

PLCY 717
Political Institutions
PUBLIC POLICY
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL

Spring 2018 / 3 Units
Professor Brigitte A. Seim (Zimmerman)
Office Hours: *By appointment*

Tuesdays 3:30-6:00 / Genome Sciences 1373
bseim@ad.unc.edu

DESCRIPTION

This course examines the relationship between political institutions and the policy process. We consider the genesis, design, and evolution of political institutions, how political institutions address market failures and shape economic development, and the role of political institutions as either mediating factors or determinants of public policy outcomes. In this course, “institution” is defined broadly. The course draws on theoretical and empirical contributions from both domestic and international contexts.

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this course is to introduce students to the scholarly literature on political institutions, with some exposure to over-arching theories of institutional analysis as well as more focused attention to a few key institutions that affect policy outcomes.

Upon completing this course, students should be able to demonstrate:

- Substantive knowledge of the prevailing theories of institutional analysis;
- Critical thinking about institutional genesis, design, and evolution;
- Awareness of how institutions determine economic and political behavior;
- An ability to construct well-reasoned arguments and express them both orally and in writing; and
- An ability to critically evaluate the quality and credibility of diverse sources of information.

READING

Readings for this course are listed below and are available through the UNC libraries system. It is each student’s responsibility to obtain and complete the readings in advance of each session. The majority of your investment in this course will occur outside of the weekly sessions. You should expect to spend a significant amount of time reading, taking notes on the reading, reviewing your notes from class each week, and working on the assignments. I highly recommend you prepare reading summaries, either in study groups or individually.

COURSE WEBSITE

Links to resources, announcements, and your grades can all be accessed on Sakai at <https://sakai.unc.edu/portal/site/spring2019plcy717>. You need regular access to the internet to successfully complete this course. To ensure that you receive my emails, have them forwarded to an account you check regularly.

EVALUATION

Summary

Final grades will be determined as follows:

35%	Response Memos
30%	Discussion Leadership
35%	Participation

Response Memos

Each week, you must write a brief response memo that quickly summarizes the week's readings (each summary should be *no more than 3 sentences*) paired with critical commentary. The critical commentary should relate the readings to each other, provide keen context or insight, and highlight weaknesses. Particularly strong memos will also propose potential research ideas, make astute connections from this week frameworks and theories from previous weeks, or discuss the important implications for real world public policy. These memos *should not* exceed 2 single spaced pages. In general, weak memos will simply summarize the readings ("Smith says x, Jones says y"). Strong essays will include commentary like:

- Describe any key conceptual issues that should be addressed or clarified by work on this topic (i.e., a presentation on inequality may discuss different ways inequality is conceptualized or measured).
- Describe the thorny methodological issues that bedevil work on the question (i.e., a memo on social revolutions may talk about the small-n problem)
- Offer criticisms and/or suggest ideas for future research

These memos should be uploaded by 5 p.m. the day before each class session on Sakai to the Forums page. You are allowed to skip six memos with no penalty; if you want to skip a week, just comment on the Forums page to say you are taking a pass. (Once you comment to say "pass," you can read your colleague's memos.) You may want to take a close look at the course calendar and your own schedule before using your six passes. I urge you to not waste these. Because you can decide when these papers are due, there will be no exceptions for late submissions or additional pass weeks.

The Forums page will allow you to see all other papers once you upload your paper or comment to say you are taking a pass. There are two reasons I have chosen to make these papers public to the class. The first is that seeing how other students summarize, interpret, and critique the readings may raise additional questions or thoughts that you want to raise during discussion. This will help prepare you for class. The second reason is that you may find it useful to see how other students summarize, critique, and analyze the readings in the memo in order to improve your own writing.

The grading scale for these papers are:

- Check minus (which means you need to work on improving – re-read the syllabus recommendations about what memos entail, and you if you receive several check minus grades you should talk to me about what your memos are missing)
- Check (which means you are doing fine, and is the modal score)
- Check plus (which means there was something amazing in your paper)

Reading and Critiquing an Academic Article

Below are *some* of the questions you *may* consider in your memos and as you prepare for discussing the readings in class. You should not think of this as a checklist or as an exhaustive list of questions. I **strongly** suggest you keep annotated bibliographies or notes of some variety for everything you read in graduate school – it will help you immensely as you prepare for exams, for your dissertation, and later in your career.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The paper usually starts with a general question before leading to more focused question. Most research can be boiled down to one specific research question or a small collection of related questions. Authors often talk about these questions in broad terms before narrowing down to the specifics. It is your job to discern the broad questions and themes, but also to identify the specific, narrower question that the author ultimately addresses.

