Structural adjustment programmes and communicable disease burdens: causal evidence from 187 countries

Elias Nosrati, Jennifer B. Dowd, Michael Marmot, Lawrence P. King

International financial organisations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) play a central role in shaping the developmental trajectories of fiscally distressed countries through their conditional lending schemes, known as 'structural adjustment programmes'. These programmes entail wide-ranging domestic policy reforms that influence local health and welfare systems. Using novel panel data from 187 countries between 1990 and 2017 and an instrumental variable technique, we find that IMF programmes cause over 400 excess deaths and over 4,100 excess disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) from communicable diseases per 100,000 population. IMF-mandated privatisation reforms cause over 570 excess deaths and over 6,700 excess DALYs per 100,000 population. Thus structural adjustment programmes, as currently designed and implemented, are harmful to population health and increase global communicable disease burdens.

Introduction

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, much scientific effort has been devoted to better understanding the institutional determinants of communicable disease control. We seek to contribute to this understanding by assessing the role of international multilateral organisations in shaping communicable disease burdens across the world. As one of the world's leading international financial institutions, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) is uniquely positioned to shape the developmental trajectories of fiscally distressed nations through its conditional lending schemes, known as 'structural adjustment programmes'. In particular, the Fund plays a pivotal role in shaping state capacities to manage pandemics by moulding the institutional infrastructure of local health and welfare systems (1).

Previous research has shown that the IMF-sponsored pursuit of short-term economic goals at the expense of long-term public investments by financially constrained governments undermines local health systems via fiscal austerity and rapid privatisation reforms, for instance by curtailing the extent of healthcare coverage, sapping the resources of primary care units, and thereby weakening the quality of care provision (2, 3). More generally, IMF-mandated policy reforms — known as 'conditionalities' — have been associated with reduced state capacities and declining population health (4–6). However, with the exception of a few case studies (7, 8), we are not aware of any prior systematic investigations of the causal relation between the IMF's structural adjustment programmes and communicable disease burdens.

A separate literature has shown that the rapid privatisation of state-owned enterprises can exert deleterious effects on population health by increasing unemployment and social insecurity, as well as eroding the public provision of various social goods, including access to healthcare (9, 10). However, research on the nexus between privatisation and mortality through the lens of structural adjustment remains scarce, and virtually nothing is known about how IMF-mandated privatisation reforms affect disability and death burdens from

communicable diseases. The purpose of our paper is to step into this breach by using previously unavailable data and a compound instrumentation technique to derive unbiased causal effect estimates.

Methods

The first of our two outcome variables is the country-level age-standardised mortality rate from communicable, maternal, neonatal, and nutritional diseases per 100,000 population between 1990 and 2017. Taken together, these highly correlated causes of death form a 'level 1' category within the framework of the Global Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors Study, the methodology of which is employed to generate comparable age-standardised mortality metrics across country-years (11). To avoid terminological clutter, however, we henceforth use 'communicable' as a shorthand for 'communicable, maternal, neonatal, and nutritional'. Our second outcome variable is the burden of communicable disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) per 100,000 population, a measure that is useful for gauging how communicable diseases burden local populations beyond their impact on mortality. We employ two sets of treatment variables to assess the effects of structural adjustment (12). On the one hand, we use a dichotomous indicator of whether a country is under an IMF programme to estimate an overall average treatment effect of IMF intervention. On the other hand, to further probe the specific nature of structural loan conditions and their relation to the outcome variables, we assess the role of IMF-mandated privatisations of state-owned enterprises.

Our economic control variables are gross domestic product (GDP) per capita, measured in constant 2010 US dollars (13), a binary financial crisis indicator (14), and foreign reserves in months of imports (13). Our political control variables include a general democracy index (15) and a more refined measure of egalitarian democracy (16), a coup d'état indicator (17) as a measure of political instability, and United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) voting alignment with the G7 countries (18). The latter variable is construed as a proxy for geo-strategic alignment and is known to be predictive of IMF programme participation and potentially of the types of conditionalities received by borrowing countries (19). We also control for average years of completed education in the female population aged 25–29 (20). Finally, to test the hypothesis according to which much of the proposed impact propagates through health systems, we control for the number of hospital beds per 1,000 population (13). Descriptive statistics are shown in Table **??**.

