

**INTA 6202: COMPARATIVE POLITICS
SPRING 2018**

Dr. Anjali Thomas Bohlken
Assistant Professor, INTA

Office Location: Habersham 216

E-mail: anjali.bohlken@inta.gatech.edu

Office Hours: Wednesday 2:30 to 3:30pm, or by appointment

Class Location and Time: IAC G17, Wednesday 6:00pm to 8:45pm

I. Introduction

This course provides a graduate level introduction to the field of comparative politics. While International Relations (IR) concerns itself with the study of relationships and interactions *between* countries, comparative politics concerns itself with the study of political phenomena that occur predominantly *within* countries. At the same time, comparative politics as a field is continuing to develop a body of knowledge that not only sheds light on specific country cases, but that also draws generalizable lessons about the causes and consequences of a range of domestic political phenomena. Thus, comparative politics is a vast field of research and the substantive topics covered in this course range from political institutions and regimes to intra-state conflict to identity politics. This course provides an introduction to the dominant questions, theories, and empirical research in each of these topic areas. The class will be discussion-based and will rely heavily on active student participation.

II. Required Texts

The following books are required for purchase.

Douglass C North. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990

Putnam, Robert D. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* [Paperback]
Princeton University Press.

Barrington Moore. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press

Acemoglu, Daron, and James Robinson. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty* [Paperback] Crown Business

Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

All other books whose chapters have been assigned on the syllabus (indicated by a star) will be made available by the instructor either electronically on Canvas or in some other convenient format. All journal articles are available through the Georgia Tech Library through databases like JSTOR. Please go to <http://www.library.gatech.edu> for more information.

III. Course Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course students who successfully complete the course should be able to:

- Explain, contrast and critique major theories in comparative politics

- Explain how key questions about the political world relating to the field of comparative politics are answered through the use of the scientific method
- Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a variety of methodologies and analytical tools used in comparative politics research
- Clearly and effectively convey analytical findings through formal papers or reports (**Effective Communication Skills**).
- Clearly and effectively convey analytical findings through oral presentation.

IV. In-Class Conduct

- Students are responsible for all materials, discussions, comments, etc. covered in class and for any exercises assigned to be completed in class (i.e. don't miss class, it may affect your grade).
- Students who arrive late to, or leave early from, class should do so with minimum disturbance.
- Students who eat/drink during class are required to do so with minimum disturbance, and to thoroughly clean up afterwards.
- All cellphones and other telecommunications devices are to be switched off during class. Laptops should be put away during class discussions, unless instructed otherwise. If your use of such devices proves distracting to the classroom environment, you may be asked to leave the class.
- Students will treat each other and the professor with respect. Constructive questioning and criticism are welcome & encouraged. Personal attacks & insults are not. The rule of thumb here is that critical comments and questions should be maturely **phrased in a manner that encourages constructive and open debate**; they should not be phrased as insults, threats, or in a manner that shuts down conversation or debate.
- Students are expected to read and abide by the Georgia Tech Student Code of Conduct and the Academic Honor Code. All violations will be reported. See <http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/rules/22/> for an articulation of some basic expectations – that you can have of me, and that I have of you.

VI. Policy on Absences

Absences for medical or personal emergencies will be excused upon verification by the Office of the Dean of Student Life. Absences due to participation in Institute activities including school athletics will be excused upon verification by the registrar. Absences due to military service will be handled on a case-by-case basis and subject to verification. Absence due to a religious observance will be excused provided you inform the professor of the upcoming absence, in writing, within the first two weeks of class. Absences that do not fall into one of the above categories will generally be treated as “unexcused”. In the event of an unexcused absence, you will NOT be granted any special accommodations including but not limited an opportunity to make up work for in-class exercises. Thus, if you miss class due to an unexcused absence, you will be responsible for any material, assignments, or announcements covered in class that you miss as a result of an unexcused absence. Moreover, if you have more than one *unexcused* absence during the semester, you will suffer a grade penalty due to your inability to participate in an in-class exercise or in class discussion (See Section XI A on Class Participation).

VII. Course Website and Communication

- Several important documents including the most updated version of the syllabus will be posted on the course's Canvas page. Please check this page regularly.
- The course's Canvas page will also be used to post information regarding class schedules, assignments and grades, and feedback on individual assignments may also occasionally be provided through Canvas. Students are responsible for staying up-to-date on those communications.
- Personal or confidential communications from the professor to you, and vice versa, will be done by emailing the address that you have registered on Canvas. **Therefore, you are required to make sure that the email associated with your Canvas account is functioning**, to check it daily, and to alert the professor if you are not receiving emails on it. It will be your responsibility to provide a functioning email address if this one fails to operate properly.