- Does the researcher focus in on well-defined questions?
- Are the questions interesting and important? (The “so what” question!)
- Are the propositions falsifiable? (Can the questions be tested?)
- Has the alternative hypothesis been clearly stated?

Theory

What is the central theoretical argument? In attempting to offer insight into the primary research question, the author will usually develop a logical argument that moves from assumptions to predictions. This argument may be written out in words or explicitly with a formal theory. Your task is to identify and assess the major assumptions made by the argument and how well its logic moves from assumptions to outcomes to predictions.

- Is the theory/model clear, insightful, and appropriate?
- Could the theory benefit from being more explicit, developed or formal?
- Are there clear predictions that can be falsified?
- Would an alternative theory/model be more appropriate?
- Is the theory a theory, or a list of predictions?
- How does the theory relate to other things you have read?

Research Design and Data

How well does the researcher craft a research design that tests the theory to answer the research question. Is the researcher really testing what he/she intends to test? Is the entire data well selected and measured?

- Is the author attempting to identify a causal impact?
- Has statistical inference been confused with casual inference?
- Is the researcher really testing what he/she claims to be testing?
- Could the question be addressed with another approach?
- Are the data clearly described?
- Is the choice of data well-suited to the question and test?
- Are there any worrying sources of measurement error or missing data? Are any proxies reasonable?
- Are there sample size or power issues?
- Could the data sources or collection method be biased?

- Are there better sources of data you would recommend?

Empirical Analysis

What evidence is provided in support of this argument? Evidence can come in many forms, whether logical, quantitative, or qualitative. It is your task to evaluate how well the provided evidence corresponds to the assumptions and parameters of the theoretical argument and how well that evidence supports the argument.

- How well has the research design been implemented? Have appropriate strategies been employed to test the theory?
- Are the statistical techniques well suited to the problem at hand?
- Has the paper adequately dealt with concerns about measurement error, simultaneity, omitted variables, selection, and other forms of bias and identification problems?
- Is the empirical strategy convincing? Are appropriate caveats mentioned?
- Are there alternative explanations for the results, and can those be tested?

Scope

Finally, you should consider the implications of this research for public policy. You should question whether or not the findings from this research should fairly be generalizable to other circumstances. You may also think about extensions of the research – if you could do a follow up to the study, how might you do things differently?

- Can the results be generalizable to other policy areas, other countries, etc.?
- Are there other types of analysis that would illuminate the external validity or the causal mechanisms at work?
- Are there other data or approaches that would complement the current one?
- What are the implications for the formation of good public policy?

Discussion Leadership

Each of you will be asked to be a discussion leader for two weeks of the course. Each course session will have a designated 1-2 discussion leaders. When there are two discussion leaders, these two individuals should work together and coordinate in advance of the course session to complete the discussion leader tasks.

There are two primary tasks associated with being the discussion leader. Leaders should generate 7-10 questions that provoke questions about specific readings, tie the readings together and/or connect the readings to previous weeks. Discussion leaders are expected to be particularly familiar with the week's readings and to lead a significant portion of class discussion. They are also expected to be able to answer specific questions that may arise about the reading. Discussion questions should be circulated on Sakai's Forums page no later than 7 PM the day before class.

The discussion leader(s) will also give a short conference-like presentation on a manuscript of your choice related to the topic and readings of the day. This presentation should be *no longer than 15 minutes*. The discussion leader can select any of the assigned readings for this presentation, and the rest of the class should engage the discussion leader in approximately 3-5 minutes of conference-like Q&A. The purpose of this task is two-fold. It will give each person additional professional experience giving a short conference-length presentation and it also help to get the discussion going each day. If you want to talk with me about your presentation or discussion questions ahead of time, please feel free to email me.

Participation

You are expected to attend all course sessions. This is your opportunity to ask questions, discuss readings and other course material, and engage in activities that will deepen your understanding of course topics. Your participation grade will be based on: 1) attendance; and 2) the quality of your participation, including demonstrating you have thoughtfully completed the reading. I expect students to come prepared, and to be respectful, attentive, and actively engaged. In-classroom discussions and activities are an integral part of this course, intended to be additional learning opportunities. If you must be absent at any point in the quarter, please notify me via email as soon as possible, ideally before that course session begins.

