleven)	1139	845
From 30,001 to 50,000	13 (thirteen)	496	326
From $50,001$ to $80,000$	15 (fifteen)	267	149
From 80,001 to 120,000	$17 \; (\text{seventeen})$	140	48
From $120,001$ to $160,000$	19 (nineteen)	81	17
From 160,001 to 300,000	$21 \ (twenty-one)$	94	33
From 300,001 to 450,000	23 (twenty-three)	39	8
From 450,001 to 600,000	25 (twenty-five)	17	3
From 600,001 to 750,000	27 (twenty-seven)	11	2
From 750,001 to 900,000	29 (twenty-nine)	6	2
From 900,001 to 1,050,000	31 (thirty-one)	2	0
From 1,050,001 to 1,200,000	33 (thirty-three)	2	0
From 1,200,001 to 1,350,000	35 (thirty-five)	1	0
From $1,350,001$ to $1,500,000$	37 (thirty-seven $)$	3	0
From 1,500,001 to 1,800,000	39 (thirty-nine)	2	1
From 1,800,001 to 2,400,000	41 (forty-one)	2	1
From 2,400,001 to 3,000,000	43 (forty-three)	3	2
From 3,000,001 to 4,000,000	45 (forty-five)	1	1
From 4,000,001 to 5,000,000	47 (forty-seven)	0	0
From 5,000,001 to 6,000,000	49 (forty-nine)	0	0
From 6,000,001 to 7,000,000	51 (fifty-one)	1	1
From 7,000,001 to 8,000,000	53 (fifty-three)	0	0
More than 8,000,000	55 (fifty-five)	1	1

Table 8 – Municipal Thresholds according to Constitutional Amendment n° 58/2009

Notes: Data refer to the maximum number of seats allowed for Brazilian municipal councils according to Constitutional Amendment No. 58/2009. Data refer to the 2021-2024 electoral cycle.