- You are also welcome to communicate with the professor by email. Please note that the professor may not respond to emails in the evenings or over the weekend or University holiday periods, so please keep this in mind when anticipating response times.
- Unless specifically instructed, assignments are always to be submitted in hard copy form only; electronic submissions can serve as backup & confirmation. Failure to submit an assignment in hard copy by the due date could result in a grade penalty.

VIII. Policy on Late Assignments

Late assignments are strongly discouraged and will incur penalties except in the event of a verified illness or emergency (documentation will be requested from the Office of Student Life). Any major scheduling conflicts – including those that arise due to participation in “approved Institute activities” - should be discussed with the professor *at least two weeks before the assignment due date*. The penalty for a late assignment will be a deduction of 2% of the assignment mark for a paper handed in on the due date but after the time specified and an additional 2% for each subsequent day that the paper is not turned in. A missed presentation – either group or individual - will receive zero points except in the case of an “excused absence” due to an illness or emergency (See Section VI for the definitions of what constitutes an excused absence). Thus, it is crucial to prepare in advance for the presentation and accord it the highest priority in your schedule for the given week.

IX. Plagiarism Policy¹

Academic dishonesty in the form of cheating or plagiarism will not be tolerated. In brief, plagiarism is defined, for the purposes of this class, as: copying, borrowing, or appropriating another person’s work **and** presenting it as your own in a paper or oral presentation, deliberately or by accident. Acts of plagiarism will be reported in accordance with the Honor Code. In order to avoid being charged with plagiarism, if you use the words, ideas, phrasing, charts, graphs, or data of another person or from published material, then you must either: 1) use quotation marks around the words **and** cite the source, or 2) paraphrase or summarize acceptably using your own words **and** cite the source. The plagiarism policy is not restricted to books, but also applies to video & audio content, websites, blogs, wiki’s, and podcasts. Plagiarism includes putting your name on a group project to which you have minimally contributed. For information on Georgia Tech's Academic Honor Code, please visit <http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/policies/honor-code/> or <http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/rules/18/>. Any student suspected of cheating or plagiarizing on a quiz, exam, or assignment will be reported to the Office of Student Integrity, who will investigate the incident and identify the appropriate penalty for violations.

X. Collaboration and Group Work

In general, unless otherwise specified, assignments are to be submitted, and will be graded, on an individual basis. For group exercises, you are expected to engage fully in your group’s discussions and to be an active contributor to all group’s assignments. Please note that **plagiarism includes putting your name on a group project to which you have minimally contributed**. If you have any doubts regarding whether an assignment should be completed individually or as a group, please clarify this with the professor.

XI. Assignments

A. Class Participation and In-Class Exercises (15%)

The class participation mark will be based on attendance and the quality of your in-class oral comments as well as on the quality of your performance on written exercises that will be handed to you in class. Many of the in-class exercises will involve small group work and you are expected to be an active contributor to your group’s discussions. Each week starting in Week #2, your in-class participation will receive a score of 0, 1, 2 or 3. A 3 indicates excellent participation – both in terms of quality and quantity; a 2 indicates adequate participation – lacking in either quality or quantity or both; a 1 indicates minimal levels of participation. Failure to attend class will result in a score of 0. Your final class participation mark will be calculated by averaging your individual scores for each week after dropping your lowest score.

A. Weekly Reading Response (15%)

Starting in Week #2, you must submit a reading response on Canvas (Under Assignments) each week of class **no later than 9am on the day of class**. To receive credit, the reading response must include **both** of the following elements: 1) Three *distinct* bullet points summarizing your key takeaways from the assigned readings for the week. At least two of these bullet points should draw connections between readings, as opposed to focusing simply on one reading. 2) Three questions that you would like to propose to the class for discussion (Avoid questions that lead to a simple yes/no answer or whose answers require only factual recall. Focus on questions that lead to analysis, synthesis, comparison, or evaluation. Also try to raise a question that is likely to elicit a variety of responses.) Each week, your reading response will receive either a “High Pass” (worth 3 points), “Pass” (worth 2 points) or “Fail” (worth 0 points). At the end of the semester, an average will be taken to determine your final mark for this component.