Three Guidelines for In-Class Time

Be present. By choosing this course, you are making a commitment to your classmates, yourself, and me to be an active and engaged participant in our academic community. You have something unique to contribute; class can go on without you, but everyone's learning will suffer from your absence. That said, I understand that other things are happening in your life besides this class. If you cannot come to class at all or cannot come sufficiently prepared, you should let me know *prior* to our class session (either by email or a quick comment upon entering class).

Be punctual. As part of your commitment to this course, you are expected to arrive in class on time. If you are more than 20 minutes late without an acceptable excuse, you will be asked to leave for the day. If you must leave class early for some reason, you must notify me beforehand.

Be prepared. I expect you to arrive at class prepared and without distractions. You should read the assigned readings prior to coming to class and be willing and able to contribute your thoughts about them to discussion. I may call on you for a contribution to discussion at any time.

CLASS POLICIES

Honor Code

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has had a student-led honor system for over 100 years. Academic integrity is at the heart of Carolina and we all are responsible for upholding the ideals of honor and integrity. The student-led Honor System is responsible for adjudicating any suspected violations of the Honor Code and all suspected instances of academic dishonesty will be reported to the honor system. Information, including your responsibilities as a student is outlined in the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance. Your full participation and observance of the Honor Code is expected (see <http://honor.unc.edu/>).

In order to ensure effective functioning of the Honor System at Carolina, students are expected to:

- a. Conduct all academic work within the letter and spirit of the Honor Code, which prohibits the giving or receiving of unauthorized aid in all academic processes. If unsure about the limits of group work versus individual work on papers and projects, ask the instructor. Do not guess.
- b. Consult with faculty and other sources to clarify the meaning of plagiarism; to learn the recognized techniques of proper attribution of sources used in written work; and to identify allowable resource materials or aids to be used during completion of any graded work.

- c. Sign a pledge on all graded academic work certifying that no unauthorized assistance has been received or given in the completion of the work.
- d. Treat all members of the University community with respect and fairness.
- e. Report any instance in which reasonable grounds exist to believe that a student has given or received unauthorized aid in graded work or in other respects violated the Honor Code. Reports should be made to the office of the Student Attorney General.

The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance requires that you sign a pledge on all written work. Please type the following on ALL your work and sign your name next to it: **“On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.”**

Plagiarism

You are encouraged to form study groups to review course material and discuss general approaches for assignments. However, you are expected to complete assignments independently. Plagiarism of published work is a violation of the honor code. Any two assignments that are submitted containing the same sentences will be considered a breach of the honor code. In written work (including overheads or handouts used in presentations), words drawn from others should be indicated by quotation marks and ideas drawn from others should refer to their source. If you are unsure about what needs to be cited, please talk with me or ask for assistance from the writing center. Plagiarism is a serious offense that can result in failure of the course and suspension from the University. To make sure that you understand what plagiarism is, please read

<http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/plagiarism/>. Also see the following link for an engaging animated tutorial on plagiarism: <http://www2.lib.unc.edu/instruct/plagiarism/>.

Grade Determination

Writing and public speaking are essential to success in public policy and in many other careers. Students will be held to professional standards. Students should not submit first drafts and should carefully proof read all work. The following factors will be considered in evaluating student assignments:

- **Content:** Responds to the assignment’s questions. Develops and supports a central thesis. Provides a focused argument throughout the essay/talk.
- **Clarity and Presentation:** Writes/speaks clearly by: developing a coherent, well-organized argument; arranging sentences in a logical and coherent manner; using correct punctuation, spelling, and grammar; and providing correct citations in the APA format.
- **Comprehensiveness:** Reviews the relevant literature and material, shows an in-depth understanding of the topic, and critiques differing points of view on the topic.
- **Creativity:** Draws the reader/listener in and engages him/her in the topic. Makes an original contribution to the topic. Presents material in an interesting and unique way that elucidates the ideas.
- **Accuracy:** Free of obvious errors. All facts are derived from assigned course material and properly cited.

Grade Definitions

The following definitions of grades were adopted by the University Faculty and are the official basis for assigning and interpreting graduate grades. Note that they are based on performance,

not on effort or individual improvement.