A) Effects of Munici	ipal Council Si	ze on Electora	l Outcomes					
,	(1)	(2)	(3)					
	Seats	Total	Candidates					
		Candidates	per Seat					
<i>bias-correcteds.e.</i>	0.607***	6.132	0.047					
	(0.143)	(4.506)	(0.391)					
Bandwidth Dbservations	$2081 \\ 1742$	$1739 \\ 1381$	$1441 \\ 1088$					
Joservations	1742	1991	1088					
B) Effects of Munici								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
	Non-White	Non-White	At Least 1	Share of	Share of			
	Candidates	Elected	Non-White Elected	Non-White Candidates	Non-White Elected			
bias-correcteds.e.	4.276	0.655**	0.015	1.431	2.370			
bias-correcteds.c.	(3.056)	(0.224)	(0.013)	(1.513)	(2.107)			
Bandwidth	2098	2523	3657	2357	2312			
Observations	1713	2087	3735	2037	1821			
		a 1 1	-					
C) Effects of Munici			(3) (3)	(4) in Local Elect	(5)			
	(1)	(2)	(3) At Least 1	(4) Share of	Share of			
	Women	Women	Woman	Women	Women			
	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Elected			
bias-correcteds.e.	2.056	0.007	0.008	-0.185	-0.733			
	(1.512)	(0.103)	(0.038)	(0.209)	(0.807)			
Bandwidth	1733	2490	2461	2103	3826			
Observations	1376	2275	2224	1779	4438			
D) Effects of Munici	ipal Council Si	ze on Age Ber	resentation in	Local Election	5			
) Encous of Maines	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	. ,	Share of	()	Share of		Share of		Share c
		Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Candidates	Elected	Elected
	Candidates	Candidates			Over 60	0 40	Over 60	Over 60
	Candidates Under 30	Under 30	Under 30	Under 30		Over 60		Over or
bias-correcteds.e.			-0.025	Under 30 0.221	0.445	-0.097	-0.035	
	Under 30	Under 30 0.475 (0.362)			0.445 (0.597)	-0.097 (0.354)	(0.064)	-1.612+ (0.894)
Bandwidth	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906	-0.025 (0.070) 2920	$0.221 \\ (0.655) \\ 3475$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871	$(0.064) \\ 4226$	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510
Bandwidth	Under 30 1.091* (0.476)	Under 30 0.475 (0.362)	-0.025 (0.070)	0.221 (0.655)	0.445 (0.597)	-0.097 (0.354)	(0.064)	-1.612+ (0.894)
Bandwidth	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906	-0.025 (0.070) 2920	$0.221 \\ (0.655) \\ 3475$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871	$(0.064) \\ 4226$	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510
Bandwidth Dbservations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803	$\begin{array}{c} 0.221 \\ (0.655) \\ 3475 \\ 3630 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842	$(0.064) \\ 4226$	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510
Bandwidth Dbservations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803	$\begin{array}{c} 0.221 \\ (0.655) \\ 3475 \\ 3630 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842	$(0.064) \\ 4226$	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510
Bandwidth Dbservations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sir (1)	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 onal Attainmen (3)	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of	0.445 (0.597) 1773 1378 on in Local E (5)	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842	$(0.064) \\ 4226 \\ 4204 $ (7)	$ \begin{array}{c} -1.612 + \\ (0.894) \\ 2510 \\ 1869 \\ \end{array} $ (8)
Bandwidth Dbservations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Siz (1) High School	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 onal Attainmen (3) High School	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School	0.445 (0.597) 1773 1378 on in Local E (5) College	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share o College
Bandwidth Dbservations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sir (1) High School Graduates	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 onal Attainmen (3) High School Graduates	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates	0.445 (0.597) 1773 1378 on in Local E (5) College Graduates	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share c College Graduat
Bandwidth Dbservations E) Effects of Munici	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Six (1) High School Graduates Candidates	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 mal Attainmen (3) High School Graduates Elected	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445\\ (0.597)\\ 1773\\ 1378\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ (5)\\ \hline \\ \\ College\\ \\ Graduates\\ \\ Candidates \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share o College Graduat Elected
Bandwidth Dbservations E) Effects of Munici	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sin (1) High School Graduates Candidates 4.480	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 0.333	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 mal Attainmen (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.676**	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 1.821	0.445 (0.597) 1773 1378 on in Local E (5) College Graduates Candidates 1.131	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.270	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.385*	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share o College Graduat Elected 2.073
 ³ bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations E) Effects of Munici ³ bias-correcteds.e. 	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sin (1) High School Graduates Candidates 4.480 (3.134)	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 0.333 (0.914)	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 mal Attainmen (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.676** (0.209)	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 at Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 1.821 (1.600)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ (5) \\ \hline \\ College \\ Graduates \\ Candidates \\ \hline \\ 1.131 \\ (1.160) \\ \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.270 (0.759)	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.385* (0.181)	-1.612+ (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share of College Graduat Elected 2.073 (1.822)
Bandwidth Diservations E) Effects of Munici bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sin (1) High School Graduates Candidates 4.480 (3.134) 1707	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 0.333 (0.914) 2517	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 mal Attainmen (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.676** (0.209) 2027	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 1.821 (1.600) 2152	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ (5) \\ \hline \\ College \\ Graduates \\ Candidates \\ \hline \\ 1.131 \\ (1.160) \\ 1630 \\ \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.270 (0.759) 1620	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.385* (0.181) 1908	-1.612 (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share of College Graduat Elected 2.073 (1.822) 1553
Bandwidth Deservations E) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Deservations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sir (1) High School Graduates Candidates 4.480 (3.134) 1707 1347	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 0.333 (0.914) 2517 2355	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 mal Attainmen (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.676** (0.209) 2027 1690	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 1.821 (1.600) 2152 1850	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ on in \ Local \ E \\ \hline \\ (5) \\ \hline \\ College \\ Graduates \\ Candidates \\ \hline \\ 1.131 \\ (1.160) \\ 1630 \\ 1254 \\ \end{array}$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.270 (0.759) 1620 1245	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.385* (0.181) 1908 1531	-1.612- (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share of College Graduat Electee 2.073 (1.822) 1553 1179
Bandwidth Deservations E) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Deservations Notes: This	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sir (1) High School Graduates Candidates 4.480 (3.134) 1707 1347 table repon	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 0.333 (0.914) 2517 2355 ets the redu	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.676** (0.209) 2027 1690 iced-form e	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 1.821 (1.600) 2152 1850 ffects of co	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ 0$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.270 (0.759) 1620 1245 on the poo	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.385* (0.181) 1908 1531 ol of candi	-1.612- (0.894) 2510 1869 (8) Share of College Graduat Electee 2.073 (1.822) 1553 1179 dates a
Bandwidth Observations C) Effects of Munici C bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Observations	Under 30 1.091* (0.476) 1954 1569 pal Council Sir (1) High School Graduates Candidates 4.480 (3.134) 1707 1347 table repon	Under 30 0.475 (0.362) 2906 2942 ze on Educatio (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 0.333 (0.914) 2517 2355 ets the redu	-0.025 (0.070) 2920 2803 (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.676** (0.209) 2027 1690 iced-form e	0.221 (0.655) 3475 3630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 1.821 (1.600) 2152 1850 ffects of co	$\begin{array}{c} 0.445 \\ (0.597) \\ 1773 \\ 1378 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ 0$	-0.097 (0.354) 2871 2842 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.270 (0.759) 1620 1245 on the poo	(0.064) 4226 4204 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.385* (0.181) 1908 1531 ol of candi	-1.612- (0.894 2510 1869 (8) Share of Colleg Graduat Electee 2.073 (1.822 1553 1179 dates a