B. Written Review and Associated Seminar Presentation (20%)

You will be assigned to deliver a seminar presentation on a given week and you will also need to submit a written review at the start of class on the same date on which you are scheduled to present. The written review portion and the oral presentation portion of the assignment will be weighted 80:20. For the class session in which you are assigned to present, you should do the following:

- ❖ find an article published in or after 2006 that is not listed on the course syllabus but whose topic is related to the assigned readings for the given week that you are scheduled to present.
- ❖ deliver an oral presentation in class on the specified day. Please follow the guidelines provided in the document on Canvas entitled **“Written Review and Oral Presentation Guidelines”**
- ❖ submit a written review of the article **closely following the above-mentioned guidelines**. Your written review will be due (hard copy only, no exceptions) at the beginning of class on the day you will present.

I will send via email a sign-up sheet during the second week of class where you can indicate your preferences for when to present. If you do not fill in this sheet by the stated deadline, you will be automatically assigned a presentation slot. Please note that once the presentation schedule is finalized (by the beginning of the third week of the semester), **you will not be able to make any changes to this schedule**. Thus, if you do not present at the time you are scheduled, you will receive a zero for the presentation portion of your grade unless in the event of a *verified* illness or emergency.

C. Case Study Presentation (15%)

You will be assigned to do a case study presentation (either individually or as part of a group, depending on class enrollment) once during the semester. The presentation should be approximately 10 minutes long. The case study presentation should consist of an exploration of the applicability of the arguments raised by the readings in a given week in the context of a given case. A “case study” could involve an examination of a single event, a specified period in a country’s history or a certain relevant phenomenon in the context of a single country or a small set of countries. You must pick a case study that has not already been discussed at length in the assigned readings (although a short mention of the case in the assigned readings does not preclude you from selecting it). In the course of the presentation, your goal should be either to (i) use the case study to shed light on the argument(s) from the assigned readings or (ii) to use argument(s) from the assigned readings to derive new insights about the case study or (iii) both of the above. By the second week of class, you will be given a chance to sign up for your preferred topic or week during which to do your case study presentation. Further guidelines on how you should structure your presentation may be provided in class. .

D. Final Paper (35%)

The Final Paper will be due on April 25th at 12 noon.

You have two options for the final paper:

Option 1: Write a critical review paper of the existing literature on a research question that falls broadly within one of the main themes of the course. Your paper should be between 15 to 20 pages (double-spaced) in length

and should include at least 15 to 20 scholarly articles or 3 to 5 books. A combination of books and articles is also acceptable and in some cases advisable, depending on your topic. As a general rule, 5 or 6 articles will be considered equivalent to 1 book. In the first part of the paper, you should summarize and – importantly - synthesize the readings. In summarizing as well as synthesizing, you should pay attention to the *argument*, the *methodology*, the *empirical evidence* and how these feed into the *conclusions* drawn. The second part of your essay should present an overarching general critique of the body of the literature you discussed in the first part of your paper. Specifically, through a specific discussion of the theories, empirical approaches and data used in the existing literature, the critique should address the following two questions: a) how well has the existing research succeeded in addressing the research question you posted at the beginning of the paper b) what are the remaining gaps and/or what are the new questions that are spawned by the existing literature on this question.

Option 2: Write a 20-25 page (double-spaced, 1 inch margins) original research paper on a topic of interest to you in comparative politics. This should follow the outline of a political science research article. Therefore it should contain a clear concise articulation of a single research question, a literature review of the academic research relevant to your question and identification of where your paper fits in, a theoretical argument and hypothesis, a description of the methodology and also of the data (either qualitative or quantitative) used, analysis of the results, and a conclusion that summarizes the paper.

XII. Grades

Your final grade will be assigned as a letter grade according to the following scale:

A	90-100%
B	80-89%
C	70-79%
D	60-69%
F	0-59%

XIII. Grade Change Policy

Legitimate requests for grade changes are welcome. However, you should resist the temptation to file a frivolous request just hoping to “get lucky”. Simple computational or clerical errors should be brought to the professor’s attention immediately. Otherwise requests for grade changes must: i) be submitted in writing either electronically or in hard copy, ii) be submitted within 7 days of receiving the graded assignment, and iii) be no longer than 600 words and no shorter than 150 words. Requests for grade changes should identify what was required in the assignment, describe *precisely* how these requirements were fulfilled at a level above the received grade and address any relevant comments written by the professor on the graded assignment (if applicable) and explain why they do not apply.

Note that grade changes requests can result in re-grades both up or down (or left unchanged). That is, if the greater scrutiny demanded by a grade change request reveals your assignment to deserve a lower grade than previously awarded, then the lower grade may be assigned.