We posit the following data-generating process:

$$Y_{it} = T_{i,t-k}\beta + X_{it}\theta + \mu_i + \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{1}$$

where Y_{it} denotes one of the two alternative outcome variables as measured in country i at time t; $T_{i,t-k}$ is a dichotomous indicator of IMF programme participation, lagged by $k \in \{1, 5, 10\}$ years to allow for dynamic effects to manifest; X_{it} is a vector of control variables; μ_i captures time-invariant country-specific effects; φ_t measures time-fixed effects; and ε_{it} is a stochastic error term. Our principal quantity of interest is β, which is a causal effect parameter to be estimated. A common approach to estimating β is through the use of two-way fixed effects models that isolate variation within units over time whilst controlling for aggregate time trends. This has the virtue of eliminating all bias induced by time-invariant confounders. However, some countries might be more likely to seek the IMF's assistance than other countries, and

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Communicable disease mortality rate	5,460	268	342	8.1	1,724
Communicable disability-adjusted life years	5,460	1,858	2,740	18.6	18,765
IMF programme	5,165	0.3	0.5	0.0	1.0
IMF-mandated privatisation	5,131	0.1	0.5	0.0	12.0
GDP per capita	4,733	11,561	17,103	164	111,968
Financial crisis	5,236	0.1	0.2	0.0	1.0
Foreign reserves	3,932	4.4	4.7	0.002	79
Democracy	4,909	3.5	6.6	−10	10
Egalitarian democracy	4,097	0.4	0.2	0.03	0.9
Coup d'état	4,396	0.02	0.1	0.0	1.0
UNGA voting alignment	5,012	−1.6	1.0	−3.9	1.4
Mean years of female education	5,404	8.9	4.0	0.5	16
Hospital beds per 1,000 population	2,694	4.1	3.1	0.01	19.9

Notes: The mortality rate from communicable diseases is age-standardised. Both the mortality rate and the disability-adjusted life years are per 100,000 population. The second column lists the number of observed country-years. The privatisation variable counts the total number of privatisation conditionalities imposed on a borrowing country by the IMF. The general democracy index ranges from −10 to 10. The egalitarian democracy index ranges from 0 to 1.

this might generate a spurious association between structural adjustment programmes and our outcomes of interest. Relatedly, in the presence of serial correlation between adjacent country-year observations, there is minimal treatment variation over time that the 'within' estimator can exploit to produce reliable parameter estimates. Taken together, these factors are conducive to point and interval estimation bias.

To address and mitigate these concerns, we construct an instrumental variable, Z, that is suited to isolating exogenous variation in T. To do this, we follow recent methodological advances in the study of structural adjustment (21, 22) by adopting a compound instrument derived from the interaction between the country-specific average exposure to IMF programmes over the sample period and the Fund's annual budget constraint, approximated by the number of countries with an IMF programme in a given year (23). This instrument meets the relevance criterion insofar as the IMF is likely to impose more stringent loan conditions when facing liquidity concerns. It also meets the exclusion criterion insofar as the Fund's aggregate annual budget constraints are independent of any given client country, such that unit-specific shocks that deviate from a country's long-run average exposure to structural adjustment result from a treatment assignment mechanism that is orthogonal to any given country's potential outcomes. Previous research has indeed shown that the IMF is more likely to impose harsher loan conditions when it faces liquidity concerns, regardless of the client country (23). In other words, the outcome of interest in countries with varying propensities to participate in IMF programmes will not be affected by changes in the Fund's budgetary constraint other than through the impact of structural adjustment. Our identification strategy is visually summarised in FIGURE **??**, where the conditional independence assumption obtains by deploying Z as a source of exogenous variation in T that helps us identify a local average treatment effect. Thus, the joint usage of an instrumental variable and of country- and time-fixed effects provides a rigorous framework for causal identification. We nevertheless provide a comprehensive sensitivity analysis that quantifies any residual confounding, as detailed below.