Table 9 – Robustness check: Year and state fixed effects estimates

in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Year and state fixed effects are included in all models. Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)					
	Seats	Total Candidates	Candidates per Seat					
³ bias-correcteds.e.	0.470**	10.602*	0.726					
	(0.151)	(4.791)	(0.424)					
Bandwidth	2228	2395	2133					
Observations	1945	2163	1820					
B) Effects of Munici	pal Council Si		*	in Local Electi				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
	Non-White	Non-White	At Least 1	Share of	Share of			
	Candidates	Elected	Non-White Elected	Non-White Candidates	Non-White Elected			
biag correcteda o	7.622*	0.935**	0.051*	3.554	5.442			
<i>³</i> bias-correcteds.e.	(3.411)	(0.339)	(0.031)	(2.819)	(3.294)			
Bandwidth	(3.411) 2586	(0.359) 2534	(0.025) 2486	(2.819) 2280	(3.294) 2328			
Diservations	$2360 \\ 2364$	$2554 \\ 2103$	2480 2037	1946	$\frac{2328}{1837}$			
Joseivations	2304	2105	2037	1940	1007			
C) Effects of Munici	nal Council Si	ze on Gender I	Representation	in Local Elect	ions			
) Encess of wruller	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
	· · ·		At Least 1	Share of	Share of			
	Women	Women	Woman	Women	Women			
		Elected		G 111	Elected			
	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Elected			
³ bias-correcteds.e.	3.572*	0.011	Elected 0.007	-0.280	-0.884			
bias-correcteds.e.	3.572*	0.011	0.007	-0.280	-0.884			
Bandwidth	3.572^{*} (1.640)	0.011 (0.097)	$0.007 \\ (0.035)$	-0.280 (0.212)	-0.884 (0.856)			
Bandwidth	$ \begin{array}{r} 3.572^* \\ (1.640) \\ 2384 \end{array} $	$0.011 \\ (0.097) \\ 3547$	$0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556$	-0.280 (0.212) 2568	-0.884 (0.856) 4378			
Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election	-0.884 (0.856) 4378 5364 s			
Bandwidth Dbservations	$3.572^{*} \\ (1.640) \\ 2384 \\ 2159$	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556 \\ 3982 \end{array}$	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4)	$\begin{array}{c} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \end{array}$	(6)	(7)	(8)
Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1)	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3)	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election	-0.884 (0.856) 4378 5364 s (5)	(6) Share of		· · ·
Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected	-0.884 (0.856) 4378 5364 s (5) Candidates	Share of Candidates	Elected	Share o Elected
Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30	-0.884 (0.856) 4378 5364 <u>s</u> (5) Candidates Over 60	Share of Candidates Over 60	Elected Over 60	Share of Elected
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557**	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160	-0.884 (0.856) 4378 5364 s (5) Candidates Over 60 0.712	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411	Elected Over 60 -0.050	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e.	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492)	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556 \\ 3982 \end{array}$ resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 \\ (0.067) \end{array}	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667)	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390)	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071)	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842)
Bandwidth Diservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556 \\ 3982 \\ \end{array}$ resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 \\ (0.067) \\ 3906 \\ \end{array}	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici Bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492)	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556 \\ 3982 \end{array}$ resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 \\ (0.067) \end{array}	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667)	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390)	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071)	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842)
Bandwidth Diservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Diservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556 \\ 3982 \\ \hline \\ $	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186 pal Council Si	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 tt Representati	-0.884 (0.856) 4378 5364 s (5) Candidates Over 60 0.712 (0.630) 2691 2555 on in Local E	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514	Share c Electec Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations	$\begin{array}{c} 3.572^{*} \\ (1.640) \\ 2384 \\ 2159 \\ \hline \\ 100 \\ \hline 1$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.011\\ (0.097)\\ 3547\\ 3963\\ \hline \\ ze \text{ on Age Rep}\\ (2)\\ Share of\\ Candidates\\ Under 30\\ 0.522\\ (0.366)\\ 3839\\ 4455\\ \hline \\ ze \text{ on Educatic}\\ (2)\\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007 \\ (0.035) \\ 3556 \\ 3982 \\ \end{array}$ eresentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) \\ 3906 \\ 4334 \\ \hline \\ 0nal Attainmer \\ (3) \\ \end{array}	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 tt Representati (4)	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7)	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8)