INTA-6202 Spring 2018 Course Schedule

January 10th: Introduction and Course Overview (Week #1)

January 17th: Methodologies (Week #2)

*King, Gary, Robert Keohane & Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. Chapters 1 and 3

*Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press., Chapters 1 and 10. Chapters 1 and 10.

Thad Dunning. 2010. "Design-Based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis?" In David Collier and Henry Brady, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2nd edition.

Available at: http://www.thaddunning.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Dunning_RSI_scanned.pdf

Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99: 435-452.

January 24th: Institutions (Week #3)

Douglass C North. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990, Chapters 1-10.

Avner Greif. 1993. "Contract Enforceability and Economic Institutions in Early Trade: The Maghribi Traders' Coalition." *American Economic Review*, Vol. 83(3): 525-48

North, Douglas C. and Barry R. Weingast. 1989. "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutional Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England" *Journal of Economic History*, 49, 803 – 832

Murillo, María Victoria, and Steven Levitsky. 2009. "Variation in Institutional Strength." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12(1): 115-133

January 31st: Democracy: Concept, Origins and Consolidation (Week #4)

Collier, David & Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49: 430-451.

Przeworski, Adam. 1999. "Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense. In *Democracy's Value*, edited by Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press." Available at: <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~zshiple/pol437/docs/Przeworski.pdf>

Putnam, Robert D. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* [Paperback] Princeton University Press (May 27, 1994), Chapter 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Barrington Moore. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press, Chapters(Preface, Chapter I, Chapter IV, Chapters VII, VIII and IX).

February 7th: Systems of Government and Electoral Rules (Week #5)

Tsebelis, George. 1995. 'Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism, and Multipartyism.' *British Journal of Political Science* 25: 289-326.

Cheibub, José Antonio, Zachary Elkins, & Tom Ginsburg. 2013. "Beyond Presidentialism and Parliamentarism." *British Journal of Political Science* 44: 515-544.

Przeworski, Adam, José Antonio Cheibub & Sebastian Saiegh. 2004. "Government Coalitions and Legislative Success Under Parliamentarism and Presidentialism." *British Journal of Political Science* 34: 565-587.

Carey, John M. & Matthew S. Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Systems." *Electoral Studies* 14: 417-439.

Clark, William Roberts & Matt Golder. 2006. "Rehabilitating Duverger's Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Laws." *Comparative Political Studies* 39: 679-708.

February 14th: Authoritarian Regimes (Week #6)

Levitsky, Steven & Lucan A. Way. 2002. "The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism." *Journal of Democracy* 13: 51-65.

Gandhi, Jennifer & Ellen Lust-Okar. 2009. "Elections Under Authoritarianism." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12: 403-422.

Jennifer Gandhi and Adam Przeworski. 2006. "Cooperation, Cooptation and Rebellion Under Dictatorships." *Economics and Politics*. 18,1, 1-25.

Smith, Benjamin. 2005. "Life of the Party: The Origins of Regime Breakdown and the Persistence Under Single-Party Rule." *World Politics* 57: 421-451.

Brownlee, Jason. 2007. "Hereditary Succession in Modern Autocracies." *World Politics* 59: 595-628.

February 21st: State and Society (Week #7)

Peter B. Evans. 1989. "Predatory, Developmental, and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy Perspective on the Third World State," *Sociological Forum* 4: 561-587.

*Tilly, Charles. 1992. *Coercion Capital and European States AD 990-1992*. Malden, MA: Blackwell
Chapters 1 to 5.

Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Introduction, Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4.

*Bates, Robert. 2005. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies*. University of California Press, 2nd edition, Introduction and Part II (Chapters 5, 6 and 7).

February 28th: Federalism, Decentralization and Local Governance (Week #8)

*Rodden, Jonathan, *Hamilton's Paradox: The Promise and Peril of Fiscal Federalism* (chapter 4)

Weingast, Barry R. "The Economic Role of Political Institutions: Market-Preserving Federalism and Economic Development," *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 11(1):1-31.

O'Neill, Kathleen. 2003. Decentralization as an Electoral Strategy, *Comparative Political Studies* Vol. 36, No. 9 (Nov. 2003), pp1068-1091

*Bohlken, Anjali Thomas. 2016. *Democratization from Above: The Logic of Local Democracy in the Developing World*. New York: Cambridge University Press., Chapters 1 and 4.