H - High Pass

P - Pass

L - Low Pass

F - Fail

IN - Work Incomplete

- A temporary grade that converts to an F* unless the grade is replaced with a permanent grade by the last day of classes for the same term one year later.

AB - Absent from Final Examination

- A temporary grade that converts to an F* unless the grade is replaced with a permanent grade by the last day of classes for the same term one year later.

Grade Appeals

I take the evaluation and grading of your assignments very seriously because I know that most of you take the preparation and writing of your assignments very seriously. If you think you deserve a higher grade on an assignment, you may write a memo and explain why you would like to appeal the grade. Before making an appeal, you should review your work and course material. After I receive your memo, I will re-read your work within 1-2 class periods. Depending on my re-reading, your grade may stay the same, be raised, or be lowered. This system is designed to minimize frivolous grade appeals and to ensure that you have carefully examined and reflected on the quality of your work before deciding to initiate a grade appeal.

Communication¹

- **Mind Your Manners:** Think of the basic rules you learned growing up, like saying please and thank you.
- **Watch Your Tone:** Merriam-Webster defines tone as an "accent or inflection expressive of a mood or emotion." It is very difficult to express tone in writing. Please attempt to come across as respectful, friendly, and approachable. Please avoid coming across as curt or demanding.
- **Be Concise but Complete:** Get to the point of your e-mail as quickly as possible, but don't leave out important details that will help your recipient answer your query. Be sure to include your full name and the course name in every email.
- **Be Professional:** Stay away from abbreviations and don't use emoticons. Don't use a cute or suggestive e-mail address for professional communication.
- **Use Correct Spelling and Proper Grammar:** Use a dictionary or a spell checker. While you can write in a conversational tone (contractions are okay), pay attention to basic rules of grammar and use complete sentences. This means that you totes can't brb or lol.
- **Be Prompt:** Bring an issue to my attention as soon as it becomes an issue. This includes conflicts with assignments and last minute illnesses.
- **Don't Make Excuses:** Everyone (including professors and TAs) knows what it is like to procrastinate or to prioritize other things before school assignments. We also know what it is like to try to invent an acceptable reason to have done so. Further, we read many, many emails from students in a semester. To top it off, I study corruption, which is fundamentally about skirting procedures and towing the line of acceptability to serve

¹ See also: <http://www.wikihow.com/Email-a-Professor> and <http://chrisblattman.com/2010/11/08/students-how-to-email-to-your-professor-employer-and-professional-peers/>

one's own interests. In brief, we can detect any fudging or lying a mile away. If you have a conflict or need to admit that you made a mistake, be up front and honest.

- **Ask Reasonable and Appropriate Questions:** Attempt to evaluate whether your question or request is reasonable and appropriate before you send me an email. Check the syllabus and Google for an answer first. For example, it is not reasonable to ask me the definition of genocide. It is reasonable to ask how the definition of genocide I've been using in class might differ from that in a reading. Also, please feel free to email me to set up an appointment to meet if the topic is too sensitive to raise in an email.

I reserve the right to delete any emails or refuse to speak to individuals that do not follow these guidelines.

Discrimination and Harassment

Any form of violence or harassment, including sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking is unwelcome at the University. If you or someone you know has been harassed or assaulted, you can find the appropriate UNC resources at <http://sexualassaultanddiscriminationpolicy.unc.edu/>. See [this blog post](#) for a discussion regarding one form of prevalent in-classroom discrimination to which I will be particularly sensitive.

Accessibility Resources and Services

The Office of Accessibility Resources & Services provides services and reasonable accommodations to currently enrolled students with disabilities. Their mission is to provide students with disabilities equal access to the services, programs and activities of University so that they may, as independently as possible, meet the demands of University life. For more information, see <https://accessibility.unc.edu/>. Students with disabilities who require individualized testing or other accommodations should discuss this with me within as soon as possible.