We thus obtain a two-stage regression model with the following selection equation:

$$T_{it} = Z_{it}\tau + X_{it}\eta + \alpha_i + \kappa_t + \upsilon_{it}. \tag{2}$$

We then re-specify the model in equation (**??**) as follows, with $\widehat{T}$ being a vector of fitted values from equation (**??**):

$$Y_{it} = \widehat{T}_{i,t-k}\beta + X_{it}\theta + \mu_i + \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{it}. \tag{3}$$

To empirically assess the strength of the chosen instrument, we compare the model in equation (**??**) to a restricted first-stage regression in which the effect τ of Z on T is set to be null, obtaining a χ^2 test statistic of 53.641 on 1 degree of freedom ($p < 0.001$). Our alternative instrument targeting privatisation conditionalities also passes the required significance threshold, with a χ^2 test statistic of 40.464 on 1 degree of freedom ($p < 0.001$). Hence, in both cases, Z comfortably satisfies the benchmark for identifying strong instruments. We control for the endogenous relation between T and Y potentially induced by any time-invariant propensity of countries with a prior health disadvantage to select into IMF programmes by adjusting for country-fixed effects, whereas year-fixed effects help account for broader aggregate changes that affect all countries simultaneously. All variance estimators are consistent with serial autocorrelation, heteroskedasticity, and country-level clustering effects. All analyses are conducted in R, version 4.0.2.



Figure 1: Causal graph depicting the effect of the treatment variable (T = IMF programme) on the outcome (Y = communicable disease mortality rate or DALY burden), identified via a compound instrument (Z = country-specific average IMF programme participation $\times$ annual IMF liquidity constraint), net of both measured covariates (X) and unmeasured confounders (U).

Given that we cannot empirically verify the presence of conditional exchangeability between treatment and control groups, the persistence of unmeasured residual confounding is possible. To address this concern, we conduct a simple non-parametric sensitivity analysis that allows us to quantify the amount of unmeasured confounding that would in theory be required to eliminate our estimated treatment effect $\hat{\beta}$. As per FIGURE **??**, let U denote an unmeasured confounder. Then the bias factor, $\mathcal{B}$, is defined as the difference between $\hat{\beta}$ and what $\hat{\beta}$ would have been had we controlled for U as well. Assuming U is binary, we define

$$\gamma = \mathbb{E}(Y \mid U = 1,\, T) - \mathbb{E}(Y \mid U = 0,\, T)$$

as the net effect of the unmeasured confounder on the outcome and

$$\delta = \mathbb{P}(U = 1 \mid T = 1) - \mathbb{P}(U = 1 \mid T = 0)$$

as the difference in the prevalence of the unmeasured confounder between the treatment and control groups. Then the bias factor is the product of these two sensitivity parameters: $\mathcal{B} = \gamma \cdot \delta$ (24, 25). In assessing the sensitivity of our model coefficients to unmeasured confounding, we ask how large γ would have to be in order to reduce our estimated effect size $\hat{\beta}$ to zero. We address this question by visualising how $\mathcal{B}$ changes as the two sensitivity parameters (co-)vary across a range of possible values.

RESULTS

TABLE **??** displays our baseline results. As seen in the top half of the table, we find that IMF programmes as a whole exert a substantively large impact both on mortality and DALY rates per 100,000 population, notably in the short and medium term. In the long run, the effect dissipates somewhat and is harder to identify precisely, as evidenced by smaller effect sizes and widening confidence intervals. This aggregate effect appears to be driven by IMF-mandated privatisation reforms, which generate large excess burdens of disability and death from communicable diseases. Also in this case, we find that the effect weakens after a decade.