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186 pal Council Si (1) High School	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 onal Attainmer (3) High School	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 tt Representati (4) Share of	$\begin{array}{c} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) (7) College	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186 pal Council Si (1) High School Graduates	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of High School	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 onal Attainmer (3) High School Graduates	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 tt Representati (4) Share of High School	$\begin{array}{c} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of College	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) (7) College Graduates	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o College
Bandwidth Diservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Diservations	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 ipal Council Si (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186 pal Council Si (1) High School	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of High School Graduates	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 onal Attainmer (3) High School	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 at Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates	$\begin{array}{c} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) (7) College	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o College Graduat
Bandwidth Diservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Diservations E) Effects of Munici	$\begin{array}{c} 3.572^{*} \\ (1.640) \\ 2384 \\ 2159 \\ \hline \\ $	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 onal Attainmer (3) High School Graduates	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 at Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected	$\begin{array}{c} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \end{array}$ s (5) Candidates Over 60 0.712 (0.630) 2691 2555 on in Local E (5) College Graduates Candidates	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) (7) College Graduates Elected	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o College Graduat Elected
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations E) Effects of Munici	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186 pal Council Si (1) High School Graduates Candidates 6.783*	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 1.354	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 mal Attainmer (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.694**	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 at Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 3.022	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.385	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.405*	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o College Graduat Elected 3.141
Bandwidth Dbservations D) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Dbservations E) Effects of Munici B bias-correcteds.e.	$\begin{array}{c} 3.572^{*} \\ (1.640) \\ 2384 \\ 2159 \\ \hline \\ $	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 1.354 (1.062)	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 mal Attainmer (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.694** (0.212)	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 t Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 3.022 (1.736)	$\begin{array}{c} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \end{array}$ s (5) Candidates Over 60 0.712 \\ (0.630) \\ 2691 \\ 2555 \\ \hline \\ 0 \text{ in Local E} \\ (5) \\ \hline \\ College \\ Graduates \\ Candidates \\ \hline \\ 2.219 \\ (1.142) \\ \end{array}	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.385 (0.739)	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.405* (0.199)	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o College Graduat Elected 3.141 (1.856)
 ³ bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Observations D) Effects of Munici ³ bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Observations E) Effects of Munici ³ bias-correcteds.e. Bandwidth Observations 	3.572* (1.640) 2384 2159 (1) Candidates Under 30 1.557** (0.492) 2444 2186 pal Council Si (1) High School Graduates Candidates 6.783*	0.011 (0.097) 3547 3963 ze on Age Rep (2) Share of Candidates Under 30 0.522 (0.366) 3839 4455 ze on Educatic (2) Share of High School Graduates Candidates 1.354	0.007 (0.035) 3556 3982 resentation in (3) Elected Under 30 0.020 (0.067) 3906 4334 mal Attainmer (3) High School Graduates Elected 0.694**	-0.280 (0.212) 2568 2441 Local Election (4) Share of Elected Under 30 -0.160 (0.667) 4079 4630 at Representati (4) Share of High School Graduates Elected 3.022	$\begin{array}{r} -0.884 \\ (0.856) \\ 4378 \\ 5364 \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	Share of Candidates Over 60 -0.411 (0.390) 3302 3478 Elections (6) Share of College Graduates Candidates 1.385	Elected Over 60 -0.050 (0.071) 4468 4514 (7) College Graduates Elected 0.405*	Share o Elected Over 60 -1.416 (0.842) 3418 3036 (8) Share o College Graduat Elected 3.141