Falleti, Tulia G. 2005. A Sequential Theory of Decentralization: Latin American Cases in Comparative Perspective, *American Political Science Review* Vol. 99, No. 3, pp 327-346

March 7th: Ethnic and Religious Identity (Week #9)

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *American Political Science Review* 90 (December): 715–35.

Posner, Daniel N. 2004. The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, No. 4 (Nov., 2004), pp. 529-545

Chandra, Kanchan. "What is ethnic identity and does it matter?." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9 (2006): 397-424.

Diana Dumitru and Carter Johnson. 2011. "Constructing Interethnic Conflict and Cooperation: Why Some People Harmed Jews and Others Helped Them during the Holocaust in Romania" *World Politics*, Volume 63, Number 1, January 2011, pp. 1-42

Thad Dunning 2010. Cross-Cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali. *American Political Science Review* 104 (1): 21-39

March 14th: Civil War (Week #10)

*Kalyvas, Stathis N. 2006. *The logic of violence in civil war*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 7

*Weinstein, Jeremy. *Inside Rebellion: The Politics of Insurgent Violence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Introduction and Chapter 1.

Humphreys, Macartan, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. "Handling and manhandling civilians in civil war." *American Political Science Review* 100.3 (2006): 429.

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97 (March): 75–90.

Dube, Oeindrila, and Juan F. Vargas. 2013. "Commodity price shocks and civil conflict: Evidence from Colombia." *The Review of Economic Studies* 80(4): 1384-1421.

March 21st: No Class - Spring Break (Week #11)

March 28th: Politics of Public Service Provision (Week #12)

David Stasavage. 2005. "Democracy and Education Spending in Africa" *American Journal of Political Science* Volume 49, Issue 2, April 2005, Pages 343–358

Michael Ross. 2006. "Is Democracy Good for the Poor?" *American Journal of Political Science* Volume 50, Issue 4, October 2006, Pages 860–874

Guy Grossman and Kristin Michelitch. "Information Dissemination, Competitive Pressure, and Politician Performance between Elections: A Field Experiment in Uganda." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming. https://www.vanderbilt.edu/csdi/includes/WP_3_2016_Final.pdf

Adam Auerbach. 2016. "Clients and Communities: The Political Economy of Party Network Organization and Development in India's Urban Slums" *World Politics* Volume 68, Number 1, January 2016 pp. 111-148

*Tariq Thachil. 2014. *Elite Parties, Poor Voters. How Social Services Win Votes in India*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 4.

April 4th: Distributive Politics and Clientelism (Week #13)

Scott, James C. 1972. "Patron-client politics and political change in Southeast Asia." *American Political Science Review* 66(1),pp 91-113.

Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1986. "Electoral politics as a redistributive game." *The Journal of Politics* 48 (2):370-389.

Dixit, A., & Londregan, J. (1996). The determinants of success of special interests in redistributive politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 58(4), 1132–1155.

*Stokes, Susan C., Thad Dunning, Marcello Nazareno, & Valeria Brusco. 2013. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1 and 8

Anjali Thomas Bohlken. "Targeting Ordinary Voters or Political Elites? Why Pork is Distributed Along Partisan Lines in India" *American Journal of Political Science* Forthcoming.

April 11th: The Politics of Economic Development (Week #14)

Acemoglu, Daron, and James Robinson. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty* [Paperback] Crown Business, Chapters 1, 2,3 and 4

*Bueno de Mesquita et. al. 2000. *Logic of Political Survival*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Chapter 1 (pages 1 to 8), Chapters 2 and 4

*Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub & Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. New York: Cambridge University Press., Chapters 3,4,5 and Conclusion

April 18th: Domestic Consequences of Foreign Aid (Week #15)

Jablonski, Ryan S. 2014. "How Aid Targets Votes: The Impact of Electoral Incentives on Foreign Aid Distribution" *World Politics*, Volume 66, Issue 2

Winters, Matthew S. "Targeting, accountability and capture in development projects." *International Studies Quarterly* 58.2 (2014): 393-404.

Cruz, Cesi and Christina Schneider. "Foreign Aid and Undeserved Credit Claiming" *American Journal of Political Science* (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajps.12285/abstract>)

Fearon, James D., Macartan Humphreys and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2009. "Can Development Aid Contribute to Social Cohesion after Civil War? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Post-conflict Liberia" *American Economic Review* Vol 99 No. 2, pages 287-291

Carnegie, Allison, and Nikolay Marinov. "Foreign Aid, Human Rights, and Democracy Promotion: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2199131>.