To assess the robustness of these parameter estimates to additional covariates, we introduce our control variables. However, to avoid multicollinearity and the loss of too many observations at once due to missing data, we add and remove these controls one by one and inspect the corresponding change in the treatment coefficient. To avoid unnecessary clutter, we limit our sensitivity analysis to the short-term effects identified above and omit all but the key quantities of substantive interest. As displayed in TABLES **??** and **??**, we find that structural adjustment remains a robust predictor of both outcome variables. The greatest attenuation in the estimated treatment effect occurs when controlling for foreign reserves — which is a strong predictor of selection into IMF programmes — and (egalitarian) democracy — which may itself be affected by IMF policies through wide-ranging institutional reforms and weakened state capacity (5, 26). The impact of privatisation reforms is also attenuated when adjusting for the incidence of coups d'état. We also find, as shown in the last row of both tables, that the causal pathway operating via health systems appears to account for a substantial proportion of the identified effects, which are attenuated by up to three-fourths when conditioning on the number of hospital beds per 1,000 population. We note, however, that the latter control models are based on a substantially reduced sample size (total $N = 2,082$) due to missing data and should therefore be interpreted with some caution.

Table 2: Baseline instrumented two-way fixed effects regression models

	Excess death rate	Excess DALY rate
IMF programme: $t-1$	402 (211, 594)	4,132 (2,128, 6,136)
IMF programme: $t-5$	418 (96, 739)	3,231 (977, 5,484)
IMF programme: $t-10$	288 (5, 571)	1,417 (282, 2,552)
Privatisation reforms: $t-1$	576 (299, 853)	6,721 (3274, 10,169)
Privatisation reforms: $t-5$	568 (149, 987)	4,739 (1,005, 8,474)
Privatisation reforms: $t-10$	424 (4, 844)	1,624 (−147, 3,394)

Notes: The outcome variables are age-standardised mortality rates from communicable diseases and communicable disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) per 100,000 population. The two treatment variables (displayed on the left), lagged by one, five, and ten years, are instrumented as described in the methods section. The corresponding parameter estimates are interpreted as the excess number of deaths or DALYs per 100,000 population caused by IMF programmes as a whole or by IMF-mandated privatisation reforms. 95% confidence intervals derived from standard errors consistent with heteroskedasticity, serial correlation, and unit clustering are shown in parentheses below each parameter estimate.

Table 3: Instrumented two-way fixed effects control models — Mortality

Control variable	IMF_{t-1} coefficient	$\text{Privatisation}_{t-1}$ coefficient
Log of GDP per capita	427 (209, 645)	571 (269, 873)
Financial crisis	408 (214, 602)	573 (297, 849)
Foreign reserves	314 (116, 512)	540 (152, 928)
Democracy	377 (193, 561)	544 (266, 822)
Egalitarian democracy	341 (129, 553)	504 (187, 822)
Coup d'état	388 (151, 625)	436 (146, 726)
UNGA voting alignment	392 (200, 584)	554 (276, 832)
Female education	413 (223, 603)	582 (304, 860)
Hospital beds per 1,000 population	97 (38, 156)	235 (−57, 527)

Notes: The outcome variable is the age-standardised mortality rate from communicable diseases per 100,000 population. Each row is a separate two-way fixed-effects regression wherein the effect of IMF programmes on the outcome is adjusted for the control variable listed in the first column. All models are also adjusted for country- and time-fixed effects. The IMF variable, lagged by one year, is instrumented as described in the Methods section. 95% confidence intervals derived from standard errors consistent with heteroskedasticity, serial correlation, and unit clustering are shown in parentheses below each parameter estimate.

Table 4: Instrumented two-way fixed effects control models — DALYs

Control variable	IMF_{t-1} coefficient	$\text{Privatisation}_{t-1}$ coefficient
Log of GDP per capita	4,258 (2,010, 6,506)	6,629 (2966, 10,292)
Financial crisis	4,163 (2,136, 6,190)	6,653 (3,220, 10,085)
Foreign reserves	2,602 (1,093, 4,111)	4,856 (799, 8913)
Democracy	3,769 (1,864, 5,674)	6,311 (2,689, 9,933)
Egalitarian democracy	3,868 (1,530, 6,206)	6,249 (1,761, 10,737)
Coup d'état	4,273 (1,572, 6,974)	6,397 (2,046, 10,748)
UNGA voting alignment	4,025 (2,016, 6,034)	6,530 (3,045, 10,015)
Female education	4,209 (2,269, 6,149)	6,720 (3,333, 10,107)
Hospital beds per 1,000 population	1,628 (430, 2,826)	4,616 (−1,650, 10,882)