Table 10 – Robustness check: Estimates with triangular kernel

elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a triangular kernel. The optimal bandwidth for each regression, minimizing mean squared error (MSE), was chosen following the method outlined in Calonico et al. (2014, 2018). Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

A) Effects of Munici	$\frac{\text{par Council Si}}{(1)}$	$\frac{\text{ze on Electora}}{(2)}$	(3)					
	· · ·	Total	Candidates					
	Seats	Candidates	per Seat					
β bias-correcteds.e.	0.759***	14.224***	1.007***					
biab correcteds.c.	(0.087)	(2.784)	(0.229)					
Bandwidth	5000	5000	5000					
Observations	6481	6496	6481					
B) Effects of Munici	pal Council Si	ze on Racial R	epresentation i	in Local Electi	ons			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
	Non-White	Non-White	At Least 1	Share of	Share of			
	Candidates	Elected	Non-White	Non-White	Non-White			
			Elected	Candidates	Elected			
β bias-correcteds.e.	9.199***	0.916***	0.025	2.271	4.410*			
	(2.086)	(0.206)	(0.016)	(1.702)	(1.940)			
Bandwidth	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000			
Observations	6261	5774	5774	6261	5760			
C) Effects of Munici	*				tions (5)			
	(1)	(2)	(3) At Least 1	(4) Shana af	(5) Share of			
	Women	Women	At Least 1 Woman	Share of Women	Women			
	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Elected			
β bias-correcteds.e.	4.727***	-0.052	-0.010	-0.177	-1.514*			
bias-correcteus.e.	(0.941)	(0.052)	(0.025)	(0.150)	(0.712)			
Bandwidth	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000			
Observations	6496	6369	6369	6496	6355			
D) Effects of Munici	-					(0)	(=)	(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Candidates	Share of	Elected	Share of	Candidates	Share of	Elected	Share of
	Under 30	Candidates	Under 30	Elected	Over 60	Candidates	Over 60	Elected
2 1.:	1.966***	Under 30	0.024	Under 30	0.074*	Over 60	0.002	Over 60
<i>bias-correcteds.e.</i>	(0.305)	0.686^{*} (0.289)	0.034	-0.074 (0.530)	0.874^{*}	-0.327 (0.292)	-0.023	-1.043
Bandwidth	(0.305) 5000	(0.289) 5000	$(0.051) \\ 5000$	(0.530) 5000	$(0.378) \\ 5000$	(0.292) 5000	$(0.059) \\ 5000$	(0.597) 5000
Observations	6350	6350	6019	5000 6006	6203	6203	5179	5167
	0000	0000	0010	0000	0200	0200	0110	0101
E) Effects of Munici	pal Council Siz			t Representati	ion in Local E			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	High School	Share of	High School	Share of	College	Share of	College	Share of
	Graduates	High School	Graduates	High School	Graduates	College	Graduates	College
	Candidates	Graduates	Elected	Graduates	Candidates	Graduates	Elected	Graduate
		Candidates		Elected		Candidates		Elected
β bias-corrected s.e.	8.581***	-0.181	0.613***	0.797	2.749***	0.689	0.230*	0.580
	(1.892)	(0.694)	(0.133)	(1.078)	(0.664)	(0.466)	(0.111)	(1.017)
Bandwidth	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Observations	6496	6496	6496	6481	6425	6425	6400	6386