Other Resources

Need help with writing? See a tutor at The Writing Center - writingcenter.unc.edu

Need help with structuring study time or taking tests? Learning Center - learningcenter.unc.edu

Other Policies

- Computer, tablet, and cell phone use is strongly discouraged in class. Please plan on taking notes by hand or on a tablet. Cell phones should be silenced (and vibrate is *not* silent) and put away when class begins. This policy will ensure the best possible learning environment, encourage active participation by all students, and minimize distractions.² However, if you strongly prefer using a computer or have a medical reason that necessitates it, you are allowed to do so. Please note that if I see a computer, phone, or tablet, I will assume you are ready to be called on to participate in discussion.
- Students should keep copies of the assignments they turn in until they receive their final course grade.
- If any problems that will affect your performance in this class arise during the course of the semester, please come see me as soon as possible. I can do more to help you if you let

² Sana, Faria, Tina Weston, and Nicholas J. Cepeda. 2013. "[Laptop multitasking hinders classroom learning for both users and nearby peers.](#)" *Computers & Education*. 62:24-31. There are dozens of other research articles that find the same thing.

me know what is happening before you miss a test or deadline.

- Twenty-four hours before assignments are due, I reserve the right to stop responding to emails with questions or concerns. Please prepare in advance of this window.
- Be respectful of others' points of view. You are encouraged to disagree with one another, but do not make personal attacks

COURSE SCHEDULE AND WEEKLY ASSIGNMENTS

1. January 15 - Introduction

2. January 22 - Institutions

- North, Douglass C. 1991. "Institutions." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5(1): 97-112.
- Hall, Peter A and Rosemary CR Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies* 44(5): 936-957.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 2000. "The New Institutional Economics: Taking Stock, Looking Ahead." *Journal of Economic Literature* 38(3): 595-613.
- Acemoglu, Daron and Simon Johnson. 2003. "Unbundling Institutions." *Journal of Political Economy* 113(5): 949-995.
- Moe, Terry. 2005. "Power and Political Institutions." *Perspectives on Politics* 3(2): 215-233.

3. January 29 - Historical Institutionalism

- Greif, Avner. 1998. "Historical and Comparative Institutional Analysis." *The American Economic Review* 88(2): 80-84.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1): 369-404.
- Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 251-267.

4. February 5 - Collective Action Theory

- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapters 1 and 2.
- Hardin, Garrett. 1986. "The Tragedy of the Commons." *Science* 162 (3859): 1243-1248.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2.

5. February 12 - Informal Institutions

- Tsai, Lily. 2007. "Solidary Groups, Informal Accountability, and Local Public Goods Provision in Rural China." *American Political Science Review* 101(2): 355-372.
- Williamson, Claudia R. 2009. "Informal Institutions Rule: Institutional Arrangements and Economic Performance." *Public Choice* 139(3): 371-387.
- Casson, Mark C., Marina Della Giusta, and Uma S. Kambhampati. 2010. "Formal and Informal Institutions and Development." *World Development* 38(2): 137-141.

6. February 19 - Institutions and Economic Development

- Platteau, Jean-Philippe. 2000. *Institutions, Social Norms, and Economic Development*. London, UK: Routledge. Chapter 1.

- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson. 2001. "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." *American Economic Review* 91(5): 1369-1401.
- Glaeser, Edward L., Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes and Andrei Shleifer. 2004. "Do Institutions Cause Growth?" *Journal of Economic Growth* 9(3):271-303.
- Banerjee, Abhijit and Lakshmi Iyer. 2005. "History, Institutions, and Economic Performance: The Legacy of Colonial Land Tenure Systems in India," *American Economic Review*, 95(4): 1190-1212.
- Pinto, Pablo M., and Jeffrey F. Timmons. 2005. "The Political Determinants of Economic Performance. Political Competition and the Sources of Growth." *Comparative Political Studies* 45(1): 26-50.

7. February 26 – Regime Type

- Geddes, Barbara. 1999. "What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1): 115-144.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2005. "Democracy as an Equilibrium." *Public Choice* 123(3-4): 253-273.
- Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3.
- Lijphart, Arend. 2012. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 1.

8. March 5 – Democracy and Policy Making

- Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Introduction.
- Lake, David and Baum, Matthew. 2001. "The Invisible Hand of Democracy: Political Control and the Provision of Public Services." *Comparative Political Studies* 34(6): 587-621.
- Boix, Carles. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. New York : Cambridge University Press. Introduction.
- Keefer, Philip. 2004. "What Does Political Economy Tell Us About Economic Development -- and Vice Versa?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 247-272.
- Wigley, Simon and Akkoyunlu-Wigley, Arzu. 2011. "The Impact of Regime Type on Health: Does Redistribution Explain Everything?" *World Politics* 63(4): 647-677.

