

International Studies 190: Corruption

Spring 2020

Faculty: Paul Niehaus, pniehaus@ucsd.edu. Office hours by appointment.

Overview

In this course we will aim to better understand corruption in developing countries today: why it occurs, what the consequences are, and what can or should be done about it. In the process, we will also aim to build practical problem-solving and communication skills.

We will (with a few exceptions) spend class time discussing the assigned readings, the challenges facing the actors in them, and the practical methods they might use. You are expected to come to class prepared for this discussion. Where the authors conduct quantitative analyses (e.g. multivariate regression) you are expected to understand the substantive conclusions they draw but not the technical details.

Grading

I expect to assign grades as follows, though the evolving situation may make it necessary to adjust. In addition, a passing grade on both reading quizzes and the research project are required to pass the course.

1. **Reading quizzes (20%).** Weekly five-minute, five-question, open-book, multiple choice quizzes covering the assigned readings for that week (20%). These will be available on Canvas starting 24 hours before scheduled class meetings each week, and must be completed before class begins.
2. **A research project (80%).** Your assignment is as follows: choose a major government program or public service in a developing country and imagine yourself as the newly appointed head of this program. Prepare a report describing (i) the services your staff are responsible for delivering and the process by which they are supposed to do so; (ii) sources of discretionary power in this process and the opportunities for corruption this creates; (iii) what is currently known about corruption among your staff; (iv) what additional information you should collect to enhance your understanding of the situation, and (v) what concrete steps you should take to control corruption. Your analysis should draw on and explicitly cite the concepts and the evidence in our class readings. I will consider proposals for alternative paper topics on a case-by-case basis.

Graded milestones for this project are a 1-page worksheet due by Meeting 5 describing its key parameters (10% of total grade), an in-class presentation during Meeting 8 or 9 (20%), and a 20 page paper due by midnight Pacific Time on 5 June (50%). If you are in a time zone more than 3 hours different from Pacific Time you may request to schedule separate time for your presentation.

Assignments unavoidably missed for an excused medical reason will be dropped. Late papers will be penalized by one letter grade per day. You are expected to do your own work, as outlined in the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship: <http://www-senate.ucsd.edu/manual/appendices/app2.htm>.

Schedule

Meeting 1: Logistics, Background & Motivation, Methods (31 March)

This unit provides conceptual and historical background on corruption, and introduces some statistical techniques used in the papers we will be reading.

Meeting 2: Corruption and Regulation (7 April)

Readings: Leff (1964), Bertrand et al. (2007). This unit examines different views on how corruption affects the regulatory process. Is corruption a good thing that circumvents onerous government regulation? Or is it a bad thing that undermines important social policies?

Meeting 3: Industrial Organization (14 April)

Readings: Shleifer and Vishny (1993), Olken and Barron (2009). This unit examines how the organization of a bureaucracy – for example, how and whether different bureaucrats compete with or cooperate with each other to provide regulatory services – affects the amount of corruption. What happens to bribes when you need 2 different permits to start a business? What if it were 10 permits?

Meeting 4: Corruption and Redistribution (21 April)

Readings: Reinikka and Svensson (2004), Niehaus et al. (2013). This unit studies how corruption affects redistribution, or transfers of wealth from the rich to the poor, and how this might influence policy choices. For example, if the government tries to pay workers \$1 more per day, how much do their wages actually go?

Meeting 5: Cultures of Corruption (28 April)

Readings: Wade (1982), Fisman and Miguel (2007). This unit examines different ideas of what a “culture” of corruption might mean. Could bribery be self-perpetuating? Do people become innured to corruption?

Meeting 6: Cracking Down (5 May)

Readings: Klitgaard (1988, pp. 13-62), Olken (2007). This unit examines methods of reducing or eliminating corruption – for example, auditing. As an additional topic we may discuss an ongoing anti-corruption effort in the Indian state of Andhra Pradesh based on biometric authentication technology. Pages 62-97 in Klitgaard are not assigned for this week’s discussion but highly recommended as input into your final papers.

Meeting 7: Politics (12 May)

Readings: Ferraz and Finan (2008), Callen and Long (2015). This unit examines the role of the information, elections and the media in limiting corruption among elected politicians. Do voters actually care whether their leaders are corrupt? What does it take to keep elections themselves clean?

Meeting 8: Student Presentations (19 May)

Meeting 9: Student Presentations (26 May)

Meeting 10: Pitfalls (2 June)

Readings: Wrong (2009). This unit examines corruption through the lens of Michela Wrong’s acclaimed biography “It’s Our Turn to Eat.” Wrong tells the story of John Githongo, a prominent journalist and activist in Kenya named anti-corruption czar under the presidency of Mwai Kibaki. Chapters 7, 9, 16, and 17 provide context on Kenyan history and society and are optional; the rest is required.

References

- Bertrand, Marianne, Simeon Djankov, Rema Hanna, and Sendhil Mullainathan**, “Obtaining a Driver’s License in India: An Experimental Approach to Studying Corruption,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, November 2007, *122* (4), 1639–1676. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25098885>.
- Callen, Michael and James D. Long**, “Institutional Corruption and Election Fraud: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Afghanistan,” *American Economic Review*, January 2015, *105* (1), 354–81. <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/aer.20120427>.
- Ferraz, Claudio and Frederico Finan**, “Exposing Corrupt Politicians: The Effects of Brazil’s Publicly Released Audits on Electoral Outcomes,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 05 2008, *123* (2), 703–745. <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/123/2/703/1930865>.
- Fisman, Raymond and Edward Miguel**, “Corruption, Norms, and Legal Enforcement: Evidence from Diplomatic Parking Tickets,” *Journal of Political Economy*, December 2007, *115* (6), 1020–1048. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/527495>.
- Klitgaard, Robert**, *Controlling Corruption*, University of California Press, 1988. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pnj3b>.
- Leff, Nathaniel**, “Economic Development through Bureaucratic Corruption,” *American Behavioural Scientist*, 1964, *8*, 8–14. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/000276426400800303>.
- Niehaus, Paul, Antonia Atanassova, Marianne Bertrand, and Sendhil Mullainathan**, “Targeting with Agents,” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, February 2013, *5* (1), 206–38. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pol.5.1.206>.
- Olken, Benjamin A.**, “Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia,” *Journal of Political Economy*, April 2007, *115* (2), 200–249. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/517935>.
- **and Patrick Barron**, “The Simple Economics of Extortion: Evidence from Trucking in Aceh,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 06 2009, *117* (3), 417–452. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/599707>.
- Reinikka, Ritva and Jakob Svensson**, “Local Capture: Evidence From a Central Government Transfer Program in Uganda,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 2004, *119* (2), 678–704. <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/119/2/679/1894528>.
- Shleifer, Andrei and Robert W Vishny**, “Corruption,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 1993, *108* (3), 599–617. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2118402>.
- Wade, Robert**, “The System of Administrative and Political Corruption: Canal Irrigation in South India,” *Journal of Development Studies*, April 1982, *18*, 287–328. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00220388208421833>.
- Wrong, Michela**, *It’s Our Turn to Eat*, HarperCollins Publishers, 2009.