Table 11 - RD estimates using bandwidth of 5,000

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a uniform kernel. Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)					
	Seats	Total Candidates	Candidates per Seat					
³ bias-correcteds.e.	0.740***	4.472*	-0.067					
Sido correctedorer	(0.067)	(2.127)	(0.173)					
Bandwidth	7500	7500	7500					
Observations	9914	9940	9914					
	10 10	D 11D						
3) Effects of Munici	pal Council Si (1)	$\frac{\text{ze on Racial R}}{(2)}$	(3)	(4)	$\frac{\text{ons}}{(5)}$			
	· · /		At Least 1	Share of	Share of			
	Non-White	Non-White	Non-White	Non-White	Non-White			
	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Elected			
<i>bias-correcteds.e.</i>	3.851*	0.326*	0.002	-3.160*	-2.357			
	(1.599)	(0.160)	(0.013)	(1.336)	(1.517)			
Bandwidth	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500			
Observations	9622	8917	8917	9622	8892			
C) Effects of Munici			*					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
	Women	Women	At Least 1	Share of	Share of			
	Candidates	Elected	Woman	Women	Women			
			Elected	Candidates	Elected			
bias-correcteds.e.	1.391	0.045	0.020	0.117	-0.420			
	(0.717)	(0.054)	(0.019)	(0.120)	(0.551)			
Bandwidth	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500			
Observations	9940	9754	9754	9940	9729			
D) Effects of Munici	pal Council Si (1)	ze on Age Rep (2)	(3)	Local Election (4)	s (5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	. ,	Share of	(/	Share of	. ,	Share of		Share of
	Candidates	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Candidates	Elected	Elected
	Under 30	Under 30	Under 30	Under 30	Over 60	Over 60	Over 60	Over 60
bias-correcteds.e.	1.031***	0.741**	0.057	0.168	0.180	0.115	-0.015	-0.885
D blas-correcteus.e.	(0.236)	(0.229)	(0.040)	(0.413)	(0.287)	(0.229)	(0.045)	(0.462)
Bandwidth	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500
Observations	9693	9693	9180	9156	9499	9499	7941	7922
E) Effects of Munici	pal Council Siz	ze on Educatio	onal Attainmer	t Representati	on in Local E	lections		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		Share of		Share of		Share of		Share o
	High School	High School	High School	High School	College	College	College Creducter	College
	Graduates	Graduates	Graduates	Graduates	Graduates	Graduates	Graduates	Graduat
	Candidates	Candidates	Elected	Elected	Candidates	Candidates	Elected	Elected
bias-correcteds.e.	3.220*	-0.653	0.461***	-0.714	1.174^{*}	0.244	-0.001	-1.892*
	(1.455)	(0.549)	(0.105)	(0.849)	(0.512)	(0.365)	(0.085)	(0.786)
Bandwidth	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500	7500
Observations	9940	9940	9940	9914	9854	9854	9788	9763

Table 12 - RD estimates using bandwidth of 7,500

Notes: This table reports the reduced-form effects of council size on the pool of candidates and elected councilors in local elections. The estimates are derived from regression discontinuity (RD) designs, utilizing a local polynomial estimator with a triangular kernel. Significance levels are denoted by: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.