9. March 19 - Decentralization

- Bardhan, Pranab and Dilip Mookherjee. 2006. "The Rise of Local Governments: An Overview." In *Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries*, eds. Pranab Barhdan and Dilip Mookherjee. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wright, Glenn D., Krister P. Andersson, Clark C. Gibson, and Tom P. Evans. 2016. "Decentralization Can Help Reduce Deforestation When User Groups Engage with Local Government." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113(52): 14958-14963.
- Wibbels, Erik. 2006. "Madison in Baghdad? Decentralization and Federalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 165-188.
- Kent, Eaton. 2006. "The Downside of Decentralization: Armed Clientelism in Colombia," *Security Studies* 48 (1): 533-562.

10. March 26 – Distributive Politics

- Alesina, Alberto and Dani Rodrik. 1994. "Distributive Politics and Economic Growth." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109(2): 465-90.
- Keefer, Philip, and Stuti Khemani. 2005. "Democracy, Public Expenditures, and the Poor: Understanding Political Incentives for Providing Public Services." *World Bank Research Observer* 20(1): 1-27.
- Blaydes, Lisa. 2010. *Elections and Distributive Politics in Mubarak's Egypt*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3.
- Kramon, Eric and Daniel Posner. 2013. "Who Benefits from Distributive Politics? How the Outcome One Studies Affects the Answer One Gets." *Perspectives on Politics* 11(2): 461-474.
- Golden, Miriam and Brian Min. 2013. "Distributive Politics Around the World." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 73-99.

11. April 2 – Natural Resources "Curse"

- Ross, Michael L. 1999. "Review: The Political Economy of the Resource Curse." *World Politics* 51(2): 297-322.
- Jensen, Nathan, and Leonard Wantchekon. 2004. "Resource Wealth and Political Regimes in Africa." *Comparative Political Studies* 37(7): 816-41.
- Dunning, Thad. 2005. "Resource Dependence, Economic Performance, and Political Stability." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(4): 451-82.
- Haber, Stephen, and Victor Menaldo. 2011. "Do Natural Resources Fuel Authoritarianism? A Reappraisal of the Resource Curse." *American Political Science Review* 105(1): 1-26.

12. April 9 – Foreign Aid

- Alesina, Alberto, and David Dollar. 2000. "Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?" *Journal of Economic Growth* 5(1): 33-63.
- Easterly, William. 2003. "Can Foreign Aid Buy Growth?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17(3): 23-48.
- Easterly, William and Tobias Pfitze. 2008. "Where Does the Money Go? Best and Worst Practices in Foreign Aid." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 22(2): 29-52.
- Kono, Daniel Y., and Gabriella R. Montinola. 2009. "Does Foreign Aid Support Autocrats, Democrats, or Both?" *Journal of Politics* 71(2): 704-18.

13. April 16 – Taxation

- Timmons, Jeffrey. 2005. "The Fiscal Contract: States, Taxes, and Public Services." *World Politics* 57(4): 530-567.
- Gordon, Roger and Wei Li. 2005. "Tax Structure in Developing Countries: Many Puzzles and a Possible Explanation." *NBER Working Paper* 11267.
- Kasara, Kimuli. 2007. "Tax Me If You Can: Ethnic Geography, Democracy, and the Taxation of Agriculture in Africa." *American Political Science Review* 101(1): 159-172.
- Khan, Adnan Q., Asim I. Khwaja, and Benjamin A. Olken. 2014. "Tax Farming Redux: Experimental Evidence on Performance Pay for Tax Collectors." *NBER Working Paper* 20627.

- Fairfield, Tasha. 2014. *Private Wealth and Public Revenue: Business Power and Tax Politics in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1.

14. April 23 - Corruption

- Montinola, Gabriella R. and Robert W. Jackman. 2002. "Sources of Corruption: A Cross-Country Study." *British Journal of Political Science* 32(1): 147-170.
- Svensson, Jakob. 2005. "Eight Questions about Corruption." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19(3): 19-42.
- Ferraz, Claudio & Finan, Frederico. 2008. "Exposing Corrupt Politicians: The Effects of Brazil's Publicly Released Audits on Electoral Outcomes." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123(2): 703-745.
- Olken, Benjamin and Barron, Patrick. 2009. "The Simple Economics of Extortion: Evidence of Trucking in Aceh." *Journal of Political Economy* 117(3): 417-52.
- Olken, Benjamin A. and Rohini Pande. 2012. "Corruption in Developing Countries." *Annual Review of Economics* 4(1): 479-509.