Notes: The outcome variable is the number of communicable disability-adjusted life years per 100,000 population. Each row is a separate two-way fixed-effects regression wherein the effect of IMF programmes on the outcome is adjusted for the control variable listed in the first column. All models are also adjusted for country- and time-fixed effects. The IMF variable, lagged by one year, is instrumented as described in the Methods section. 95% confidence intervals derived from standard errors consistent with heteroskedasticity, serial correlation, and unit clustering are shown in parentheses below each parameter estimate.

Given the observational nature of our study, the persistence of unmeasured residual confounding is possible. To address this concern, we conduct a simple non-parametric sensitivity analysis that allows us to quantify the amount of unmeasured confounding that would in theory be required to eliminate our estimated short-run causal effects, as described above. The results of this analysis are visualised in FIGURES **??** and **??**. The Y-axis quantifies the net effect of U on the outcome variable that would be required to completely eliminate the estimated causal effect of structural adjustment programmes. In light of our instrumented treatment variable, we believe it is plausible that the amount of residual confounding remains moderate. As such, the most likely magnitude of δ would be at the lower end of the X-axis in FIGURE **??**. If $\delta = 0.1$, U would have to cause around 4,000 excess deaths and over 40,000 excess DALYs per 100,000 population to nullify the effect of IMF programmes, which seems implausible. Even higher net effects would be required to nullify the impact of privatisation conditionalities. At higher values of δ, an inordinate amount of unmeasured confounding would be needed to cast doubt on our causal estimates.



Figure 2: Sensitivity analysis plot to assess residual confounding of the estimated effect of IMF programmes on mortality rates from communicable diseases and disability-adjusted life years as per the top half of Table **??**. Values on the solid lines would completely eliminate the estimated effects of IMF programmes. Values above the plotted curves would reverse the sign of the estimated effects.



Figure 3: Sensitivity analysis plot to assess residual confounding of the estimated effect of IMF-mandated privatisation reforms on mortality rates from communicable diseases and disability-adjusted life years as per the bottom half of Table **??**. Values on the solid lines would completely eliminate the estimated effects of IMF programmes. Values above the plotted curves would reverse the sign of the estimated effects.

Discussion

Our analysis provides novel causal evidence from previously unavailable cross-national panel data, linking the IMF's policy interventions to poor health outcomes. We corroborate earlier studies and hypotheses surrounding this topic, yet we offer new empirical insights. Our main finding is that IMF programmes, and IMF-mandated privatisation reforms in particular, increase avoidable burdens of illness and death from communicable, maternal, neonatal, and nutritional diseases. Although we are unable to specify the specific mechanisms by which the estimated causal effects take place, we find that a substantial portion of these effects seems to be mediated by how IMF programmes impact local health systems, as measured by the number of available hospital beds per 1,000 population. This is in line with the extant literature, which suggests that IMF-mandated reductions in health and public sector spending affect the quality of primary care in addition to exerting durable influence on the social determinants of health (1). Moreover, the rapid privatisation of state-owned enterprises has previously been linked to turbulent labour market conditions, high levels of social insecurity and stress, and weaker public institutions (9, 10). Such insights lend credence to our findings.

We note that the observational nature of our analysis precludes any guarantee of strictly unbiased causal estimates. However, the sensitivity analysis suggests that an unusual amount of unmeasured confounding would be required to cast serious doubt on our substantive findings. We thus consider our results as providing an important empirical basis for future policy-making and research. We therefore conclude that structural adjustment programmes, as currently designed and implemented, are harmful to population health by increasing global communicable disease burdens and must be rethought and reformed.

References

1. Kentikelenis AE. Structural adjustment and health: a conceptual framework and evidence on pathways. Soc Sci Med 2017; 187: 296–305.

2. Kentikelenis AE, Stubbs TH, King LP. Structural adjustment and public spending on health: Evidence from IMF programs in low-income countries. Soc Sci Med 2017; 126: 169–76.

3. Stubbs TH, Kentikelenis AE, Stuckler D, McKee M, King LP. The impact of IMF conditionality on government health expenditure: A cross-national analysis of 16 West African nations. Soc Sci Med 2015; 174: 220–227.

4. Forster T, Kentikelenis AE, Stubbs TH, King LP. Globalization and health equity: The impact of structural adjustment programs on developing countries. Soc Sci Med 2019; online first: 112496.

5. Reinsberg B, Kentikelenis AE, Stubbs TH, King LP. The world system and the hollowing out of state capacity: How structural adjustment programs affect bureaucratic quality in developing countries. Am J Sociol 2019; 124(4): 1222–1257.

6. Stuckler D, Basu S. The International Monetary Fund's effects on global health: before and after the 2008 financial crisis. Int J Health Serv 2009; 39(4): 771–781.

7. Kentikelenis AE, Karanikolos M, Reeves A, McKee M, Stuckler D. Greece's health crisis: from austerity to denialism. Lancet 2009; 383(9918): 748–753.

8. Stuckler D, King LP, Basu S. International Monetary Fund programs and tuberculosis outcomes in post-communist countries. PLoS Med 2008; 5(7): e143.

9. Azarova A, Irdam D, Gugushvili A, Fazekas M, Scheiring G, Horvat P, Stefler D, Kolesnikova I, Popov V, Szelenyi I, Stuckler D, Marmot M, Murphy M, McKee M, Bobak M, King LP. The effect of rapid privatisation on mortality in mono-industrial towns in post-Soviet Russia: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Public Health 2017; 2(5): e231–e238.

10. Scheiring G et al. The gendered effects of foreign investment and prolonged state ownership on mortality in Hungary: an indirect demographic, retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Global Health* 2018; 6(1): e95–e102.

11. Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network. Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Seattle, United States: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, 2018.

12. Kentikelenis AE, Stubbs TH, King LP. IMF conditionality and development policy space, 1985–2014. Rev Int Political Econ 2016; 23(4): 543–582.

13. World Bank. World Development Indicators. http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators. Accessed 1 June 2021.

14. Laeven L, Valencia F. Systemic Banking Crises Database. IMF Econ Rev 2013; 61: 225–270.

15. Center for Systemic Peace. The Polity Project. https://www.systemicpeace.org/polityproject.html. Accessed 1 June 2021.

16. Quality of Government Database. https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data. Accessed 1 June 2021.

17. Powell JM, Thyne CL. Global Instances of Coups from 1950 to 2010: A New Dataset. J Peace Res 2011; 48(2): 249–259.

18. Bailey M, Strezhnev A, Voeten E. Estimating Dynamic State Preferences from United Nations Voting Data. J Conflict Resolut 2015; 61(2): 430–456.

19. Sturm JEA, Vreeland JR. Politics and IMF Conditionality. J Conflict Resolut 2015; 59(1): 120–148.

20. Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network. Global Burden of Disease Study 2017: Socio-demographic Index 1970–2017. Seattle, United States: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, 2018.

21. Lang V. The Democratic Deficit and Its Consequences: The Causal Effect of IMF Programs on Income Inequality. *Rev Int Organ* 2020; https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-020-09405-x.

22. Stubbs TH, Reinsberg B, Kentikelenis AE, King LP. How to evaluate the effects of IMF conditionality: An extension of quantitative approaches and an empirical application to public education spending. Review Int Organ 2020; 15(1): 29–73.

23. Vreeland JR.The IMF and Economic Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2003.

24. VanderWeele TJ, Arah OA. Bias formulas for sensitivity analysis of unmeasured confounding for general outcomes, treatments, and confounders. Epidemiol 2011; 22(1): 42–52.

25. VanderWeele TJ. Explanation in Causal Inference: Methods for Mediation and Interaction. New York: Oxford University Press; 2015.

26. Reinsberg B, Stubbs TH, Kentikelenis AE, King LP. Bad governance: How privatization increases corruption in the developing world. Regul Gov 2020; 14: 698–717.